

Using Marine Spatial Planning in the Gulf of Guinea for the implementation of Payment for Ecosystem Services and Coastal Nature-based Solutions

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10875

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

CBIT No

NGI No

Project Title

Using Marine Spatial Planning in the Gulf of Guinea for the implementation of Payment for Ecosystem Services and Coastal Nature-based Solutions

Countries

Regional, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Togo

Agency(ies)

IUCN

Other Executing Partner(s)

FCWC

Executing Partner Type

Others

GEF Focal Area

International Waters

Taxonomy

Financial and Accounting, Biodiversity, Focal Areas, Stakeholders, Type of Engagement, Payment for Ecosystem Services, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Productive Seascapes, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, International Waters, Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan Preparation, Fisheries, Biomes, Mangrove, Seagrasses, Large Marine Ecosystems, Marine Protected Area, Influencing models, Demonstrate innovative approach, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Participation, Private Sector, Local Communities, Beneficiaries, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Participation and leadership, Access to benefits and services, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Knowledge Generation, Knowledge Exchange, Capacity Development, Learning

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Duration

36 In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

270,000.00

Submission Date

9/15/2021

A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
IW-1-1	GET	2,250,000.00	7,000,000.00
IW-1-2	GET	750,000.00	2,000,000.00
Total Project Cost (\$)		3,000,000.00	9,000,000.00

B. Indicative Project description summary

Project Objective

To implement a regional mechanism for nature-based solution implementation for habitat restoration and maintenance using payment for ecosystem services in the countries of Togo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana (Gulf of Guinea).

Project Component	Financing Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
Component 1: Marine Spatial Planning in Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire	Technical Assistance	1.1 Mapping and management of coastal and marine areas improved by establishing a regional MSP to enhance cooperation and support partnerships for financing.	1.1.1 In country training for MSP taken place 1.1.2 A regional working group for MSP arranged and regional dialogue for stakeholder concertation and engagement 1.1.3 Review report of current management strategies and identification of elements pertinent for the MSP (incl. Ecosystem ecological conditions, socio-economic assessment, socio-economic trade-offs. existing governance arrangements) produced 1.1.4 Established MSP for FCWC region in place	GET	950,000.00	2,000,000.00

Component 2: Payment for Ecosystem Services in Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire	Technical Assistance	2.1 Improved understanding of the current state of FCWC ecosystems pertaining to the provision of ecosystem services. 2.2 Establishment of a PES system, increasing the monetary contribution by beneficiaries for their use of ecosystem services, improved regional cooperation and understanding of PES.	2.1.1 Key Ecosystem Services, beneficiaries, and viable compensation systems identified 2.1.2 Ecological condition of coastal and marine ecosystems, their vulnerability and estimation of the differential between their full capacity and their current capacity identified 2.1.3 Monetary valuation report of ES for the target countries. 2.2.1 PES pilot schemes for Togo, Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire in place as a guide for FCWC countries 2.2.2 Monitoring system of ecosystem services established (using GMES Africa) and socio-economic impacts.	GET	750,000.00	2,000,000.00
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	------------	--------------

3. Coastal and Marine Nature-Based Solutions Scheme in Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire	Technical Assistance	3.1 Improved organisation of regional integrated ecosystem services.	3.1.1 Regional Accounting Monitoring system in place for ecosystem services	GET	1,157,143.00	4,550,000.00
		3.2 Improved management of ecologically important ecosystems for the provision of ecosystem services through NBS	3.1.2 Effective financial mechanism for ES collection in place			
			3.2.1 Areas identified and ranked in terms of priority (incl. in MPAs, incl. using ecosystem vulnerability index, incl. vulnerable coastal communities)			
			3.3 Strategy for improved regional coordination for scaling up of NBS	3.2.2 Stakeholders engaged in determining NBS selections (location/type) through co-design. Plan in place for NBS projects.		
		3.2.3 NBS pilot projects in place with consistent monitoring.				
		3.3.1 Lessons learned documented and disseminated				
			3.3.2 Funding Scaling-up process initiated			
Sub Total (\$)					2,857,143.00	8,550,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
GET					142,857.00	450,000.00
Sub Total(\$)					142,857.00	450,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)					3,000,000.00	9,000,000.00

C. Indicative sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Donor Agency	EU-PESCAO	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,500,000.00
Donor Agency	EU-Mangroves	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
Donor Agency	EU-FISHGOV	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00
Donor Agency	World Bank - WACA	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	4,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	FFEM - WACA	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
			Total Project Cost(\$)	9,000,000.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

Not Applicable

D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
IUCN	GET	Regional	International Waters	International Waters	3,000,000	270,000	3,270,000.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					3,000,000.00	270,000.00	3,270,000.00

E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
PPG Required **true**

PPG Amount (\$)				PPG Agency Fee (\$)			
100,000				9,000			
Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
IUCN	GET	Regional	International Waters	International Waters	100,000	9,000	109,000.00
Total Project Costs(\$)					100,000.00	9,000.00	109,000.00

Core Indicators

Indicator 2 Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
350,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 2.1 Marine Protected Areas Newly created

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	---------	---------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

Indicator 2.2 Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
350,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
		Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources	350,000.00						

Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
25000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

25,000.00

Indicator 5 Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

70,000.00

Indicator 5.1 Number of fisheries that meet national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
--------------------------	-----------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

Type/name of the third-party certification

Indicator 5.2 Number of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollutions and hypoxia

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)
0	0	0	0

LME at PIF	LME at CEO Endorsement	LME at MTR	LME at TE

Indicator 5.3 Amount of Marine Litter Avoided

Metric Tons (expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 8 Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels

Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)
27,000.00			

Fishery Details

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	120,000			
Male	105,000			
Total	225000	0	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

Values estimated on existing MPAs, coastal protected areas, identified EBSAs, existing fisheries catches and the number of individuals in coastal communities associated with the proposed activities. The Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Programme:

<https://biopama.org/> Mami Wata EBSA Framework: <https://mamiwataproject.org/2019/03/01/ebsa-framework/> FAO FishStat

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers

The project will intervene in three countries : Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire. Currently Togo and Côte d'Ivoire are part of the WACA project and Ghana will be included in WACA as of 2023. The current project foresees to develop planning tools (MSP) and activities (PES, NbS) at the scale of the EEZ of the three countries to complement the WACA initiative which focuses mainly on the coastal zone. The three countries were also chosen because they are adjacent and it will give the opportunity to develop a transboundary MSP. The sections below therefore reflect problems, causes and barriers in these 3 countries. The two major issues are linked to the transboundary nature of the resources and the obstacles to the implementation of effective resource management schemes.

1.a) Transboundary environmental and adaptation problems and root causes

- Decline in fish stocks and unsustainable harvesting of living resources – the overexploitation of fishery resources and the use of destructive fishing practices, alongside the destruction of coastal ecosystems has a significant effect on coastal communities, due to the dependency on fisheries for the economy and the contribution to food security. There exists a significant gap in knowledge around the contribution of coastal ecosystems to fish biomass production, thus the link between ecosystems and food security needs to be made in social understanding. Furthermore, the ecosystem services provided to the distant water fishing fleets are unaccounted for, which generates the need for ecosystem valuations to establish the economic benefit provided by the ecosystems. This engenders the need for a clear link to be made that fisheries depend on coastal and marine ecosystem services provided.
- **Uncertainty regarding ecosystem status** - information about ecosystem status, integrity (changes in community composition, vulnerable species and biodiversity, introduction of alien species) and yields in a highly variable environment including effects of global climate change is lacking. Inadequate state of knowledge of the ecosystem status and lack of regional coordination in studies of biodiversity, habitats, and ecotones hinders effective management on a national and regional level. The root cause of the lack of information derives from the non-existence of valuation of ecosystem services in place. Furthermore, there are simply not enough funds generated to research, restore and maintain coastal and marine ecosystem services at a regional level. There are no payment for ecosystem services schemes in place to help generate these funds.
- **Habitat destruction and alteration** - including inter alia, modification of seabed and coastal zone, degradation of coast and coastline erosion. These result from a decline in fish stocks (as outlined in point a) above) which results in changes of fishing practices to those that are more harmful to the ecosystem (such as larger net mesh size and blast fishing, for example), further impacts arise from the intense urbanisation of the coastal zones, unsustainable exploitation of wood, particularly from mangroves, coastal erosion and offshore oil exploration and pollution. Currently no ecosystem services compensation scheme is in place for those benefiting from the services provided by the ecosystems, particularly those who benefit from harmful practices on the ecosystems.

- **Decline in water quality** – Changes in freshwater inputs, increased sediment loads, alteration of natural flows, degeneration of ground water; algal blooms, microbial contamination and nutrient enrichment, land-based and marine sources including solid waste, marine litter and pollution from oil spills, shipping, storage facilities, ports and harbours. The deterioration in water quality is caused by several factors including construction activities on river basins and in the coastal zone, the dumping of ballast water and fuel from ships, the escape of species from aquaculture operations, drought impacting the dynamics of estuaries, oil and mining activities and agricultural run-off leading to nutrient enrichment in coastal areas.
- **Climate change** – global warming and associated climate change is another major area of concern for the FCWC region, highlighted in the GCLME Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA), and will require adaptive management actions to address its impact. Climate change will impact all sectors and will have major influences on upwelling dynamics, plankton productivity, fisheries habitats and critical habitats. In the context of socio-economics and ecosystem health, climate change is expected to lead to more extreme events, flooding, sea level rise and coastal erosion. Some of which are already making marked impacts on coastal communities. Already, climate variability and environmental change are impacting fisheries migrations, seasonal plankton production and coastal erosion.

Coastal land-based threats - urbanisation, destruction of coastal habitats, pollution from land based extractive industries, sand extraction from the beaches for construction are some of the threats the coastal ecosystems are facing. Over the coming decades the coastal zone will be confronted to huge challenges such as population displacement or industries relocations that will require strong decisions

These key issues stem from three main areas:

- Currently, there are **no integrated systems for management of ecosystems**, particularly pertaining to the use of resources in a spatial sense. Marine Spatial Planning is a stakeholder driven process which defines the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities[1]. Typically planning involves assessing the socioeconomic and ecological benefits and impacts of the various uses of, and threats to, a given area and then determining how to spatially allocate these activities among various scenarios based on ecological and socioeconomic trade-offs. Currently, only Ghana has a proposed plan for Marine Spatial Planning (MSP). MSP could provide awareness of what exists in the area, why the ecosystems, their health and services provided are important, why it is necessary to take care of them, and what to do to ensure their longevity.
- Those **benefiting from ecosystem services are not paying for them**, and there is a lack of stewardship for the coastal and marine ecosystems. A payment for ecosystem services (PES) scheme can encourage the safeguarding of economically and ecologically important areas and generate income for coastal communities and conservation measures. PES is based on the idea that beneficiary or user of an ecosystem service makes some form of payment to the provider or steward of that service. The intention is that whoever preserves or maintains an ecosystem service should be paid for doing so[2].
- The **current system for management of marine resources is fragmented** and conservation efforts seldom operate on the principles of nature-based solutions (NBS), which put ecosystems and societal wellbeing at the heart of resource management. NBS involves working with nature to address societal challenges, including strengthening resilience to the impacts of climate change, to provide benefits for both human well-being and biodiversity. Typically, NBS activities involve protection, restoration, regeneration or management of natural or semi-natural ecosystems.

