

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10875

**Countries**

Regional (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Togo)

**Project Name**

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

**Agencies**

IUCN

**Date received by PM**

12/8/2022

**Review completed by PM**

5/5/2023

**Program Manager**

Leah Karrer

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF CEO Endorsement

### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, May 24, 2023) Yes

(Karrer, May 5, 2023)

1. The focus on fisheries is not consistent in the Pro Doc. For example, Section 4.2 third paragraph still discusses working across sectors, including energy, mines, industry and tourism.
2. In component 1, the MSP is still planned, which by its definition requires working with multiple sectors. If you are only interested in fisheries, then you need to call it ?fisheries zoning?, not ?marine spatial planning.? If you really are going to do MSP managing multiple uses, then the range of sectors (i.e. fisheries, energy, mining, industry, tourism, shipping and conservation) need to be noted and the relevant government agencies, private sector actors, NGOs and other relevant stakeholders need to be engaged in this first component. The mapping of activities beyond fisheries can?t be determined only by the ministry of fisheries and environment, but need to engage the other ministries, private sector players and CSOs related to the other previously noted sectors of energy, mining, industry and tourism.

Table 7 needs to be clear that the PES will focus on fisheries PES.

3. Since you added a new component 4, which includes capacity building across the project for the range of topics, you need to remove capacity building in component 1 since duplicative and it is inconsistent to only have in component 1 but not in 2 or 3.

4. Regarding the theory of change, there are 2 different diagrams. The first seems to be a copy and paste of the components, outcomes and outputs plus the barriers and threats. Then the second is somewhat similar, but not exactly (e.g. the ?outputs? are different) and conveys the real connections between the pieces. These need to be merged so there is one clear TOC. As noted previously, the ?outputs? noted in the second diagram are more like sub-objectives. The text following the TOC diagrams needs to be revised for accuracy.

(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) No.

1. **All sector or fisheries focus** - The CER is unclear in terms of its focus ? whether it will address the range of sectors or it will focus on fisheries. For example the second paragraph in the ProDoc section 4.1 notes addressing ?activities in the sectors related to fisheries, coastal management and development, extractive industries, shipping, biodiversity conservation, and tourism through ?MPAs, PES and NBS?? Similarly Section 4.2 notes sectoral integration including not only fisheries, but also energy, mines, industry, and tourism. Component 1 (MSP) is planned to enhance a range of issues including equity, low carbon development and more. Component 2 (PES) will address ecosystems ?linked to fisheries, tourism and recreation, storm protection, sediment stabilization, water purification, and carbon sequestration?? These statements imply all the components will work on the range of sectors, threats and services.

In contrast other text indicates the project will focus on fisheries. For example, ProDoc Section 4.2 institutional integration lists categories of stakeholders that are focused on fisheries. Outcome 1.2 focuses on fish stock distributions without mention of examining other sectors. Outcome 2.1.1 notes ?ecosystem services (linked to fisheries) and determining users and beneficiaries using fish stocks?. Similarly Output 2.1.3 is focused on the economic value of the fish provisioning service.

The scope of the project indicates a need to address the breadth of sectors. Given the nature of MSP, it would seem all sectors need to be addressed since the idea of MSP is to spatially designate uses. For PES, if the focus is only on fisheries, then opportunities for PES from other beneficiaries, particularly hotel industry, insurance, and coastal developers who benefit from shoreline protection and recreational services, will be missed. And for NBS, if the focus is only on fisheries, then the various major threats to the ecosystems (and consequently to fish stocks) will not be adequately addressed, such as dredging and wastewater pollution from hotel development.

The project needs to be edited for consistency. This comment was made during the PIF final review when the Agency was requested to address these inconsistencies throughout the

project plans during PPG. Please also be consistent in which sectors. In reading through the document, the sectors noted are: fisheries, aquaculture, energy, tourism, recreation, ports, shipping (or transport and trade), and extraction of non-living resources (or mining). Sometimes a few of these sectors are noted, but not all. Please be consistent ? decide which will be addressed and consistently note those.

2. **Which habitats** There is a lack of explanation as to which coastal and marine habitats will be addressed by this project. Will *coastal* ecosystems, including mangroves, wetlands and beaches be included? Or will the project only focus on *marine* ecosystems (below high tide), such as seagrass beds, coral reefs, pelagic fisheries, others? Please clarify.