Barriers to the sustainable management of resources in the FCWC countries

The main barriers that need to be addressed primarily relate to policy and regulations, technical resources and research capacity, monitoring, control and surveillance infrastructure, institutional capacities and practices, communication, information sharing and awareness, training and human capacity development and financial restrictions. The barriers can be summarized as follows:

- **Regulatory:** absence of regional plans for PES, NBS or MSP. Inadequate legal and environment policy measures and regulations including plans to incorporate NBS. Insufficient monitoring and assessments of fisheries and ecosystems, conflicts over access rights to marine resources and lack of policy coordination and harmonisation.
- **Institutional, technical and financial capacity:** Constraints in relation to capacity development hinders the implementation of national PES, NBS and MSP as well as multi-country management within the FCWC countries. Furthermore, capacity constraints limit the ability to regulate, monitor and protect vulnerable ecosystems and species (upon which food security depend). These issues include a lack of funding to undertake ecosystem and fisheries monitoring and assessment activities as well as inadequate technical expertise to service and maintain research and monitoring equipment. The consequences of lack of capacity and expertise at a national level leads to limited interactions between institutions and countries and inability to implement nature-based solutions and participate in regional decision making. It also results in uncoordinated resource management, monitoring and research programmes, lack of knowledge and understanding of the resources and environmental processes, absence of full stakeholder participation, imbalances in baseline information and a collection of poorly advised governments. The socio-economic consequences of lack of capacity development together with poor communication and information sharing often leads to conflicts at the local level, usually involving artisanal coastal communities. Incorporating nature-based solutions, PES and developing marine spatial plans is a slow process that requires both awareness-raising campaigns and incentives.

1. b) **Baseline scenario and associated baseline projects**

The area of FCWC countries along the Gulf of Guinea lies between Liberia and Nigeria. The FCWC area has an area of 1,766,463km² and is populated by over 237 million inhabitants. The coastal area is characteristically low lying and interspersed with marshes, lagoons and mangrove swamps. The region has a monsoon climate with high precipitation and almost constant monthly temperatures. Many rivers flow into the Gulf of Guinea, giving warm, low salinity coastal waters, except during the upwelling seasons in the central part of the Gulf. Mangroves are found around the major river mouths in the Gulf of Guinea, especially in the Niger Delta. Some corals are present in coastal and offshore areas, but true reefs are absent. Turtles, marine mammals and seabirds are also present. A number of fish communities are present in coastal and offshore waters. The Gulf of Guinea is the most densely settled coastal area in Africa and is highly impacted by human activities. Mangroves, which constitute an important resource for coastal populations, are damaged by over-exploitation and pollution of water bodies from urban run-off. Forest clearance in rural areas is another major problem, causing topsoil erosion. Artisanal and industrial fisheries and aquaculture are an important source of employment and food in the region and shallow coastal waters appear fully or over exploited. Other anthropogenic activities include onshore and offshore oil production, damming of major rivers, port development and landfill. Such activities have serious effects on marine and coastal environments and can contribute to coastal erosion. A number of protected areas now exist, and some environmental legislation is in place. However, enforcement is difficult, mainly due to constraints on financial, physical and human resource

The rapid population growth in the coastal zone has resulted in pollution of social values and culture, socio-economic dislocations and conflicts, in addition to serious environmental degradation. Similar to conditions in the rest of the world, many of the region's poor are crowded in the coastal areas for subsistence socio-economic activities, viz: fishing, farming, sand mining and production of charcoal in the mangrove areas. Additionally, more than 60% of the existing industries in the region are concentrated in the coastal cities.

Fisheries

In terms of fisheries resources, the FCWC area has 2,633 km of coastline and an exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of 923,916 km². Despite its imposing maritime space, the FCWC area does not produce enough fish to feed its population. Only Ghana is relatively “self-sufficient” in fish production. Its imports of fish products represent less than 10% of the total availability of fresh equivalents. All five other countries in the FCWC region are heavily dependent on imports of fish products. Despite the poor performance of their fisheries sector, the countries of the sub-region are not immune to overexploitation of their fisheries resources as a result of the difficultly controllable development of foreign industrial fishing and IUU fishing (illegal, unreported and unregulated). These countries are not immune to the degradation of the marine and coastal environment.

The fisheries resources of the sub-region are exploited by artisanal, semi-industrial and industrial fleets. In general, the fisheries sector provides a major source of employment and foreign currency since most of the tunas and shellfish are exported. The total landings of fish captured by countries in the sub-region have gone up by less than 115,000 tonnes in 1960 to over 1,200,000 tonnes in 2018, while the aquacultural production during the same period has been multiplied by 10 over the last two decades, from 40 000 t in the early 2000 to more than 400 000 t in 2020. The sub-region nevertheless remains a net importer of fish and fishery products. For a large part of this population, fish is the only source of animal protein. With regard to food, the sector is essential for the supply of protein in the region. The average consumption accounts for almost double the African average of 8.2 kg /year /inhabitant.

The fisheries administrations in the countries of the West Central Gulf of Guinea region lack the human, physical and financial resources to effectively and efficiently carry out their commitments with regard to the management of fishery resources. The shortage of personnel and regulatory bodies undermines the application of the law in certain countries. In all the member countries of the Fisheries Committee for the West Central Gulf of Guinea, except Ghana which has a Ministry for Fisheries, the administration of fisheries is under the Ministry of Agriculture or Animal Production.

Fisheries governance gives rise to several problems notably socioeconomic and ecological. Many of these problems are common to all the member countries and require that coordinated efforts be made to exchange knowledge and information, improve management tools, strengthen monitoring, control and surveillance as well as the fight against illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing.

Table 1: Fisheries data for each FCWC country

Country	Annual Catch (tonnes) (2019)	Annual per capita supply of fish and fishery products (2013)	Fishing agreements in place
Benin	73 484	13.3	-
Cote d'Ivoire	108 638	16.1	Agreement with EU
Ghana	392 990	24.8	Agreement with China
Liberia	16 569	4.1	Agreement with EU and Senegal
Nigeria	825 013	13.3	-
Togo	25 526	11	-

Source: FAO FishStat

Currently, most of the countries of the Gulf of Guinea have joint venture agreements in place. They are widely used in the trawling segment with Chinese and Korean counterparts and in the Tuna segment with Thai and Korean counterparts. Bilateral agreements concern only Côte d'Ivoire and Liberia, which allow access of EU fleets to Ivoirian and Liberian waters in return for monetary compensations to the country. A further agreement exists which allows Senegalese canoes to Liberian waters. The fishing agreements pose some challenges within the country but add valuable financing for public finances. The EU agreement supports sustainable fishing practices and improve transparency. No bilateral fishing agreements currently exist for Benin, Nigeria or Togo. Establishing bilateral fishing agreements could be a strong mechanism for ensuring financing for resource management and conservation measures, as is the case in Mauritania, where the EU contributes 1 million euro per year specifically to the Banc d'Arguin National Park for the preservation of the resources therein.

Coastal Development and Extraction

Approximately 40 - 80 per cent of the regions incremental economic activity takes place in the coastal zone. For most countries, about 60 per cent of industries are located in coastal cities (UNDP/GEF, 1993). A high percentage of the coastal populations traditionally depend directly or indirectly on the lagoons, associated wetlands, and inshore waters surrounding them livelihood. These coastal ecosystems contribute significantly to the socio-economic development of coastal cities. In recent times coastal activities have greatly diversified with traditional resource-based practices such as fisheries, forestry, aquaculture and agriculture giving way to more profitable ones such as industry, shipping, commerce and tourism. The coastal zone has facilitated trade, commerce and socio-economic growth for centuries through maritime transportation and played significant role in regional integration and globalization. Rural-urban drift of population is predicated on a perceived availability of greater economic opportunities in coastal cities. The influx to metropolitan and urban areas however creates social problems of inadequate housing facilities, poor public hygiene and sanitation, poor educational and health facilities and unsustainable utilization of natural resources leading to environmental degradation.

The areas of natural or undeveloped coastal land in are increasingly under threat from largescale urban developments, mostly residential estates, and ports and harbour development. With economic growth, some of the countries in the region embark on huge infrastructural development such as Export Promotion Zones (EPZ) including new deep-water ports and ancillary facilities to support export trade. This development will bring significant trade, industry and economic prosperity to the region although not without environmental costs.

In terms of mining, the coastal and marine environment is mined for sand and gravel, and significantly for fossil fuels - natural gas and oil for which some of the countries (Angola, Congo, Gabon, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, and Nigeria) are already net exporters. Crude oil has been found in economic quantities in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire. Increasingly, the region's continental shelf is a hub of prospecting activities with sporadic exploration, onshore and offshore in Liberia, Togo and Benin. Some proven reserves have been discovered extending the frontiers of hydrocarbon deposits in the fragile ecosystem.

The degree of the impact of onshore and offshore oil and gas activities on the environment is considered to be largely local, but differs in different ecosystems and increases in those areas where there are a number of installations and development. There are linkages between the socio-economic and environmental effects of onshore and offshore oil and gas operations. When development is not performed in the context of open and participatory environment, it could result in serious resentment and social division with political, economic and security implications.

Mangroves, Wetlands, Coastal Lagoons and Seagrasses

Coastal habitats such as shallow estuaries, bays, lagoons and wetlands that are often reclaimed or cleared for habitation, development or agricultural purposes are the most productive nursery grounds for major fish or shellfish in the region. They are therefore critical habitats, which underpin the regenerative capacity of the fishery of the sea. It plays a vital role as producers of nutrients in primary and secondary productivity and in supporting biologically diverse communities of terrestrial and aquatic organisms of direct and indirect economic value and transboundary significance. The importance of mangrove, wetland and lagoon areas as spawning and breeding grounds for many transboundary fish species and shrimps is well known in the FCWC region. In addition to providing fish habitats, the lagoons are important staging, feeding and roosting areas for water birds, many of which are migrants of global importance. The FCWC region has a chain of lagoon complexes adjacent to the Gulf of Guinea beginning from Cote d'Ivoire and passing through the mouth of the Volta River in Ghana through the Republic of Benin and finally into Nigeria. The Lagos lagoon complex is the largest of the four lagoon systems of the Gulf of Guinea coast. As a stand-alone resource, the total landed catch of estuarine and estuarine-associated fish is presently unknown although it accounts for most of the artisanal landings in some countries. Presently the mangrove forests in the Gulf of Guinea region are under pressure from over-cutting (for fuel wood and construction timber) and from other anthropogenic impacts (e.g. pollution), thereby jeopardising their roles in the regeneration of living resources and as reservoirs of biological diversity. It is expected that should sea levels rise even a meter due to the influences of climate change, mangroves would be inundated in much of the region. This would increase the rates of erosion of the shoreline and contribute to increased flooding, all resulting in the loss of income and livelihoods from coastal industries and port activities throughout the region, as well as loss of opportunities for development of tourism. Degradation in the coastal areas is a source of concern which along with poverty, poor health, and rapid urbanization inhibits human development in the coastal areas.

Seagrass beds play a vital role in delivering multiple benefits to the environment – and people. They are nurseries for commercial fish and a food source for marine turtles and manatees among others, and are an important habitat for endangered species like seahorses. They also promote sediment stabilisation, pathogen reduction in coastal waters and carbon sequestration. Seagrass beds have been recorded in Nigeria, Togo, Benin, Cote d'Ivoire and Liberia, however, none of these countries have included seagrass beds for their Nationally Determined Contributions. Seagrass ecosystem restoration involves the rehabilitation of degraded seagrass areas and can be effective in reversing biodiversity loss and recovering ecosystem services, yet these ecosystems are diminishing with the effects of coastal urbanisation, harmful fishing practices and pollution.

Current MPAs and protection strategies

Various protected areas exist in the region (Table 2). These areas do not adequately represent all the biogeographic zones in the region. Major gaps are apparent. Priority sites where there are likely to be a number of important sites for rare and endemic West African coral species and associated marine life have not been identified. Information is required to begin to plan the development of a system of MPAs that would adequately represent marine biodiversity and the provision of ecosystem services in the region.

Ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) are defined by the Mami Wata project as “discrete geographic or oceanographic areas that provide important services to one or more species, populations, ecosystems, compared to other regions with similar characteristics, and meet the EBSA criteria” – 1) uniqueness or rarity; 2) particular importance for life cycle stages of species; 3) importance for endangered/threatened species; 4) vulnerability, sensitivity or slow recovery; 5) biological productivity; 6) biological diversity; and 7) naturalness. In other words, these areas correspond to marine areas of high biodiversity hotspots and play a key role in the ecological and biological processes of the marine environment. Some EBSAs exist within the FCWC region and are identified in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Current Marine Protected Area coverage and identified EBSAs within each FCWC country.

Country	% MPA coverage[1]	EBSAs[2] (yet to be implemented)
Benin	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Nazounme-Bouche du Roi (2512 ha) · Avlekete Togbin (16390 ha) · Togo-Benin transboundary marine area (594 km²)
Cote d'Ivoire	0.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Canyon and Sous-Marine de Tabou (50 km of coastline) · The road of turtles and sarines (over 300 km) · Tropical breeding ground for Cote d'Ivoire tuna · Abidjan-Assinie (220 km long) · Aire Marine d'Assinie (80 km)
Ghana	0.09	
Liberia	0.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Grand Kru-Sinoe Sea Turtle breeding ground
Nigeria	0.02	
Togo	0.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Agbodrafo between Lome and Kpeme · Avlekete Togbin (16390 ha) · Togo-Benin transboundary marine area (594 km²)

Source: Mami Wata and BIOPAMA

These areas are of critical importance to the provision of ecosystem services and economic benefits, but currently do not benefit from any formal protection or management measures. In addition, the sustainable management of these sites can contribute to the sequestration of carbon (seagrasses, mangroves, reefs) and the conservation of emblematic species.

Current state of Ecosystem Services valuation

According to Tregarot et al 2020[3], the estimated financial value of the ecosystem services provided solely by seagrass beds and mangroves of the Guinea LME is about 75 million USD/year with the seagrass beds providing services such as carbon sequestration and water purification for about 45 million USD/year while mangrove, with carbon absorption and coastal protection provides services for a value of 30 million USD/year. Furthermore, the economic impact provided by the ecosystem services to the fisheries alone is estimated by UNEP[4] to be around \$18 billion in total, or \$18 million per year. This is derived by taking the quantity of the ecosystem services provided, multiplying it by the market price and adjusting for illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and maximum sustainable yield.

This highlights the importance of ES, but also the money that could be generated through PES. However, the value of ecosystem services will likely continue to decline in the future without appropriate policies to address the increasing pressure due to population growth along the West African Coast. Money from PES can then be used to implement and support NBS to protect, restore and regenerate ecosystems to enhance the capacity of ecosystems to provide services.

Implications of the COVID-19 pandemic

Following the 2019 outbreak in Wuhan, China of COVID-19, global concern intensified around the social, economic and ecological impacts that would be associated. In West Africa, the effects of the outbreak have been particularly severe, especially for vulnerable communities that are in some cases already confronted with hunger or conflict. In terms of fisheries, observed negative impacts of the pandemic include shut-downs of entire fisheries, chain reactions from market failures driven by reduced demand, collapse of seafood prices and increasing health risks for fishers, processors, sellers and associated communities. Women in the fisheries sector, who play a vital role in the industry, have been at the forefront of the effects of the pandemic on fish value chains, often experiencing deepened gender inequalities as a result[5]. Further in the fisheries industry, reductions in monitoring, control and surveillance of fishing activities during the pandemic is likely to have opened the door to more illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, putting further pressure on marine ecosystems and exploited stocks beyond ecologically sustainable levels. This is particularly pressing because of the long-term implications this might have for the future of food security.

In economic terms, limitations of cross-border and internal movements, closures of local markets, increased prices and difficulties in carrying out economic activities associated with marine systems (tourism, extractive activities, etc.) has contributed to social tensions, major loss of employment and an increase in crime rates. In particular the tourism industry, having already suffered major economic losses following the collapse of British tourism company 'Tomas Cook', faced further drying up of tourist arrivals, forcing hoteliers, coastal tour operators, guides and others associated with coastal tourism to look for alternative means to earn a living.

In environmental terms, waste management has posed a great challenge to the countries of the FCWC region. This has been exacerbated by the new materials and personal protective measures such as masks, gloves, shields etc. These threats, where not handled effectively have had compounding impacts on the marine and coastal environment, not to mention human sanitation and health. Furthermore, the drastic decline in employment has resulted in a marked increase of illegal activities that detriment the ecological systems due to desperation (eg. Wildlife trade, illegal dumping, pollution events, etc.)

Baseline projects

Given the urgent need to manage the coastal line properly and develop adequate tools, IUCN in partnership with WAEMU (West African Economic and Monetary Union) prepared the "Regional shoreline monitoring study and drawing up of a management scheme for the West African Coastal area" (2010). The study has acknowledged the potential for development but also the risks along the West African coastline (from Mauritania to Nigeria) as well as the

key problems related to erosion, a phenomenon exacerbated by climate change. Since then, many initiatives and programmes have been launched, including several GEF projects on the Guinea-Current LME, the World Bank - West Africa Coastal Area initiative (WACA), the European Commission funded Mangrove initiative and the West-Africa Biodiversity and Climate Change (WA BICC) project supported by USAID.

Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire, and Benin have been selected by the Abidjan Convention to pilot a three-year project (2018-2021) with funding from the German Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation, Construction and Nuclear Safety and the Ghana Government. An ecosystem-based approach to Integrated Marine and Coast Environment Management in Ghana (the "Mami Wata" Pilot Project) was launched in September 2018. Ghana's Environmental Protection Agency is the implementing agency for the project. Capacity development is a core aspect of the pilot project and will build capacity of both national and regional Institutions to develop MSP. The project aimed to prepare a marine spatial plan for Ghana as the pilot, with Benin and Cote d'Ivoire to follow. It is hoped that the experiences from these three countries can be used for future scaling up of MSP in the region. The project ends in December 2021. Documents to be produced will be of general order and the current project will seek to refine the documents produced and apply the planning exercise in specific geographical areas or sectors.

The Strategic Action Programme (SAP) (2007) for the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem (GCLME) is a negotiated policy document under the aegis of the IGCC, funded by the GEF, which describes policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments needed to address the priority problems of a transboundary nature identified in the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis of the GCLME Region. The SAP aims to employ a holistic ecosystem-based approach for the integrated assessment, monitoring and adaptive management of coastal and marine resources, and to managing human activities in these systems within a framework of sustainable development.

Further development with regards to the SAP exists under the UNEP/FAO/UNDP/UNIDO GEF funded project "Strengthening of the enabling environment, ecosystem-based management and governance to support implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem" (2018-2021), which focuses on supporting transboundary policy, planning frameworks, capacity-building, regional collaboration mechanisms and setting up innovative financial mechanisms. It aims to strengthen the regional governance and ecosystem-based management of the GCLME through assisting the counties to build capacity for SAP implementation measures related to transboundary fisheries, biodiversity conservation and pollution reduction. The UNEP/FAO/UNDP/UNIDO project ends in 2021. The current project will seek to build on the strategies developed by the project and strengthen the institutions and the regional collaboration mechanisms put in place. Through the WACA project, IUCN has an agreement with the Abidjan Convention in the implementation of coastal zone management protocols. IUCN will use this privileged relationship with the Convention to support the establishment of the Guinea Current Commission. In addition, it will ensure that the current project complements and refine the work done by UNEP/FAO/UNDP/UNIDO.

The ongoing WACA / FFEM (Le Fonds français pour l'environnement Mondial) project 'Soft solutions to counter coastal erosion in West Africa' (2018-2022) aims to use nature-based solutions to combat coastal erosion associated with climate change and increasing urbanisation along the coasts of Togo, Benin and Senegal. The project is aimed at developing soft solutions on several pilot sites, such as planting or the use of sustainable materials in breakwater construction. It also brings together coastal observation mechanisms in order to guide public policy on the management of coastline areas.

The CECAF-PESCAO Project (2018-2023) focuses on improved regional governance of marine resources in the CECAF area (which includes the FCWC countries), specifically supporting member countries in application of management advice, information sharing with other organizations in the region and contribution to other processes at sub-regional level. It is funded by the European Development fund of the European Union and supports the Economic

Community of West African States (ECOWAS). The main objectives of the project are to improve regional governance of marine resources in the CECAF area using knowledge-based advice by strengthening management processes to contribute to sustainable fisheries, food security, and sustainable livelihoods. A second phase of the project is likely to start in late 2023.

The GREPPAO project (2018-2023), funded by PESCAO and the European Union, aims to contribute to the achievement of the overall objective of the PESCAO Programme which is to improve the contribution of fisheries resources to sustainable development, food security and poverty reduction in West Africa. GREPPAO has three specific objectives: 1) Improve the contribution of small pelagic transboundary fisheries to the food security of West African populations; 2) Increase the added value created throughout the fisheries sector specific to the small pelagic transboundary fishery; and 3) Contribute to the management of migratory fisheries related to the small pelagic transboundary fishery.

The EU Mangrove Project (2019-2023), the “Management of Mangrove Forests from Senegal to Benin (PAPBio C1 Mangroves), seeks to protect mangroves in Ghana, Senegal, The Gambia, Sierra Leone, Benin, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Togo and Benin. It was signed in July 2019 with €9.9 million funding from the European Union (EU) and is jointly implemented by the IUCN, the Wetlands International Africa and the 5Deltas collective. The goal of this project is to strengthen the management of protected areas and unprotected mangrove sites through linkages between governance and production systems with mangrove conservation structures for integrated protection of mangrove's diversity and ecosystems in West Africa and their enhanced resilience to climate change.

The FishGov project (2021-2025) addresses 3 strategic issues where collaboration with AU institutions, such as AUDA-NEPAD. AU-IBAR is responsible for the overall management and coordination of the various actions. The three strategic actions comprise: 1-Supporting evidence-based decision making on sustainable fisheries and aquaculture through improved knowledge, effective consultation, solid reporting and the promotion of cross-sectoral approaches; 2-Maintaining coherent implementation of the PFRS at continental, regional and national level; 3-Strengthening the African voice on issues of fisheries and aquaculture in international fora and domestication of global instruments. FishGov 2 will provide additional value and will complement EU Action at regional and national levels. The project is implementing key policy instruments, such as the Policy Framework and Reform Strategy (PFRS) for Fisheries and Aquaculture, and the Africa Blue Economy Strategy.

The WACA ResIP-CCA World Bank Investment Project (2018-2023) aims to strengthen the resilience of targeted communities and areas in coastal Western Africa particularly against the impacts of climate change. It is built around strengthening regional integration; strengthening the policy and institutional framework; strengthening national physical and social investments; and national coordination between Sao Tome & Principe, Benin, Togo, Mauritania, Cote d'Ivoire and Senegal. The project focuses on supporting policy and protocols for coastal zone management to generate stronger enforcement of national and regional regulations; and ensuring sound investment is available. The WACA ResIP-CCA targets the most vulnerable coastal communities and areas. The target areas are selected based on comprehensive technical analyses and stakeholder engagement.