3. **Project wide governance capacity building, knowledge sharing.** Capacity building is only provided for MSP related activities (Output 1.2.2), not for PES or NBS. Please add for the other components. Alternatively, capacity building could be included as a new component that includes plans for an institution and for knowledge sharing.

4. **Theory of Change (TOC)** The logic for the TOC is not sufficiently explained. The Theory of Change in the Pro Doc, particularly the component lists and the outputs, are not consistent with the project plans in the Log Frame. The ?outcome? in the TOC is part of the ?objective? in the Log Frame. The TOC ?outputs? are not consistent with the ?outputs? in the Log Frame . The components are also inconsistent. For example, the TOC Component 3 only lists MPAs, EBSAs, and restoration; whereas the text notes broader management measures (this point was noted in the final PIF review to address during PPG). Further, the connections between the noted outputs and outcome are not adequately explained. For example, it is hard to understand how Component 2 (PES) will lead to improved ecosystems when it?s a payment system, not actual management of threats. The barriers and assumptions are not reflected in the graph nor are they explained in the text. The second output is documents whereas the other outputs are broader achievements.

5. **MSP v. NBS.** Please clarify how the MSP, which will assess the ecological and socioeconomic context and determine a marine zoning strategy, relates to the NBS measures. How will these measures complement each other and be integrated? The MSP seems focused only on marine-based activities (e.g. fishing, mining) whereas the NBS seems more focused on the range of sea and land-based threats to the marine and coastal ecosystems. Please explain how the MSP zoning fits with the NBS, which similarly includes site selection for management measures. Why are both needed when the NBS is broader in scope and would seem to suffice.

6. (PPO) Implementation Start seems to be quite far away, one year from now ? please inquire with the Agency whether this is a mistake.

## Agency Response

22 May 2023

Thanks for raising this. This project will engage other sectors in Component 1, MSP, *only*. To keep MSP as it is, (and true to what was conveyed to the governments and stakeholders of each country), this component will remain as MSP and not fisheries zoning and will stay multisectoral. The other intervention areas (components 2 and 3) focus on fisheries related resources.

The third para in Section 4.3 has been clarified that sectoral integration only occurs in the first component through MSP. We note that at the workshops and consultations in-country, there were representatives of the relevant spatial planning departments/ministries in each country. Their attendance / department has been better indicated in the stakeholder list in Appendix B to reflect this.

The stakeholder engagement plan has been updated to include that the inception phase of the project will engage all relevant MSP actors, and this is also clarified further in the activities of the MSP which includes stakeholder consultations as a natural course of MSP. The private sector actors will be expanded from a fisheries focus to other areas to ensure appropriate engagement.

The Gender Action Plan has also been edited to ensure that in Component 1 it reflects women in sectors beyond the fisheries.

The title of Table 7 has been updated to include ?fisheries PES interventions? and one of the interventions made more fisheries specific to avoid overlap with other sectors.

The capacity building elements of component 1 have been moved to component 4.

Regarding the Theory of Change, there are not two different diagrams. On the track changes version of the previous submission, you can see the old version that was removed (it is

indicated by a red line through it) and replaced with the new one. We have updated the new one to include the connections between relevant elements.

12 April 2023

1. This project has a focus on fisheries, given that the executing agency (the FCWC) is a regional fisheries body. Throughout both the CEO and ProDoc, the references to addressing other activities have been removed, or better clarity has been provided as to how they will be impacted. In more detail:

Component 1 on MSP will naturally have impacts on sectors other than the fisheries, but is designed to highlight areas that are currently weak in terms of fisheries practices, where conflicts occur that affect the fisheries and associated communities, or where ecosystems essential to the delivery of fisheries services are vulnerable and require intervention.

Component 2 on PES has been revised to focus only on fisheries as this is what will be most efficient under the executing agency.

Component 3, while having various benefits to other sectors and communities, will focus on coastal ecosystem important to the delivery of fishery services that contribute to the provision of resources predominantly through their role in acting as nurseries, feeding grounds, and breeding grounds.

Throughout the project documents, this has been harmonised for clarity and consistency.

2. The project will focus predominantly on coastal ecosystems, which include in this project: mangroves, wetlands, beaches and seagrass beds (seagrass beds are more commonly understood to be coastal ecosystems). This is due to the critical role that these ecosystems play in the provisions of fisheries related services, particularly the coastal/inshore fisheries with which this project will have the most impact. This has been clarified in the Prodoc.