Proposed alternative scenario (with brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project)

This proposed project for GEF-7 “International Waters” focal area will be complementary to the above initiatives and projects by specifically providing the tools to integrate coastal planning efforts done under WACA and other initiatives into a broader planning and management of the marine and coastal zone using the Marine Spatial Planning tools. Since WACA focuses on coastal management this project will build upon it to deliver MSP across the entire EEZ's. The planning efforts done by WACA on the coastal zone will be complemented by the current project. Ultimately, the proposed project aims at

delivering a sustainable new model for the management of fisheries in the Gulf of Guinea. The project will facilitate the establishment of a marine spatial planning (MSP), which will put in place the basis for valuation of fishery services and allow for the set-up of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) at the national level. The establishment of MSP and PES will not take place without the GEF funded project. Once the MSP and PES schemes are in place, this will enable nature-based solutions for the protection, restoration and regeneration of service producing ecosystems through the funds generated by PES. This is a truly innovative approach brought to the FCWC for developing a greater understanding of the ecosystems, their condition, the services they provide, and how to use these to generate financing for the implementation of conservation measures such as NBS. In addition, the project will support the implementation of existing sustainable management plans for coastal and marine areas, such as those developed by the WAVA project and these plans will be integrated into the regional MSP. Based on this, the paragraphs below provide details on the project's three components as they are currently planned.

Keeping in mind that balancing economic development with environmental management of the coastal and marine areas in the Fisheries Committee for the West Central Gulf of Guinea (FCWC) countries, this proposed GEF 7 funded project main objective will be to support investment opportunities in the sectors relevant to this area, mainly fisheries management, coastal management and biodiversity conservation. It will do this through mobilizing the private sector (fisheries, tourism, extractive industries, etc.) to invest in the ecosystems for which they are beneficiaries, as well as evolving a sustainable development trajectory for the coast, fisheries and biodiversity, which will ensure the longevity of the products and thus provide grounding for encouraged investment. In that perspective, the project intends to develop a strategy at the FCWC level that will lead sustainable management of coastal and marine resources in the member countries by mainstreaming environmentally sound practices in sectors that are critical to the regional economy. These investments will address the drivers of degradation and therefore prioritize activities in the sectors related to fisheries, coastal management and development, extractive industries, shipping, biodiversity conservation, and tourism through the expansion of marine protected areas, payment for ecosystem services and nature-based solutions in general (under the stewardship of the IUCN nature-based solutions standard).

Component 1: Marine Spatial Planning in Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire

Marine spatial planning (MSP) is a powerful tool for integrated marine management. It is designed to balance diverging interests and activities and, based on the predetermined objectives for a given marine area, to determine the optimal spatial and temporal distribution of marine activities. Typically, planning involves assessing the socioeconomic and ecological benefits and impacts of the various uses of, and threats to, a given area and then determining how to spatially allocate these activities among various scenarios based on ecological and socioeconomic trade-offs. In order to ensure the success of the MSP, all decisions on marine activities must be made in accordance with the marine spatial plan; this is the biggest challenge associated with MSP. As a public process to analyse and allocate the spatial distribution of human activities in marine areas for the achievement of ecological, economic and social objectives, MSP is increasingly seen as an operational approach that could make ecosystem-based marine management a reality.

In order to consider the new management paradigms of coastal and marine ecosystems, Marine Spatial Plans will be prepared, discussed and approved at the Ministerial level. It can be used to update the TDA and SAP, or other major national plans of the Guinea-Current large marine ecosystem with innovations aiming at enhancing private sector investments in sustainable management practices in the area. Traditionally, sectorial policies (transport and trade, tourism, fisheries, coastal management, extraction of non-living resources, etc.) linked to the coastal/marine domain are developed side-by-side and often contradictory. The development and implementation of Marine Spatial Plans in this project will take a holistic approach to marine/coastal zones and resources will complement the activities undertaken by the WACA project.

Given the shared resources and similar problems between the Member countries, a strategy will be drafted using the Marine Spatial Planning principles but considering the transboundary dimensions that can be mitigated through cooperative actions. As it integrates all sectors related to the marine and coastal zones such as nature protection (including coastal land-based conservation activities), shipping, ports, tourism, recreation, fishing, mineral extraction (include coastal land-based extraction activities), or aquaculture it identifies specific use for each area and helps in avoiding conflicts and reduces impacts on ecosystems. Once the FCWC zoning strategy will be drafted, national plans and strategies for the implementation of the spatial plans will be drafted . Developing a MSP strategy will complement the coastal management planning work promoted by WACA. Some of the target countries have coastal management plans and strategies. In the context of the WACA project, each country has planned to draft a coastal law or an integrated coastal management plan. The GEF support through this project will ensure these planning documents and strategies are integrated into broader Marine Spatial Planning approaches.

Regional activities for MSP will require improved sharing and compatibility of data and information between countries and a better understanding of issues concerning transboundary fisheries resources, ecosystem functioning and vulnerable species and habitats. To ensure this, the MSP will use regional working groups, closely coordinated with the Guinea Current Commission and the Regional Coordination Units. These will continue to strengthen and build links between institutions to exchange information and coordinate scientific findings resulting from the monitoring and assessment activities that are closely linked with MSP, and ensure that the needs and lessons learned from existing projects are accounted for and incorporated into further planning. Reporting back and a discussion forum for stakeholders will be required to ensure continued participatory engagements, the exchange of ideas and for the sharing of information. This would involve representatives of fisheries institutions, the scientific research community, the private sector and civil society. It would also serve as a valuable platform to conduct awareness-raising and information dissemination activities on the state of the resources, ecosystem health and impacts of human activities on the marine environment.

The expected outcomes and outputs of this component are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Expected outcomes and outputs of Component 1 – Marine Spatial Planning in Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire

Outcome 1.1 – Mapping and management of coastal and marine areas improved by establishing a regional MSP to enhance cooperation and support partnerships for financing.	
Output 1.1.1 In country training and capacity building for MSP taken place	This consists first in articulating the research and the training (education and capacity building) with the implementation of the MSP in order to have the necessary expertise at the national and regional level. The identification of training needs is done following the definition of the field of application and must be periodically reviewed as the MSP actions are implemented. Implementation of a limited number of joint training / education programs in the fields of MSP (academics, maritime school, short courses, etc.) and monitoring and evaluation. The implementation of Marine Spatial Planning in national plans and strategies require capable and trained national staff. A capacity-building programme for national institutions and a potential institutional reform will be organised to allow for the conservation of coastal resources for the long term.

Output 1.1.2 A regional working group for MSP arranged and regional dialogue for stakeholder consultation and engagement	<p>Structuring of the working group (designation of countries representatives), definition of a restricted coordination unit, definition of operational method. This is so that nationally trained MSP practitioners and planners can collaborate, share knowledge and best practices in developing a regional marine spatial planning strategy. This component will be led by the FCWC support unit and will be closely coordinated with the regional coordination units of the GCLME and the Guinea Current Commission.</p> <p>Importantly, the marine spatial plans will be prepared through a series of well-defined steps based upon international experience that engages stakeholders at every relevant stage in the planning process. Importantly, stakeholder dialogues that raise awareness for the role, benefits and dynamics MSP to decision makers and the wider community will be essential to ensuring long-term participation and coherence.</p>
Output 1.1.3 Review report of current management strategies and identification of elements pertinent for the MSP	<p>Some of the target countries have coastal management plans and strategies. In the context of the WACA project, each country has planned to draft a coastal law or an integrated coastal management plan. Currently Togo, Benin and Côte d'Ivoire are part of the WACA project in which efforts are underway to develop coastal zone management plans. It is foreseen that soon Nigeria and Ghana will also be part of WACA.</p> <p>The GEF support through this project will ensure these planning documents and strategies are integrated into broader Marine Spatial Planning and synthesise a report to incorporate the current systems of management.</p> <p>This stage will also undertake a comprehensive scoping assessment of ecological condition, social interdependencies, economic structures and the synergies between the three. It furthermore will undertake an analysis to assess the trade-offs between these three domains based on potential zoning options. Areas with vulnerable coastal communities, those most impacted by the effects of climate change and environmentally important areas will be included within the spatial plans. This will be carried over into components 2 and 3 and incorporated into the report.</p>
Output 1.1.4 Established MSP for the region in place	<p>Piloting of MSP will take place to develop MSP planning documents for the target countries and integrate them in practice. The documents will be developed in a way that contributes to enhancing ecosystem services, sustainable management, equity, low carbon development, resource efficiency, and social inclusion. Most importantly, MSP will allow for a full mapping assessment of ecosystems, the cumulative impacts and those dependent on the resources. Through the regional working group identified in 1.1.2, a document towards a common approach for MSP in the FCWC region, including a regional action plan will be prepared and presented.</p>

Component 2: Payment for Ecosystem Services in Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire

Shifting economic incentives in favour of conservation, while benefiting livelihoods can be achieved through focused payments for ecosystem services (PES) schemes, headed by national pilot projects. With the mapping of ecosystems that takes place in component 1 under MSP, it is then possible to select ecosystems linked to fisheries, tourism and recreation opportunities, storm protection for shoreline development, sediment stabilization, water purification and carbon sequestration, and develop a payment for ecosystem services scheme. Assessing the value of ecosystem services is essential to facilitate the dialogue with and between decision-makers and make choices about public investment. It helps to formulate sound policies for both economic development and nature conservation. The baseline condition for all payments to ecosystem services is a good characterisation of ecosystem services benefiting the buyer, thus the first outcome focuses on characterising the regional state of ecosystems and the services provided. The novelty of PES arises from its focus on the 'beneficiary pays principle', as opposed to the 'polluter pays principle'.

Historically, financing and management of natural protected areas and ecosystem services has been perceived as a public responsibility, and in developing countries has been financed principally by governments, foundations and overseas development assistance sources. Protected areas in the West African region are increasingly dependent on financing from international public or private donors. However, over the last few decades, cutbacks in the availability of public resources have undermined the effectiveness of such strategies. Budgets for government protection and management marine areas and ecosystem services are declining, as are international sources from overseas development assistance. At the same time, public responsibility for nature protection is shifting with processes of devolution and decentralization. Yet new sources of financing for local governments to take on biodiversity ecosystem service protection have not been forthcoming.

A number of obstacles exist that may limit the development of coastal communities and particularly, conservation, especially obstacles that involve increasing costs and risks for those buying in to conservation. Overcoming these obstacles will require transparent information about the current market for the provision of resources. It will further require the identification of key market actors and the development of networks to connect them to one another and those holding stewardship of service providing ecosystems. It will also require the establishment of policy frameworks and institutional arrangements for new types of markets, developing innovative business models for buyers and sellers of conservation services, and building leadership and institutional capacity to design and implements PES. Organization of PES will generate significantly increased financing for investments that improve livelihoods and coastal and marine biodiversity conservation.

Based on the fact that economic development is dependent upon the services which ecosystems provide, there is urgent need to reassess how Blue economic development might proceed, since much mainstream economic activity provides incentive to undermine ecosystem health. For these resources to be conserved they need to be more valuable than the alternative uses of the coastal or marine areas, and good stewardship needs to be more profitable than bad stewardship. PES provides one means to increase the supply of an ecosystem service, or services through good stewardship.