3. At present, capacity building makes up the majority of the budget, including the activities that make up Components 2 and 3 (PES and NBS). This is in the form of educational/sensitisation workshops at the start, training throughout, and knowledge sharing workshops at the end of each component. This has been better clarified in the description of activities. A further component 4 has been added to to increase the presence of capacity building and knowledge sharing activities. This component will further disseminate the experience and lessons learned on MPS, NBS and PES in the region.

4. The TOC has been revised completely to reflect the updated logframe.

5. The MSP provides a clear indication of the types of ecosystems, their location and surface area, ecological condition and vulnerability. The MSP also provides information on the link between the watershed and all the external impacts (including pollution and conflicts with other sectors). Ultimately it will contribute to identify areas that are either in good shape, or severely threatened, through the use of ecological condition indicators ? this identified the areas in need of restoration through NBS, or protection through NBS supporting activities. The MSP provides a good basis for defining the type of NBS to be used or the management that needs to take place at the watershed level. Simply doing NBS scoping exercises is insufficient as it is less integrated and doesn't take into account the externalities on the ecosystems (the site selection in the NBS component is done based on the outcomes of the MSP, but still requires community engagement to determine the viability of intervening in that area particularly from a social and practicality perspective). Furthermore, MSP is necessary as it provides a tool to monitor progress (which in this project will be open and transparent through the online platform). All in all, MSP is a robust foundation for the implementation of NBS. This has been clarified in the components' descriptions, and the activities for site selection in the NBS component made more specific.

6. Given that project approval is only expected in June 2023, the start date for the project was set at January 2024 to allow sufficient time for preparation, contracting and coordination with the executing agency. For reference, the agency (IUCN) usually only considers project commencement upon signing with the executing agency. However, project start date has been updated to August 2023 if this is more reasonable to the GEF SEC.

#### **Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, May 24, 2023). Yes

(Karrer, May 5, 2023).

d) Contrary to the response, Outcome 3.1 and related outputs were not moved to Component 2; instead, they are now Outcome 1.2. Please revise.

(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) No.

Please note the online version of the CER is readable; however, when saved the pdf version tables overlap with the text. Please resolve.

**Component 1 (MSP):**

a) The new Outcome 1.1 for a regional body makes sense, but is not specific to the MSP component. Therefore, please consider creating a new component for overall activities, including the establishment of a regional body. Relatedly, *Outcome 3.3 Strategy for improved regional coordination for scaling up of NBS and PES synergies* is not specific to NBS so suggest moving to overall component and noting for MSP too.

**Component 2 (PES):**

b) Please explain why the budget was reduced by almost ?

c) It is unclear who is anticipated to pay as beneficiaries. There is brief mention of ?mobilizing the private sector, including fisheries, tourism, extractive industries, etc? as beneficiaries,? but who exactly these are is unclear. There is mention of shipping industry as a benefactor, yet, shipping does not require healthy ecosystems so why would they pay?

**Component 3 (NBS):**

d) Outcome 3.1 (Improved organization of regional integrated ecosystem services) and related outputs seem duplicative with PES plans in Component 2. Output 3.1.1 focuses on an accounting system and Output 3.1.2 focuses on financing ecosystem system collection, which suggests a PES scheme. Why is this separate from Component 2?

e) The ProDoc overview of Component 3 indicates that the activities will address the breadth of threats including fisheries, pollution, climate change and habitat destruction. A range of possible activities are noted including habitat restoration, fisheries regulations, floor plan measures, tourism destination regulations, coastal land use and waste management regulations, pollution measures, and adapting to sea level. However, the Output 3.2.3 Pro Doc text possible activities are focused on MPAs. Please clarify as the intent is to pursue a range of activities as needed not only establishing MPAs.

Agency Response

22 May 2023

This was a writing error. It was moved to Component 1, where it sits best as a more comprehensive accounting measure that is synergistic with MSP.

12 April 2023

The formatting of the tables has been revised to the best of our knowledge. The portal sometimes renders things differently to how we see them our side. We hope that it reads correctly now.

- a) These have been moved to the new component 4 on project organisation and knowledge management.
- b) The PES budget in the PIF is 400 000 \$US. In the budget submitted it is 423 000 \$US
- c) The beneficiaries are the organisations who work for rehabilitation and conservation that will *receive* the money from the PES. The people paying will be the people in the fisheries sector (reference to the other sectors has been removed as we have refined this project to focus on the fisheries as earlier indicated) ? we discussed this with the fisheries organisations in the workshops ? the organisations are keen to be involved (at different levels, artisanal, semi-industrial and industrial) especially indicated by the small-scale fisheries organisations in the workshops. Overall, however, the people who receive the benefits will be the fishers (through the rehabilitation of the ecosystems that provide fisheries services). This was conflated in the project design, and has been updated throughout to refer to users (fishers) and beneficiaries (NBS actors).
- d) These have been moved to component 2, and the synergistic activities between components 1 and 2 more clearly indicated.

The entire project has been revised for clarity to ensure that the focus is on fisheries, and ecosystems associated with the delivery of fisheries related services. In output 3.2.3 the activities are indicative, but have been updated to also include habitat restoration, such as mangrove or seagrass planting/maintenance. MPAs are not an NBS activity when standalone, therefore we only include the setup of MPAs where there is existing NBS activity taking place (through other projects). We highlight again that these are indicative and that the final activities chosen will be determined by the MSP and by communities and stakeholders, and therefore might vary from the indicative activities.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

### Agency Response

#### Co-financing

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, May 24, 2023). Yes. As noted, during project implementation, it will be important to seek government co-financing and to prioritize developing government long-term commitment to this work.

(Karrer, May 5, 2023) No. Please modify Table C. Sources of Co-financing so clear funds are from WACA and from ProBlue.

IWLEARN engagement is highlighted; however, please note 1% of the project budget will go toward these activities (e.g. contributing to global synthesis documents, sharing experiences through webinars and in-person fora, etc).

The lack of government co-financing is disappointing as it reflects lack of commitment. During project implementation, it will be important to prioritize developing government long-term commitment to this work.

(Karrer 1&2, Parhizkar 3&4, Feb 3, 2023) No.

1. Please explain the changes in the co-financing, particularly how the WACA contribution increased from \$4M to \$14M. Also, please explain the complete lack of any government co-financing even in-kind. The lack of co-financing from the government indicates a lack of commitment and questions the long-term sustainability of the project.

2. Please explain why the co-financing specifically for Component 1 increased from \$2M to \$9M.

3. On the co-financing provided by the World Bank, the letter is signed by a *Lead Environmental Specialist*. Please obtain a co-financing letter that includes details of the person signing the letter.

4. It seem that the 14 million co-financing provided by the WB includes technical assistance but also a mix of investments. If this is the case this needs to be reflected in table C of the Portal. Please provide one line for the co-financing provided as in-kind and another line for

the co-financing provided as investments mobilized. Please remember to include a description on how the investment mobilized was identified below table C.

## Agency Response

22 May 2023

This has now been updated on the portal to make it clear funds are from ProBlue.

Noted regarding IWLEARN and the 1% budget. This has been added to the text in the communication and knowledge section and is included in the Budget.

Regarding national interest and co-financing, national institutions will be heavily involved in the design of the Payment for Ecosystem Services. Given that through this mechanism, it is likely that national authorities will be able to mobilise funds for conservation purposes, it is likely it will generate an interest and leverage further co-financing throughout the project cycle (which will be monitored and reported).

12 April 2023

1. Some sources of co-financing mentioned in the PIF such as EU PESCAO and EU Fishgov proved impossible to mobilize. Through our discussions with the World Bank it appeared that not only WACA funds could be mobilized as a source of funding but also Problue.

The inception workshops carried over in the three countries showed a great interest in the project. However, the thematics (MSP, PES and NbS) were quite new for the audience, hence for the countries of project implementation. Given the scarce resources the administration can rely on to manage the coastal resources, the concepts have to first show their relevance before government invest in it.

2. As mentioned in the co-financing letter, "World Bank-executed technical assistance in Marine Spatial Planning financed by PROBLUE" is a fund that focusing on MSP, which explains the increase in available funding.

3. please find a revised letter in the CEO endorsement package, indicating the details of the person signing.

4. The Co-financing covers technical assistance in Marine Spatial Planning financed by PROBLUE. As mentioned above, this is a fund that focuses on MSPs and advancing the blue economy therefore can leverage knowledge and data for the projects MSP activities. Investments mobilised have been updated in the CEO endorsement.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer 1, May 24, 2023) Yes.

(Karrer 1, PPO 2, May 5, 2023) No.

1. Please consider how the vehicle can be further co-financed by other sources.

2. Now the M&E budget under section 9 is missing make it impossible to compare the originally \$111,000 with the budget table of Annex E is \$163,500 ? please amend.