The overall aim of this component is to create financial incentives for conservation of ecosystems to continue providing services, with a particular focus on those supplied to the fisheries and biodiversity conservation. The first outcome of this component focuses on establishing the baselines for ecosystems, their ecological status or health, and the values of the services they provide, including their potential for further provision of resources under better functioning health states. The second outcome focuses on the establishment and implementation of regional pilot scheme for PES application at national or transboundary levels. In West Africa, example of PES can be found within the bilateral agreement that Mauritania and Guinea Bissau have with the EU. Even if they are not called PES, they have been set-up in recognition of the services provided by coastal ecosystem of both countries and more particularly the ones of MPAs. Tanzania's Marine Legacy Fund, a payment for ecosystem service programme, derives revenues from commercial fishing licences, marine ecotourism revenue sharing, and oil and gas taxation that is used to pay coastal communities for conservation and to finance some operational expenses. The government of Seychelles, with co-funding from the Global Environment Fund (GEF), instituted a buyout and retraining

programme for tortoiseshell artisans prior to banning commercial sales. Current marine PES show potential for involving local communities. They also show capacities to protect marine species. For instance, the Luis Echeverria community in Mexico is protecting about 48.5 km² of grey whale habitat in exchange for USD 25 000, used to finance small-scale development and alternative income generation.

As part of this outcome, the project will develop and implement strategic planning and training workshops for the region. These will serve as a platform to disseminate information to audiences of diverse sectors, form innovative partnerships, examine strategic issues facing ecosystem service markets, and provide strategic training on establishing payment schemes. Leaders will learn to participate in, design and manage ecosystem service payments systems, through training, strategic planning support, participation in learning networks and access to practical tools and resource materials. Participants will represent buyers, sellers, intermediaries, and other institutions from the sectors involved in establishing and implementing PES. Initial priorities would be determined through piloting projects since this is a novel and innovative approach to conservation in the region. The project will provide technical assistance to plan, design, implement and monitor PES in critical areas of the FCWC region relevant to the supply of fisheries resources.

Ultimately, this component can help deliver a number of benefits:

- Developing a clear understanding of ecosystem health and the benefits (monetary, livelihoods, health, protection etc.) provided.
- Establishing institutional capacity for expanding systems of payments for ecosystem services to a scale sufficient to have a meaningful impact on regional conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services and on achieving national commitment goals such as the SDGs or the CBD.
- Catalysing market activity and reduce risks and transaction costs for buyers and sellers, by making timely information about biodiversity and other ecosystem service markets available.
- Enabling leaders from diverse sectors to understand, design, participate in and manage PES systems.
- Securing investment in biodiversity and ecosystem services from potential buyers and sellers, by demonstrating diverse, financially viable and user-appropriate models for business and community enterprises.
- Enabling the full participation of low-income coastal landowners and resource users in the development and operation of ecosystem service markets.
- The scale and scope of new sources for financing for ecosystem stewardship will increase significantly through PES, catalysing new finance for conservation from the distant water fleet, as well as private business, industrial firms, infrastructure agencies and companies, local governments, and producer organizations.

The outcomes and outputs of this component are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Expected outcomes and outputs of Component 2 – Payment for Ecosystem Services in Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire

Outcome 2.1 – Improved understanding of the current state of ecosystems pertaining to the provision of ecosystem services	
Output 2.1.1 Key ecosyst	This involves developing a clear understanding of the benefits (monetary, liv

<p>em Services, beneficiaries and viable compensation systems linked to the fishing and tourism industries identified</p>	<p>elihoods, health, protection etc.) provided to the fishing and tourism industries as well as storm protection for shoreline development, sediment stabilization, water purification and carbon sequestration from coastal and marine ecosystems. This includes direct and indirect provisions.</p> <p>A full assessment of the beneficiaries will be undertaken to understand the socioeconomic context and viable payment systems evaluated, this will involve extensive stakeholder engagement with those likely to be affected by the schemes. There are many different forms of PES payments such as cash payments, conservation easements, awards for protection contracts, land use tenure and ownership rights, labour exchange, production inputs and/or technical support for sustainable livelihoods. The type of PES scheme used will be based on the key ecosystem services identified, the beneficiaries involved and those most impacted by the use of resources by beneficiaries. A cost-benefit analysis of different options and alternative livelihoods will be undertaken.</p>
<p>Output 2.1.2 Ecological condition of coastal and marine ecosystems, their vulnerability and estimation of the differential between their full capacity and their current capacity identified.</p>	<p>Using well established methods on the assessment of ecological status using health condition index and vulnerability index, ecosystems that provision services to the fisheries and tourism industries but also for storm protection, sediment stabilization, water purification and carbon sequestration will be examined for their capacity to provide services.</p> <p>To support coherent management and the design of the PES scheme, an analysis of each ecosystem's vulnerability provides information on its weaknesses as well as on its capacity to recover after suffering an impact. To communicate the results of vulnerability assessments to other researchers, policymakers, and the community at large, it is important to map vulnerability distributions and therefore to be spatially explicit. The mapping will indicate ecosystem vulnerability hotspots that require specific intervention, and those that are under significant pressure to provide services from the fishing industry. This will aid in determining which areas of productivity should be prioritised for developing payments for their services.</p> <p>This is also linked to component 3.2.1, wherein the information about ecosystem health and vulnerability will be used to determine priority sites for the implementation of NBS. Furthermore, the current capacity to deliver services by an ecosystem will be assessed against what a healthy functioning ecosystem of a similar nature should be providing. This will provide insight as to h</p>

	<p>ow much more value the ecosystem could provide if better managed, protected, restored or regenerated.</p>
<p>Output 2.1.3 Monetary valuation report of ES per tonne of fish caught (per group of species) for fisheries for tourism, as well as supply, regulatory and support services.</p>	<p>For fisheries, this involves determining the economic value of the fish provisioning service of marine coastal ecosystems. The spatial distribution of fishing activities and value added by specific sectors of the fishery will be identified. By establishing the monetary value of each group of targeted fish species, the importance of the ecosystem services provided (habitats, nursery grounds, refeeding grounds etc.) to ensure that these species remain productive can be determined. This will inform which areas related (directly or indirectly) to the fisheries should be prioritised for the development of a PES scheme.</p> <p>In terms of tourism, the report will establish all areas pertinent for the delivery of tourism activities and services to identify areas that should be prioritised for the PES scheme.. Where potential is shown, analysis of the payment for supply, regulatory and support services will be conducted.</p>
<p>Outcome 2.2 – Establishment of a PES system, increasing the monetary contribution by beneficiaries for their use of ecosystem services, improved regional cooperation and understanding of PES.</p>	
<p>Output 2.2.1 PES pilot schemes for Togo, Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire in place as a guide for FCWC countries</p>	<p>PES pilot schemes are implemented in collaboration with intermediaries to test practical application in specific contexts. This will include the development of PES guidance and documents for wider application across the region. For example, a framework will be developed for international fishing companies to be involved in payment for fisheries ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation in coastal and marine ecosystems. In setting up and executing pilot payment for ecosystem services schemes, the project will scale-up protection and restoration of natural resources (Component 3) while at the same time implementing Blue Economy principles in the region.</p>
<p>Output 2.2.2 Monitoring of ecosystem services established and socioeconomic impacts associated with the PES scheme and improved knowledge sharing and dissemination of experiences</p>	<p>Using the Global monitoring for environment and security and Africa (GMES Africa), the condition and provision of ecosystem services as well as the impacts on the socioeconomic context (using economic data and on the ground interaction) will be monitored in real time to provide information to policy makers, scientists, businesses and the public about the ongoing impacts of the PES scheme. This information will be used to inform other countries in the region of the lessons learned and best practices based on the experiences of this project.</p>

Component 3: Coastal and Marine Nature-Based Solutions Scheme in Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire

IUCN defines NBS as “actions to protect, sustainably manage, and restore natural or modified ecosystems, that address societal challenges effectively and adaptively, simultaneously providing human well-being and biodiversity benefits”. NBS is thus an umbrella concept that covers a whole range of ecosystem-related approaches that address societal challenges and support achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. The main objective of this component is to enhance the capacity of ecosystems to provide services. Based on the ecosystem mapping carried out under MSP (component 1), the valuation of ecosystems and the generation of funds from PES (component 2), this component uses Nature Based Solutions (NBS) to expand and protect healthy functioning ecosystems; and restore and regenerate those which are degraded or under severe anthropogenic pressure.

Effective restoration of important ecosystems and species where targeted habitats include seagrasses, salt marshes and mangroves which support biodiversity (including commercially important species) by forming key nursery areas and providing natural refuges and feeding grounds. They also improve seawater quality and clarity and sustain tourism and cultural activities. Furthermore, these also form natural coastal protection and thereby help to adapt to increased storms, sea level rise and flood risks resulting from climate change. Thus, NBS activities will be piloted in areas identified with particular significance to the delivery of fishery-based ecosystem services (such as nursery grounds, areas of important marine flora production etc). They will complement past and on-going activities that were implemented through projects with a short lifetime and low level of continuity. Main example is the mangrove plantation in many areas of the coast without any follow-up activities, including monitoring.

Other NBS activities will focus on sustainable harvesting of seafood from fisheries and aquaculture, and the provision of tourism activities that is flexible, adaptive and managed on a whole ecosystem basis. The specific activities will be decided upon after areas of significance have been identified but are likely to include: the restoration of mangroves and seagrass beds; restoring bird/fish/turtle nesting areas to encourage population growth and eco-tourism; regulation on fishing practice to ensure sustainable harvests, development of coastal protection measures through plans for flood risk, coastal lagoon restoration of saltmarsh/marine vegetation habitats; restoration of benthic habitats important to species population growth; beach restoration and regulations for popular tourism destinations; synthesizing regulations for coastal land use and waste management, developing community management systems (co-management) for the use and restoration of coastal resources, developing integrated adaptation strategies for pollution events, threats to biodiversity and climate change, or integrating coastal habitats for sea-level rise. Addressing the ongoing impacts of ecosystem degradation requires an ecosystem-based management and a multi-species approach that can adapt to shifts in species' productivity, distribution and interactions. Where possible, the use of the IUCN NBS standard will be used. Based on the concept that society benefits from fully functional marine and coastal ecosystems. Restoration, rehabilitation and enhancement of coastal and marine ecosystems using NBS not only provide ecological benefits but will also improve the wellbeing of society. Those benefits will be particularly tangible to human communities in coastal zones where NBS can limit the effects of natural hazards and associated costs. In short, scaling up NBS can fulfil our moral responsibility toward protecting future generations. Strategies will also account for potential trade-offs among multiple users, economic sectors and the ecosystem services such as cultural heritage for effective Blue Growth linking with spatial planning in component 1.

The outcomes and outputs of this component are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Expected outcomes and outputs of Component 3 – Coastal and Marine Nature-Based Solutions Scheme in Togo, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire

Outcome 3.1 – Improved organisation of regional integrated ecosystem services

Output 3.1.1 Regional Accounting & Monitoring system in place for ecosystem services	This involves the development of a system of accounts for the services provided to beneficiaries. The accounting systems will be based natural capital accounting[1], blue economy satellite accounts, the blue economy Valuation Toolkit[2] and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment[3]. This is linked to component 1.2.3/4 on MSP implementation and component 2.1.1 which identifies the services provided by various coastal ecosystems. It mainly consists of the precise monitoring of key services (nursery, food provisioning, etc.) on a regular basis using standard method and indicators understood by all country teams. Data will be recorded into the MSP.
Output 3.1.2 Use of financial mechanisms from payment for ecosystem services	Component 2 (PES) is designed to generate funds through payment for the provision of ecosystem services. These funds, generated from the private sector, public entities and public-private partnerships, are to be used to set up and implement the NBS pilot projects such as the restoration of the coastal habitat in Senegal or more broadly the enhancement and restoration of critical habitat in the Gulf of Guinea (WACA project).
Outcome 3.2– Improved management of ecologically important ecosystems for the provision of ecosystem services through Nature Based Solutions	
Output 3.2.1 Areas identified and ranked in terms of priority	To determine which areas are of priority for the implementation of NBS, pre-feasibility checks should be undertaken to rank ecological areas in terms of their priority for restoration or rehabilitation. This will look at areas already under protection, ecologically or biologically important areas for food security and societal wellbeing. Using ecosystem vulnerability index (as outlined in component 2.1.3) to determine those most under threat and those which pose most threat to the wellbeing and livelihoods of coastal communities. This further involves conducting consistent yet context-specific measurements and monitoring to understand how NBS might impact complex, social-ecological systems including factors related to provisioning, regulating and cultural ecosystem services when implemented.