(Karrer 1,2, 3; Salazar 3, Feb 3, 2023) No.

1. The PMC is not justified to exceed 5%. Please revise. By creating a separate overall regional coordination, KS, scaling component (suggested in previous comments) some previously PMC-type activities may be funded there.

2. The ProDoc budget for M&E etc notes \$33,500 for knowledge management. Presumably this will include engagement in IWLEARN activities, which we typically request be allocated 1% or more of the budget (\$30,000). Please confirm.

3. The budget in CER Appendix E notes a budget for vehicles purchase (car, boat, motor bikes) that totals 5% of the project budget. Vehicle purchase is generally not encouraged under GEF financing, please explore co-financing to finance for this expenditure.

#### Agency Response

22 May 2023

1. FCWC currently has several projects. Contacts will be made to explore co-financing of the vehicles. The vehicle (car) related budget was already reduced from 45 000 \$US to 28 000 \$US and for the remaining modes of transport this is essential across such a large marine area.

2. This is not missing, it was in the prodoc as indicated on the portal entry. It is now in the portal in addition to this. The M&E budget had changed from \$111,000 to \$74,500. This is reflected in Annex E and in the M&E budget, as was in the previous submission. This was correct at \$74,500.

12 April 2023

1. The PMC does not exceed 5%

2. We have revised all knowledge management to fall under Component 4 and adequate resources have been allocated to IW:LEARN.

The car price was reduced from 50 000 \$US to 30 000 \$US, making it necessary to co-finance the purchase of a robust vehicle

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Feb 3 2023) Yes.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer 1, May 24, 2023) Yes.

(Karrer 1 and Parhizkar 2, 3, May 5, 2023). No.

1. Please add the explanation for the calculation of Core indicator 8 (Sustainable fisheries).

2. The targets for core indicator 5 and 11 are not consistent in the results framework and the core indicator table.

3. There is a significant reductions in target from PIF to CEO endorsement. Please provide further justification. ie., CI.2?s target reduced from 350,000 ha to 60,000 ha. CI. 3?s target reduced from 25,000ha to 2,500 ha.

(Karrer 1&2 and Parhizkar 3, Feb 3, 2023) No.

1. There are three new indicator targets for Indicator 3 (area of land and ecosystems under restoration), Indicator 5 (marine habitat under improved practices) and Indicator 8 (sustainable fisheries). Please explain the basis for the target amounts noted.

2. The PIF review noted, ?during PPG consideration needs to be given as to whether it is realistic for the project to **develop new MPAs?**. Please clarify if this request was addressed and how as new MPAs are not reflected in the indicators table.

3. Core indicators are missing in the results framework. Core Indicators targets need to be aligned with Results Framework (Annex A). GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework.

#### Agency Response

22 May 2023

1. This explanation has been added to the portal.

2. The indicators for 5 and 11 are disaggregated. If the values in the results framework are summed, you?ll find that they add up to what is in the core indicators table. For indicator 5, there are 20,000 ha in output 2.2.1, and 50,000ha in 3.1.3 ? totalling the 70 thousand ha. For indicator 11, clarity has been provided on the disaggregation where previously not well represented.

The justification for the reduction in targets 2 and 3, as provided in the previous submission, has been added to further. This justification in reduction in targets is due to a revised focus and scale of project interventions as mentioned in the previous submission.

12 April 2023

1. We highlight that this must be a portal error, as on our side of the portal, and in the PIF and CEO documents we have the same values for Indicators 5 and 8 (70 000ha and 27 000tons respectively) at both the PIF and CEO stage. Indicator 3 has changed since PIF stage (25 000ha to 2 500 ha) and this was detailed and explained underneath Table E in the CEO.
2. This must also be a portal error as our CEO (unchanged since submission) notes 60 000ha of MPAs either introduced or under improved management under indicator 2.2. Again we highlight that MPAs are not NBS but can be useful to support NBS activities.

The core indicators have been added to the results framework. Gender has been disaggregated to reflect the beneficiaries across the activities. The Area of marine habitat under improved practices (excl. MPAs) has been split between the implementation of PES and NBS activities as these will both contribute to improved practices, although NBS will directly do this more. The rest of the core indicators have remained aggregated at the most suitable points in the outcomes.

## **Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) No. See previous comments.

Agency Response  
12 April 2023

These have been addressed in response to the earlier comments, see above.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response  
**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response  
**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
NA

Agency Response  
**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, May 24, 2023). Yes. As noted, regarding engaging the coastal communities, these were consulted during PPG for Togo and Cote d'Ivoire, but not Ghana. To rectify this situation, consulting with the Ghana coastal communities will need to be a priority during early implementation.

(Karrer, May 5, 2023).

The addition of the private sector stakeholders is appreciated; however, only fisheries-related stakeholders are noted. The project includes developing marine spatial plans (Component 1), which require working with a range of sectors, including tourism, mining, energy (oil & gas), shipping, and conservation. Please add these. As noted in the first comment, the alternative is to focus Component 1 only on zoning fisheries in which case the other stakeholders would not be as engaged.

Regarding engaging the coastal communities, these were consulted during PPG for Togo and Cote d'Ivoire, but not Ghana. To rectify this situation, consulting with the Ghana coastal communities will need to be a priority during early implementation.

(Karrer, Feb 3 2023) No.

The ProDoc stakeholder section provides a detailed account of the relevant government agencies, NGOs and research institutions that will be engaged. These cover a range of sectors beyond fisheries, which is encouraging. How they will be engaged is also noted. However, the private sector is not listed. This group is important for the project activities. Please add this list and ensure it reflects the breadth of sectors relevant to the project as discussed in the first comment.

Appendix B lists the stakeholders engaged during PPG; however, most of the organizations noted are unknown acronyms. Please add a column indicating the type of stakeholder ? e.g. fisheries organization, private shipping business, etc. so that we can understand who was consulted. Note that Canada Council member specifically requested consultations with coastal communities affected by sea level rise. Please ensure this request was addressed.

## Agency Response

22 May 2023

These stakeholders have been added as part of the MSP activities (full response above to similar comment).

This is duly noted, we have specified in the SEP in inception phase of the project the engagement with coastal communities in Ghana.

12 April 2023

Section 3.4 has been updated to include the private sector stakeholders that will be engaged. These will be the national fisheries organisations and associations, small scale fisher associations, and tuna associations. Most of these were there already, but not properly

indicated as private sector and this has since been updated. Section 4 of the CEO doc has been updated too to reflect this.

In Annex B of the ProDoc, a column indicating the type of stakeholder engaged during PPG has been added, and the acronyms expanded too for clarity.

Regarding the communities affected by sea level rise, please see response below in the council comments section.

#### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

(Karrer, May 5, 2023). Yes. As explained in the response, the gender aspects will be further analyzed and addressed during implementation as plans evolve and progress.

(Karrer 1 Lebale 2, Feb 3, 2023) No.

1. A gender analysis and action plan was conducted during PPG. The resulting plan for the project provides useful guidance indicating that women need to be engaged in the project activities, that the impacts to them need to be considered and that alternative livelihoods need to be identified to fit their interests.

However, the gender analysis was too limited and did not adequately address the project activities. It focused on national-level information (e.g. education levels, access to healthcare, engagement in decision-making). Related to the project, the focus was very much on the role of women related to fisheries and to a limited extent mangrove resource extraction (e.g. oyster harvesting). There was no analysis of how women relate to the other activities that impact or benefit from coastal and marine ecosystems, which were identified by the project as fisheries, aquaculture, energy, tourism, recreation, ports, shipping (or transport and trade), and extraction of non-living resources (or mining). Consequently there were no insights into how women would be affected by (positively or negatively) the proposed activities around MSP, PES and NBS. There needs to be an understanding as to the role of women, how they will be affected, and recommendations to the project. In the final PIF review this point was made. Specifically, "During PPG consideration will be needed regarding the role of women related to the various threats that are managed by the project, which are not all reflected in the gender

section. For example, agriculture, wood exploitation, plastic pollution, mineral extraction, oil exploration, shipping, ports and harbor construction.?

Consequently, the gender analysis needs to be redone to address the breadth of activities relevant to the project.

2. In addition, as a good gender mainstreaming practice, it is recommended to reflect/weave in gender equality considerations in the project components, whenever relevant (i.e., not to confine gender perspectives in the Gender Action Plan).

## Agency Response

12 April 2023

1. Given that the project has been refined to focus only on the fisheries these other sectoral areas have not been addressed. Because the exact schemes that will be applied for NBS and PES are not yet identified and are only indicative since they need to be consulted with stakeholders, including women, this type of analysis has rather been designed in to the activities as a necessary first step prior to intervention. As such, there is already a site-specific gender analyses in the project prior to NBS and PES pilots. The provision of gender based results has also been updated to ensure it is included in the results framework.