<p>Output 3.2.2 Stakeholders engaged in determining NBS selections (location/type) through co-design. Plan in place for NBS projects.</p>	<p>Local communities living adjacent or with access to priority conservation areas will be supported to benefit from economic development driven by sustainable nature-based livelihoods, with a focus on youth engagement. In order to establish the precise details of local community access and use of the project sites, and identify possible options for interaction based on allowable activities and bottlenecks for engagement (especially with a focus on women and youth), an assessment will be carried out early in the project.</p> <p>This component activity involves getting stakeholders to co-create the NBS strategy and maintain dialog with key stakeholders to obtain the buy-in, involvement and corroboration needed for long-term, community-based intervention.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Output 3.2.3 NBS pilot projects in place with consistent monitoring system</p>	<p>Based on areas identified in component 3.2.1, initial pilot projects for NBS will be delivered by using an integrated approach on NBS co-creation to overcome social and economic conflicts that often prevent their implementation. Selected beneficiaries, on a voluntary basis, will contribute to the implementation of pilot projects. Discussion with beneficiary representatives and government representatives will start earlier in the project to have a protocol of collaboration in place. Experimentation will be pursued to develop the most appropriate model for the PES implementation. Example of the Mauritania and Guinea Bissau fishing agreement with EU will be referenced (specific support for MPAs within the supporting actions scheme) and examined to define standards for Public funded PES. Tanzanian PES scheme implemented within the licence scheme will also be studied to specify private PES scheme. Other schemes under development, such as in The Bahamas, will also be looked at. The voluntary process will ease the dialogue and definition of ways of implementation.</p> <p>Establishing a monitoring system involves evaluating the ecological, economic and social improvements associated with successful habitat restoration and other NBS and time horizons needed to meet specific objectives. Monitoring of NBS implementation encompasses scales ranging from the local demonstrator scale to catchment scale and addresses ecological parameters ranging from KPIs for target habitats (e.g., seagrass, saltmarsh, mangroves and coral reef area), associated ecosystem functions (e.g., production, biodiversity, carbon sequestration) and environmental factors affecting the success of the NBS (e.g., light climate, nutrient regime, fishing pressure). As a consequence, ecological monitoring involves a wide spectrum of methodologies ranging from surveys of area cover/distribution of habitats (e.g., using underwater/benthic video transects, drones, aerial or satellite imagery), biodiversity assessments (from field identification to eDNA), to in situ measurements of abiotic features (e.g., light levels, SPM loads, nutrient concentrations), and physical and biogeochemical modelling of catchment including nutrient inputs. Concomitant monitoring of socio-economic elements builds a holistic evidence base on the role of NBS in social-ecological systems.</p>
<p>Outcome 3.3 – Improved regional coordination for scaling up of NBS</p>	

Output 3.3.1 Lessons I earned documented an d knowledge dissemi nated	Well documented evaluation of achievements, shortcomings, opportunities a nd threats to be shared with other countries in the region. A deeper element of this output is creating educational materials and novel tools to communica te and visualize the effectiveness of NBS to reduce climate hazards, increase biodiversity and provide ecosystem services.
Output 3.3.2 Funding S caling-up process initia ted	By providing specific evidence and guidance for NBS scaling-up at national, re gional and international levels, this can be conveyed to funders, investors and governments to generate funds for further NBS at a wider scale. The screenin g exercise undertaken by NBS and insurance practitioners, academics, and st akeholders will provide evidence needed to fully understand the conditions re quired for an effective implementation of NBS at large scale.

Theory of Change:

The theory of change of the project is that first activity of the project will focus on conducting Marine Spatial Planning in the three target countries, complementing the work already done in the Mami Wata and WACA projects. Through this exercise, the ecosystems most likely to generate payments will be targeted and mechanisms will be put in place for funds to be made available. The funds available will be invested in priority in NbS activities contributing to the protection and conservation of the ecosystems generating the payments. The outputs will be the availability of marine spatial plans, the sustainable use of the ecosystems and enhanced community involvement. It will all contribute to the enhanced coastal and marine habitat, provision of services and livelihoods in the three target FWCW countries.

4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or impact program strategies

The project is aligned with the International Waters (IW) Focal Area. It will mainstream objective 1 “Strengthening National Blue Economy Opportunities” through MSP by identifying sustainable public and private national investments in the Blue Economy, through funding of collective management of coastal and marine systems and implementation of the full range of integrated ocean policies, legal and institutional reforms across the region. All components align to the first area of strategic action under the IW focal area, “sustaining healthy coastal and marine ecosystems”. This will be done through national and regional level programmes for the restoration of degraded habitats and protection of ecologically important ones using NBS (component 3), for which funds will be generated from regional and national PES schemes (component 2). The areas of ecological importance or in need of protection – as a nursery for fisheries services for example – will be identified through a national and regional MSP process (component 1). Similarly, the second area of strategic action for IW, “catalysing sustainable fisheries management” is addressed through all three components, whereby the main objective of this project is to enable sustainable fisheries management for the FCWC region through the activities proposed, under which, each will target ecosystems particularly important to the longevity of sustainable fisheries and food security. Lastly, the third area of strategic action for IW, “addressing pollution reduction in marine environments”, can also be envisaged through this project, wherein MSP (component 1) can identify areas of pollution entry points, areas particularly sensitivity to pollution, and areas with cumulative impacts from pollution. This can then be used to inform policy development at national and regional levels.

5) Incremental cost reasoning and expected contributions from baseline

As described in the baseline scenario, there are a number of projects at the regional level which are already contributing to addressing the transboundary issues facing the FCWC and wider Gulf of Guinea LME region, as outlined in the SAP and Transboundary Analysis (TDA). For example, the work on governance being done by the Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF) and GREPPAO, and MSP propositions under the Mami Wata and WACA projects. As part of the WACA project, the current coastal management that is underway does not deal with the entire EEZ. This proposed project will build on the existing planning and management mechanisms to deliver MSP at a wider level. Furthermore, under the Mami Wata project, Documents that will be produced will be of general order, thus the current proposed project will seek to refine the documents produced and apply the planning exercise in specific geographical areas or sectors.

Moreover, what is needed are mechanisms to bring these institutions and partners together to ensure that the SAP is implemented in a coordinated and coherent way in order to achieve common objectives. This proposed project aims to develop mechanism for this delivery. This and the additional capacity development will be the main added value of GEF financing being requested under project. The funding will go towards technical assistance to deliver results described in the previous section above, particularly for the MSP and PES components which are additional to any existing work in the region and would not be possible without the GEF funding.

The GEF-funded GCLME SAP/TDA development project helped ensure commitment from the Gulf of Guinea LME countries, of which the FCWC countries are party to. Without this MSP, PES and NBS project proposed, the momentum would be lost, and the commitment weakened, slowing progress towards the achievement of the ambitious SAP goal “a healthy ecosystem, sustainably managed, providing services and equitable benefits for human wellbeing by 2030”. By working closely with the GCLME SAP Implementation Project, this project can build on the existing mechanisms in place and use the lessons learned to develop stronger mechanisms for transboundary management and ecosystem resilience.

The IKI/BMU funded Mami Wata, implemented by the Convention d'Abidjan was planning to have a full MSP developed for Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Benin. However, the project will end at the end of 2021 and the plans are not finalised. Given the amount of work it already represents, the exact steps needed to finalise the plans in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire will be evaluated during the PPG in order to build upon this previous work.

As earlier outlines, the main outcome expected from this project is to have in place agreed mechanisms for partnership, collaboration and financing to support the implementation of MSP, PES and NBS to deliver the development goals of the region, particularly those of the GCLME SAP, and encourage collaborative, transboundary management. This directly contributes to the achievement of the GEF International Waters (IW) Programme, Objective 1 “Strengthening National Blue Economy Opportunities”.

Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF?/SCCF)

The proposed project will enable to better coordinate activities in areas that are critical to the provision of ecosystem services, particularly relating to the fisheries and ensuring livelihoods and food security. It was support ecosystem services delivery at a transboundary level. Consistent with Global Environmental Benefits defined for IW alongside core indicators, in summary the project will deliver the following, for which the benefits will be defined further in the PPG phase:

- An increase in marine protected areas created and managed for conservation and sustainable use of around 350,000 hectares
- An increase in the area of land restored (particularly wetlands and mangroves) of around 25,000 hectares
- An increase in the area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity of around 70,000 hectares
- Around 11 more shared marine ecosystems under new or improved cooperative management.
- Increased management of overexploited stocks to bring 27,000 metric tons of commercially important species to sustainable levels.
- Multi-state cooperation to reduce threats to international waters through regional MSP and NBS

- Reduced pollution load in international waters from nutrient enrichment and other land-based activities through better managed resources and NBS
- Restored and sustained freshwater, coastal, and marine ecosystems goods and services, including globally significant biodiversity, as well as maintained capacity of natural systems to sequester carbon through PES and NBS
- Reduced vulnerability to climate variability and climate-related risks, and increased ecosystem resilience through all three components of the proposed project.

Innovation, sustainability and potential for upscaling

They key innovative aspects in MSP and PES is the flexible mechanism for cooperative governance being proposed. The mechanism takes into account the mandate and expertise of existing intergovernmental organizations in the region, linking these with national ministerial departments. Currently, the concepts of MSP, PES and NBS are not well developed in the region, and this project proposes bringing strong management mechanisms to the forefront of resource management and incorporating them into policy. The project will strengthen the payment for ecosystem services in the fisheries sector and will also develop others for the tourism sector, which will be innovative in the area. For example, agreements will be put in place with the tourism industry to pay for the conservation of an attractive coastal zone by the communities. Another potential framework could be developed for international companies to be involved in payment for carbon sequestration in the mangroves.

The core elements of the project aim to generate a sustainable fishing industry across the Gulf of Guinea, using well established methods for generating income through sustainable processes that have nature at the heart of their functioning. All three components MSP, PES and NBS are by their nature, designed to promote the sustainable and equitable use of resources to ensure longevity of ecosystems upon which such a large percentage of the population depend.

In terms of potential for scaling up, the proposed project already incorporates a large portion of scaling up, whereby marine spatial plans are done at both a country, then a regional level to ensure that transboundary issues are accounted for. This is intended to strengthen or solidify the foundations for subsequent development of MSP and PES within the Gulf of Guinea and West Africa beyond the FCWC area.