We have left in the national level context on health, education etc as it does provide useful knowledge to support the implementing actors at a later stage.

The project design has been updated to include gender based activities where relevant, and the results framework also updated to reflect this.

### **Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, May 5, 2023). Yes.

(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) No. Please revise to specify the private sectors engaged in PPG. Ensure financiers are included.

Agency Response

12 April 2023

Section 3.4 has been updated to include the private sector stakeholders that will be engaged. Some were already on there, but more have been added ? essentially these will be the national fisheries organisations and associations, small scale fisher associations, and tuna associations. Section 4 of the CEO doc has been updated too to reflect this.

A column indicating the type of stakeholder engaged during PPG has been added to Annex B of the ProDoc.

#### **Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

#### **Agency Response** **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, May 5, 2023). Yes. The response ?the FCWC contact Ministries in each of the 3 countries is the Ministry of Fisheries. However it is foreseen the Ministry of Environment will be very much involved? indicates a very limited scope for engagement. While that may be fine for the NBS and PES activities, for the MSP a wide range of ministries will need to be engaged related to tourism, mining/energy, etc. Fortunately, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan notes a range of government agencies for each country indicating the breadth will be engaged.

(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) No.

The EA for the project is the Fisheries Committee for the West Central Gulf of Guinea (FCWC). Given the importance of other sectors beyond fisheries and given the focus on only 3 countries, it would seem the EA would need to have a broader mandate and broader expertise.

Further, given the focus on the 3 countries and activities within each, it would seem that the national government agencies from the 3 countries would be engaged, particularly agencies beyond fisheries.

The relationship between this project and the GCLME activities, including the proposed Guinea Commission, need to be explained. The GCLME project is in flux; however, it still needs to be considered. The final PIF comments noted, "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. This assessment needs to occur during PPG and the relationship with GCLME and the proposed Guinea Commission clearly explained in the CER. This point will be carefully reviewed for CER."

#### Agency Response

22 May 2023

Duly noted. The Ministry of Environment will be fully engaged in the MSP process, as will the other ministries indicated on the SEP.

12 April 2023

The FCWC contact Ministries in each of the 3 countries is the Ministry of Fisheries. However it is foreseen that the Ministry of Environment will be very much involved in the process as PES and NbS are concepts that should be integrated by the Ministry

As mentioned in 5.2, an inter-ministerial committee will be set up in each of the three countries gathering the different sectorial institutions involved in fisheries and coastal resources management at national and local levels. Moreover, representatives of the national inter-ministerial committee will be participating in the steering committee. Finally, the list of participants in the national inception workshops shows the diversity of the audience.

GCLME is currently non functional, the Guinea Commission has not been established and as such it difficult to develop collaboration. GCLME is to hosted by the Abidjan Convention, and currently the letters of endorsement of the countries parties to the project are awaited as well as letters from the partners agreeing on the new role of the Abidjan Convention. However, once the current projet is in the course of implementation and hoping the GCLME is functional, links on subjects such as the maintenance of ecosystem health and protection of biodiversity, and collaborate to integrate MSP, NbS and PES in the regulatory and institutional framework of the three countries

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, May 5, 2023). Yes. The knowledge management is intended to share experiences in how the project activities were undertaken, including lessons learned on what worked or not. From the 4.11 Communication and KM text and Table 12, this will occur in Component 4.

(Karrer 1&2; Biro 3-, Feb 3, 2023) No.

1. The ProDoc section on knowledge management emphasizes sharing lessons learned; however, the table does not include activities related to synthesizing and sharing lessons learned from the project. Please revise to indicate these plans.

2. These knowledge management plans are not reflected in the actual project components all of which need to include knowledge and experience synthesis and sharing with relevant stakeholders related to the project and with other relevant projects. Currently some outputs note sharing experiences between pilots, others note synthesizing data, training and creating a shareholder dialogue platform. There need to be more consistent plans throughout the components, particularly for synthesizing and sharing knowledge and experiences

3. The project's KM Approach and communication plan could be better elaborated, especially in terms of how the project will participate in IW:Learn. While there is mention of knowledge dissemination through the platform and IW:Learn, there is no clear description of a communication plan/strategy for the project.