[1] https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/capital_accounting/index_en.htm

[2] https://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/SROs/BEVTK%20Operational%20Manual_0.pdf

[3] <https://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/index.html>

- [1] The Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Programme: <https://biopama.org/>
- [2] Mami Wata EBSA Framework: <https://mamiwataproject.org/2019/03/01/ebsa-framework/>
- [3] Tregarot, E., Tournon-Gardic, G., Cornet, C. C., & Failler, P. (2020). Valuation of coastal ecosystem services in the Large Marine Ecosystems of Africa. *Environmental Development*, 36, 100584.
- [4] UNEP 2016. *The Socioeconomics of the West, Central and Southern African Coastal Communities: A Synthesis of Studies Regarding Large Marine Ecosystems*. United Nations Environment Programme, Abidjan Convention Secretariat and GRID-Arendal, Nairobi, Abidjan and Arendal.
- [5] WorldFish (2021) [African women join forces to overcome COVID-19 challenges in aquatic food systems](#).
-
- [1] IOC-UNESCO: <http://msp.ioc-unesco.org/about/msp-facts/>
- [2] UNDP: <https://www.sdfinance.undp.org/content/sdfinance/en/home/solutions/payments-for-ecosystem-services.html#mst-1>

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

The executing agency will be FCWC and as such the 6 countries will be involved in the MSP exercises of Component 1. However, only Ghana, Togo and Côte d'Ivoire will be involved in the development of the PES and NBS activities (Components 2 and 3).

The FCWC is composed of six coastal countries of the Gulf of Guinea namely the Republic of Benin (9.3077° N, 2.3158° E), the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire (7.5400° N, 5.5471° W), the Republic of Ghana (7.9465° N, 1.0232° W), the Republic of Liberia (6.4281° N, 9.4295° W), the Federal Republic of Nigeria (9.0820° N, 8.6753° E) and the Togolese Republic (8.6195° N, 0.8248° E).



[1] <https://fcwc-fish.org/about-us/member-states>

2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Yes

Civil Society Organizations Yes

Private Sector Entities

If none of the above, please explain why:

In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement

GEF focal points in the target countries have been consulted and the documents were shared with them. Discussions have also been undertaken with FCWC secretary general to ensure the project answers a need and will have strong support. In the project proposal development phase, the private sector, governmental institutions, local communities living in and depending on fishery resources and associated coastal ecosystems will be strongly involved in identifying and designing the project interventions in the target sites, and therefore act as agents of change to achieve resilient and sustainable fishery management.

FCWC will lead project implementation and will be responsible for the day-to-day management and monitoring of the project. FCWC will also be responsible for the technical implementation of the project in close cooperation with national designated institutions. IUCN will sign the contract with GEF and as such be responsible for the implementation of activities. The stakeholder consultations that are expected to take place for this project are outlined in Table 6.

There has already been considerable engagement, exchange of information and the development of links with a number of involved bodies and institutions. This includes the WACA project, with whom the project will closely interact; The World Bank; Nongovernmental research organisations such as the Centre for Blue Governance; the regional fisheries bodies such as CECAF and the FCWC; and the FCWC contact persons in the Ministries of the three target countries.

In addition to directly engaging and sharing information with various stakeholders and regional bodies, the project will dedicate at least 1% of its operational budget to participating in GEF IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN activities including engaging in webinars, trainings, conferences and producing results papers.

Table 6. Expected stakeholder consultations

Stakeholder	Expected involvement in project component(s)
Local communities	<p>All fishers (men and women), women, young people, councils of elders, traditional power structure, village committees, youth and women associations will be consulted for the development of marine spatial plans, PES schemes, and most importantly, NBS schemes. It is hoped that local communities will become stewards of the environment – benefiting from the PES by maintaining healthy ecosystems and implementing NBS.</p> <p>With the project, local communities will be encouraged to share information about traditional knowledge on fisheries and ecosystems management, inform about regulator role that promotes consultations and manages conflicts within the community, inform about the existence of village development committees and land management committees in some project sites, and provide information on gender equity and progress, opportunities.</p>
Private sector	<p>Private sector entities engaged in fishery, coastal pollution and waste management and tourism- based industries relevant to the scope of the project will be invited to participate in the development of marine spatial plans. Furthermore, they will be heavily involved in the setup of PES schemes as primary beneficiaries of ecosystem services.</p>
National institutions	<p>Government Ministries and Agencies – Fishery, Environment, Finance, Planning, and other relevant ministries will be part of and/or consulted in the process of developing marine spatial plans and PES schemes.</p>
NGOs	<p>Local, regional and international active in the region will be targeted for outreach and awareness raising campaigns and selected training.</p>
FCWC	<p>Overall project management and implementation.</p>

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

Women are key stakeholders in the various activities that will be developed in the FCWC countries . In the fishery sector, they contribute to a large share of daily tasks such as fish processing and marketing, agricultural work, cooking, salt processing, in addition to a variety of households-related tasks. Because of their strong reliance on natural ecosystems and fish stocks for such tasks, women represent a significant part of the local population that experiences the negative outcomes associated with climate change and environmental degradation. In the tourism sector, women always represent a fair share of the labour used by the industry to deliver services. Also, through their daily activities collecting natural resources, women can play a key role in mangrove restoration, carbon sequestration and sediment stabilisation.

As a result, women will be the main beneficiaries of the proposed project. All project activities, specifically the implementation of Nature Based Solutions, will be designed to empower women. Throughout component 3 (Implementing Nature-based Solutions), the project will work towards promoting women access to alternative climate resilient, economically viable and sustainable livelihoods, building upon their current roles and knowledge about coastal ecosystems, fishing and processing. Further, it will increase women's capacity to implement and sustain such activities and will encourage the advent of female entrepreneurs through the public-private partnerships platforms. As such, component 3 will work with women as main agent of change to raise awareness on coastal ecosystems, and to design, implement and sustain conservation and restoration plans.

The project will ensure that women's specific needs are met, that women enjoy equal access to project activities from the design to the implementation stage and that all potential benefits are equitably accessed through project implementation. During the development of the PPG, a full analysis will be undertaken to ensure that all project components consider the needs and preoccupations of women, men, youth and people living with disabilities. This will inform the development of a gender action plan to be carried through the project. Active participation of women during the consultation and decision-making processes will be promoted to ensure equitable participation between men and women, so that both benefit from the outcomes of the project.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes

closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

improving women's participation and decision-making; and/or Yes

generating socio-economic benefits or services for women. Yes

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

TBD

4. Private sector engagement

Will there be private sector engagement in the project?

Yes

Please briefly explain the rationale behind your answer.

The private sector will be engaged in the processes of MSP mainly as a stakeholder role active in the region, and particularly in the PES component, whereby the private sector is involved as the beneficiary of the services provided by the ecosystems. From the beginning of the project (Component 1), the various stakeholders involved in marine activities will be engaged to design and agree to the MSP. The fisheries and tourism sectors, but also oil and gas, shipping, seabed mining and aquaculture will be involved. As land-based activities benefit from healthy ecosystems (e.g. shoreline development is protected from storms by mangroves and seagrasses) and impact (e.g. farming), coastal developers, farmers and potentially insurance companies will be engaged in the process.

The project will be innovative in that sense as up to date, support to ecosystems and the management of fisheries has mainly be done through public sector support and the strengthening of governments and public organizations, including the institutions in charge of fisheries management and the conservation of ecosystems. As awareness increases and corporate environmental and social responsibility are on the rise, the private sector is under pressure to offset, minimise or contribute to the amelioration of environmental harm. New markets and business models that focus on biodiversity, sustainability and social development are increasingly being developed, thereby offering investment opportunities and contributing to nature and society at the same time. Private sector buyers with strong Corporate Responsibility agendas may be particularly keen to secure co-benefits. This project will engage with the private sector by providing direction on how to prioritize investment in ecosystem services and consider trade-offs that encourage economic development while maintaining ecosystem integrity. Furthermore, PES schemes can also innovatively marry public and private money to provide enhanced funding for future projects, implementation strategies and social development, such as the NBS proposed in component 3, which would further engage the private sector in cooperating with NBS.

Given the limited capacity in the countries, the project will continue to strengthen these capacities, especially in light of the need for cooperation among various stakeholders and partners. However, the project will bring work with government institutions and partners to expand the scope of intervention and support to the private sector. For doing so, the project will support the enabling environment for having more investments and opportunities for partners to invest into the sustainable development of the Blue Economy. During PPG, a more thorough assessment of the private sector partners active in the area and how they could partner in the project activities will be undertaken, considering their involvement is critical for achieving sustainable impact in the area while at the same time maintaining livelihoods.

5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the Project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the Project design (table format acceptable)

A major assumption in this project is that local communities and key stakeholders will comply with national legislation and local government authorities. At the national level, one of the assumptions is that the government, local communities, private sector, NGOs and other relevant stakeholders will collaborate effectively within a joint framework with the aim to fulfil commitments under this project. Table 7 below lists the main risks, their categories, level of impact, and the proposed risks mitigation measures.

Table 7: Relevant risks, categories, impact level and mitigation measures

Risk/External Factor	Risk Category	Level of Impact	Risk Mitigation Measures
Insufficient inter-institutional cooperation	Institutional	M	Through component1, the project will seek to improve legal instruments and inter-institutional coordination pertaining to mangrove ecosystems management. The project will ensure that a close collaboration between the relevant stakeholders is fostered.
Climate change impacts may constitute a threat to conservation and restoration efforts and impact the planning and implementation of activities	Climate change	M	The conservation and restoration planning processes in components 2 and 3 will take into account climate change projections in order to mitigate risks associated with such activities. All project activities will aim at strengthening the resilience of human and natural systems to the impacts of climate change. Activities undertaken as part of the project will account for climate change in their planning. For example, the zoning of activities will consider the potential necessity to adapt to shifts in uses (such as the need for fishing grounds to move as fish populations migrate with warming waters).
Limited interest or involvement by target communities in restoration/conservation activities and implementation of alternative livelihoods	Social	L	The project will seek permanent participatory approach from communities and local stakeholders for the implementation of all components, particularly components 1 and 3. The involvement and subsequent investments by the private sector in the local public-private partnerships platform will help maintaining involvements of stakeholders in alternative livelihoods through stimulation of entrepreneurship.
Chronic illegal mangrove deforestation	Social	M	As part of component 1, the project will build capacity of local stakeholders to set up monitoring and surveillance

Over deforestation may jeopardize the project conservation efforts			can stakeholders to set up monitoring and surveillance communities-led committees in target sites. In addition, awareness-raising efforts are expected to help changing behaviours toward more sustainable mangroves management.
Lack of political support to enhance inter-institutional strengthening for resilient mangrove ecosystems management	Political	L	Key decision-makers will be involved in the project implementation. The project will maintain close relationships with key authorities and update them about the progress made towards the project milestones.
Countries' vulnerability to exogenous shocks and poverty could hinder the project diversification efforts (alternative livelihoods) and result in continuous degradation	Economic	M	The socioeconomic assessment planned under component 2 will provide a comprehensive overview of local communities' situation from a social and economic standpoint. Taking into consideration local knowledge, it will provide key insights economic vulnerability drivers, hence allowing the market and value chains study to consider communities' socioeconomic situations. Alternative livelihoods will be identified on an economic profitability basis to incentivize economic change and reduce poverty. In addition, public-private partnerships will aim at catalysing private investments in profitable livelihood, thus contributing to reduce poverty. The project will complement such efforts in facilitating communities' access to initial investments and creating shared investments schemes.
National execution partner(s) are assessed to have moderate or high risks on a selection of operational standards, making the operationalization of the project more costly and complex	Fiduciary	M	Before engaging partners as operational partners in project execution, micro-assessments of the operational capacity of the partner will be carried out. This is done either at PIF or PPG stage. The partner will only be engaged with if risks are low or moderate. A detailed risk mitigation plan is developed and is part of the operational partner agreement (OPA) with the national execution partner. It is the intention to work with national execution partners, as the project partnership can help develop operational capacities of the partners. Still, if no suitable national execution partner can be identified during PPG (meaning that the micro-assessment indicates high risk and OPA is not an option), an international partner will be engaged in the project execution.
Local, regional and/or national authorities	Health	M	Given the situation caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the