Please revise the KM approach to better explain how the project will engage with IW:Learn, what the project's communication strategy/plan is and how the platform fits in. Also please provide a clear budget for implementing planned knowledge management activities, including the development of the platform, participation in IW:Learn and implementation of the communication plan/strategy.

4. A timeline related to KM activities has been provided in the prodoc; but the project document does not seem to specify a KM budget, other than listing the cost of KM elements as part of the M&E budget. It is also not clear how much the platform will cost to build. Please revise.

## Agency Response

12 April 2023

1. The existing activities on lessons learned that were in the logframe have been added to a new KM table in section 4.11 of the prodoc indicating all of the relevant KM activities across the project, and the associated knowledge outputs.
2. The activities from the knowledge management section have been added to the new component 4.
3. The KM approach has been revised to do include a knowledge management strategy that includes monitoring thereof. IW:Learn has been better incorporated by adding 2 activities that address this, 1 is on linking the stakeholder dialogue and lessons learned platform to IW Learn and the other is hosting an IW Learn webinar on the outcomes of the project.

The KM plan has been revised to indicate where knowledge management and communication activities take place across the components and activities. Because there are now outputs within the project design that cover knowledge management, these are all incorporated in the revised budget for the components.

4. See above the responses to points 2 and 3. The cost of building the platform has also been reflected in the budget.

## **Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response  
**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Salazar, Feb 3, 2023) No.

M&E budget under section 9 ? Monitoring and Evaluation is \$111,000, while under the budget table of Annex E is \$163,500.

Agency Response  
12 April 2023

The M&E costs have been updated to total \$74,500. This has been updated in the Prodoc (section 8) and the budget table (Annex E).

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) Yes.

Agency Response  
**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, May 5, 2023). Yes.

(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023)

1. Canada requested consideration of how coastal communities will be affected by sea level rise, particularly displacement. In the response you noted, "This project is designed to increase the resilience and ability of coastal communities to adapt to coastal living in response to climate change?" However these aspects do not seem addressed in the plans, particularly NBS plans. Please clarify.

Canada's comments to engage with stakeholders related to the MSP and gender aspects are reflected in previous comments related to stakeholder engagement and gender plans.

2. Germany raised concerns regarding the MSP process. Please incorporate response points into the Pro Doc and CER, particularly regarding plans to work with the various government agencies and plans to legalize and enforce the MSPs.

3. Norway and Denmark's comments regarding a deeper risk analysis and gender analysis were addressed.

## Agency Response

12 April 2023

1. There was an error in the response to the council comments. We've reconsidered the impact of the project to be a co-benefit to climate change adaptation and mitigation, but not a primary benefit. This project will naturally enhance the resilience of coastal communities affected by sea level rise through the implementation of NBS, which we expect will predominantly be restoration of coastal ecosystems. However, this project is not an entirely climate project and focuses primarily on fisheries. The fisheries focus will benefit those affected by the impacts of climate change on declining and migrating fish stocks in terms of livelihoods and food security in the face of climate change too. As such, the communities engaged were not consulted on sea-level rise specifically but rather the issues related to ecosystem service delivery (related to fishing), what PES might look like in their communities, and potential NBS solutions that would be most feasible or rewarding to them.

2. We acknowledge the need to ensure that MSPs are legalized and enforced to be effective. However, it is beyond the scope of the project to ensure enforcement and legalization, especially given that the FCWC (the executing agency) is a regional body that has limited influence, and can't force, the integration of spatial plans into national law. The project demonstrates what can work in practice, and provides tools to support national institutions, but there are no funds, nor the political will, to ensure institutions apply these. The intention is that through capacity building and training of national officials in the MSP component, and through the stakeholder workshops, that the countries take ownership of the tools given to them. They are on board with developing MSPs (as identified in our workshops), however whether or not they are used in practice is beyond the remit of this project.

3. noted.

### **STAP comments**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, May 5, 2023). Yes.

(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023)

STAP suggested a revised objective, which the Agency responded they adopted; however, this is not the case. Please revise the objective to be, "Enhance coastal and marine habitats in

Togo, Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire through coordinated marine spatial planning (MSP), economic incentives (payment for ecosystem services), and nature-based solutions.?

Agency Response

12<sup>th</sup> April

Please indicate where this still needs to change, as we did adopt this, and currently it reads as requested on the first page of the CEO doc, as well as in the the gender action plan, and the project results framework.

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Feb 3, 2023) No.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>2/3/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/5/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/24/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat comments**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
---

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**