<p>r global measures to contain impacts from pandemics (such as Covid-19) and their repercussions on availability of technical expertise, engage stakeholders, and secure financing</p>		<p>probability of epidemic or pandemics threatening the advancement of the project is not unlikely. In case of COVID resurgence during the project, measures will be taken to ensure smooth implementation through virtual meetings, and delegation in the implementation of activities. Resilience in the project intervention logic is interpreted in a rather comprehensive fashion, and therefore includes building less vulnerable communities to pandemics, putting in place the infrastructure to build back better, such as short value chains for local markets, extension services that easily and promptly address health related concerns, so they do not become social, economic and environmental crises, etc. The project intervention logic has the potential to address critical issues around human-wildlife interaction (including increased exposure to viruses), and the landscape management plans will explicitly integrate this concern.</p> <p>To overcome concerns in mobilizing the technical expertise to support project design and implementation, the project will work as much as possible with locally rooted (CSOs, NGOs, government institutes, extension services, ...) organizations and realities in order to minimize the impacts of limitations on mobility at the national and international level. Technological alternatives to face-to-face consultations will be deployed, securing proper participation and engagement of all relevant stakeholder groups, including women and youth.</p> <p>As government priorities potentially shift to address crises (health or other), the project will deliver evidence and increase its sensitization and awareness raising and capacity development efforts in order to advocate for continued support to green and resilient recovery.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6. Coordination

Outline the institutional structure of the project including monitoring and evaluation coordination at the project level. Describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

FCWC will implement this project with the support of IUCN Marine and Coastal Programme for West and Central Africa. The PCU will be based in the FCWC offices in Tema, Ghana. The IUCN will be the partner responsible for ensuring that the project results are achieved, and that resources are allocated and disbursed efficiently and effectively. The implementation of the project will be conducted under the overall guidance of a project steering committee, designed specifically for this purpose. A project manager/coordinator will be in charge of designing and implementing annual work plans and budget and will report directly to the project steering committee. The project coordination unit will be also responsible for the project monitoring and evaluation. In each of the target country, a focal point to assist in the development of the project will be identified in consultation with the partner Ministries. Under the guidance of the FCWC project officer and IUCN, technical support, the activities will be designed and implemented by the national institutions.

The project will coordinate with ongoing initiatives in FCWC countries related to coastal management and conservation. The proposed project will design at early implementation stage coordination framework with these initiatives to ensure enhanced learning and sharing of lessons learned.

The project will build on the work of existing projects and coordinate and establish linkages with the following projects and initiatives the details for which can be found on page 10 under 'Baseline projects':

GEF-financed initiatives:

- A part of the current WACA project is financed by GEF and links will be developed to ensure the complementarity of the projects
- The GEF co-financed GCLME project which builds on the SAP aims to strengthen the regional governance and ecosystem-based management of the GCLME through assisting the countries to build capacity for SAP implementation measures related to transboundary fisheries, biodiversity conservation and pollution reduction. Collaboration and coordination with this project will help deliver the objectives of both the SAP (2007) and the wider project (2018). The project will ensure it has all the deliverables of the GCLME and based on the documents, will consider to follow-up and/or strengthen the initiatives and activities already developed.

Non-GEF financed initiatives:

- The EU Mangroves project has strong ties to NBS related activities through mangrove restoration. The project intervenes in Togo and Ghana to put in place NbS activities aimed at conserving coastal ecosystems. Through its NbS component, the current project will seek to strengthen the activities put in place by the Mangroves project. This project will promote integration with the mangrove project through the IUCN as the guiding agency.
- At a continental level, the project will be linked to the processes of the African Union's Fisheries Reform Strategy (NEPAD and AU-IBAR) and will assist in the strengthening of institutional capacity and compliance with international governance of fisheries, ecosystem health and the marine environment.
- This project has strong ties to both the GREPPAO and PESCAO projects which focus on regional fisheries development within the CECAF area. PESCAO provides support to the CPCO and CSR, the 2 sub-regional commission for fishery for the development of their MSC (monitoring, control and surveillance) capacities. The project brings furthermore some assistance to ECOWAS countries by supporting their fishery research Centres through research projects

(DEMERSEM that focuses on demersal fisheries and GREPPAO on small pelagic, climate change and food security. Both projects are active in Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire and Togo.

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Is the Project consistent with the National Strategies and plans or reports and assesments under relevant conventions?

Yes

If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc

This project will establish/reinforce existing connections with policy bodies in charge of the implementation of national policies such as CBD Strategy 2021-2030 and NDC 2020-2025. National partners are in dialog with policymakers on the implementation of NBS demonstrators (many of which are projects that have been running for some time) as well as the scaling-up process advance national NBS policies for coast and seas. In that regard, this project will deliver critical evidence of the societal benefits of NBS for policy development.

In signing the GCLME SAP, the three countries of this project have agreed to actions to develop and strengthen at national and regional level policy, regulations and institutional arrangements; management measures; knowledge, awareness raising and communications; and capacity development. The proposed project components have been designed to strengthen these priority actions identified in the SAP.

The National strategies and plans under relevant conventions for each country have been outlined in Table 8 below.

Table 8: The National strategies and plans under relevant conventions for each country

Country	National plans, reports, strategies or assessments with which this project aligns
Cote d'Ivoire	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP): The project is aligned with several o f Cote d'Ivoire NBSAP's priorities, including (i) Safeguarding natural environments, their functi ons and services, (ii) Strengthening conservation infrastructure, (iii) protection and sustainabl e use of biological diversity, (iv) citizen mobilization and dissemination of knowledge about liv ing things, (v) strengthening national coordination, resource mobilization and international co operation.
	The Cote d'Ivoire Ministry for Animal and Fishery Resources' Strategic Plan for the Developme nt of Livestock, Fisheries and Aquaculture (PSDEPA,) alongside the National Agriculture Invest ment Programme, aims to mobilise resources for the sustainable development of fisheries res ources particularly in areas of ensuring food security and governing the use of fishery resourc es. This aligns to the work of this proposed project through its potential to improve managem ent of fishery resources and contribute to the longevity of food/fish producing ecosystems.
Ghana	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP): The project is aligned with all of Gh ana's NBSAP's priorities, including (i) to address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by

	<p>mainstreaming biodiversity into all sectors of government and society programmes; (ii) to improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity; (iii) to enhance the benefits of biodiversity to all sectors of the economy; (iv) to enhance implementation of national biodiversity action plan through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building.</p>
	<p>The government of Ghana has produced a comprehensive national plan: Fisheries Management Plan of Ghana: A National Policy for the Management of the Marine Fisheries Sector. It aims to provide a strategic framework for reversing the declining trend of fish resources and establish a sound management regime to ensure that fish stocks are exploited sustainably in an enhanced environment. This project aligns to several of its objectives including (i) to protect marine habitats and biodiversity; (ii) to strengthen participatory decision making in fisheries management (co-management); (iii) to reduce the excessive pressure on the fish stocks.</p>
Togo	<p>National Action Plan for Adaptation (NAPA): The project is aligned with Togo's NAPA in terms of climate change adaptation, specifically natural resources long term access, resilience of ecosystems. This GEF project will contribute to reduce pressure in natural resources and loss of habitats and biodiversity. Finally, it will capitalize lessons-learned and good practices generated by projects implemented under the NAPA.</p> <p>National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP): The project is aligned with several of Togo's NBSAP's priorities, including (i) Strengthening the benefits for all of diversity biological and ecosystem services; (ii) Improve the legal and institutional framework, and governance; (iii) Develop knowledge about national biological resources; (iv) Strengthen technical and human capacities.</p>

8. Knowledge Management

Outline the knowledge management approach for the Project, including, if any, plans for the Project to learn from other relevant Projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.

Knowledge management will be structured primarily through a two-way sharing system, where much of the activity will be built upon the learning experiences of the relevant projects with which this proposed project is aligned and connected. Engagement with the other projects provide valuable information, lessons learned and data to progress the development of this project.

The project will generate knowledge as a key part across its three components. Such knowledge will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention areas through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will utilize the considerable expertise and information sharing tools of GEF IW: LEARN and LME: LEARN as key platforms for information exchange. In addition, the project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based, and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned from other networks. Experiences and lessons learned from the project will be used in the compilation of knowledge products approved by IUCN. These will be used as tools to build capacity within the region towards sustainable practices in the coastal, marine and blue economy sectors. Based on studies, but also from the experience of member countries, these knowledge products will support local and regional authorities in playing a greater role in promoting MPAs and EBSAs in the protection and conservation marine and coastal ecosystems. Issues addressed will be fisheries management, coastal erosion control, water quality, and biodiversity conservation.

The project will generate and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in replicating the project outcomes in other countries across Africa. A focus will be on the knowledge generated from local communities on fishing practices, ecosystem service management and carbon compensation. Furthermore, the project will create the needed linkages with projects of a similar focus and adapt multiway flows of information (sharing and gaining knowledge). The project will particularly consider building bridges with the CECAF-PESCA Project that is designed to improve regional governance of marine resources in the CECAF area.

The project will design a knowledge management strategy aiming at promoting the lessons learned from the project and benefits provided by marine spatial planning, payments for ecosystem services and nature-based solutions for the fisheries and wider ecosystems. This will encompass organizing awareness-raising campaigns, undertaking south-south knowledge sharing activities with countries in the sub-region and organizing national and local communication activities in the FCWC Countries' coastal areas.

9. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification*

PIF

CEO Endorsement/Approval MTR

TE

Medium/Moderate

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Provide preliminary information on the types and levels of risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and describe measures to address these risks during the project design.

The project is expected to lead to environmental and social outcomes that are highly positive. However, as demonstrated in the above table some environmental and social (E&S) risks have been identified already at this early stage of project design. Some of the risk issues seem to be already addressed by the project design; others will require further analysis and the development and implementation of dedicated mitigation measures. The table above provides first suggestions for mitigation measures and an early judgement of the significance of the risk issues, based on their probability of the risk occurring and the expected magnitude of the impacts. Based on this early judgement project is tentatively rated as a moderate risk projects – also considering that a few impact areas cannot be rated yet and as such applying a precautionary approach. The social analysis that will be carried out during the PPG phase as part of the baseline study; as well as a major part of project design for MSP, these will provide a better understanding of the socio-economic conditions and social structures prevailing in the intervention sites and guide stakeholder consultations and the further fine-tuning of project activities. The ESMS Screening will then provide for a more comprehensive judgement of the risks and deliberate about potential further assessment needs.

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title

Submitted

ESMS preliminary Screening

Theory of Change

Part III: Approval/Endorsement By GEF Operational Focal Point(S) And GEF Agency(ies)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter with this template).

Name	Position	Ministry	Date
Charles Acquah	Operational Focal Point	Environment Protection Agency	8/20/2021
Comlan Awougnon	Operational Focal Point	Ministere de l'Environnement et des Ressources Forestieres	9/6/2021
Comlan Awougnon	Operational Focal Point	Ministere de l'Environnement et des Ressources Forestieres	9/6/2021
Alimata Kone Bakayoko	Operational focal point	Ministere de l'economie et des finances	10/25/2021
Alimata Kone Bakayoko	Operational focal point	Ministere de l'economie et des finances	10/25/2021

ANNEX A: Project Map and Geographic Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project intervention takes place