



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5278		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Strengthening Global Governance of Large Marine Ecosystems and their Coasts through Enhanced Sharing and Application of LME/ICM/MPA Knowledge and Information Tools		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4481 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$75,000	Project Grant:	\$2,500,000
Co-financing:	\$13,254,600	Total Project Cost:	\$15,904,600
PIF Approval:	February 20, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Vladimir Mamaev

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): NA, this is a global project	5th of December 2014 (lkarrer): NA, this is a global project.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): NA, this is a global project	5th of December 2014 (lkarrer): NA, this is a global project.
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, funds are available under the IW focal area allocation.	5th of December 2014 (lkarrer): Yes, funds are available.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project is in alignment with IW - 3</p>	<p>Dece 5, 2014 (Ikarrer). Yes.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): This is a global project, but it is addressing a global identified need.</p>	<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): This is a global project addressing a global need for learning across projects.</p>
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes</p>	<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes</p>	<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): No. Please address the following points:</p> <p>OVERALL</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Linkages between LME Learn and IW Learn - There needs to be a clear plan for how LME Learn and IW Learn will be integrated as a single effort,</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>including how the activities are linked and how the staff will be one unit led by IWLearn. Currently the components much less the outputs are not related to each other or cross-walked in any way implying two distinct projects. There needs to be a big picture plan for integration. At the IWLearn partners meeting GEFSec provided a strawman cross-walk of how these are linked based on the draft Pro Docs. Please use that matrix, modify or create something better “ but the links between activities, which partner is leading which activities and staff responsibilities need to be clear.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Not addressed. There needs to be a clear explanation of how the two projects are related, specifically that IWLearn is the umbrella project. There also needs to be a clear explanation of how the similar project activities, such as the training and twinning, are inter-related, including an explanation of Figure 1 which notes tasks but is not explained.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Relatedly, the staff list for LMELearn includes a Project Coordinator and for IWLearn a Director. Please clarify how they will collaborate to ensure LMELearn is embedded within IWLearn as lead. There are several other overlapping staff that need clarification</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>in terms of coordination - LMELearn also has an Admin Assistant as does IWLearn. IWLearn lists a Deputy for training and twinning “ will that person oversee training and twinning for LME Learn too? Who will oversee the toolkits? Please clarify responsibilities for the unified IWLearn/LMELearn team and a plan to implementation given start dates are off by a few months.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Not addressed. While the organograms are a useful addition, the way they are designed implies separate, not interrelated, projects. By having the positions under specific project headings it appears that the positions only relate to that project. While it's fine to indicate the funding source by position (e.g. footnote or in separate table), the organogram needs to reflect how the position responsibilities are related across projects. Relatedly, it needs to be clear the PM is responsible for both projects, not just IWLearn as implied by only listing IWLearn tasks underneath the position title. With regard to the TOR for the TA, the skills need to include expertise and experience with knowledge management, particularly in identifying and synthesizing lessons learned across projects, communicating and disseminating these insights, which are responsibilities of the position.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed. Relatedly, the NOAA grant to UNDP to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>finance the project is most welcome. We assume that day-to-day reporting will be to the Program Manager as depicted in the organogram. Therefore, such dual reporting lines need to be clear in the plans, including in the TORs.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Partner Engagement - The organizational structure, including how the various partners will be engaged, is weak. Since project success depends on partnerships, it is important to be clear on which partners will be responsible for, and engaged in, which activities. Since the PIF stage partners have provided specific input on their existing capacity and interests in the project activities; however, the roles of partners does not seem to have been decided and this information is not presented in the Pro Doc. Nor is there information on budget allocations. There is often mention of ICES and occasional mention of NOAA and IUCN. Meanwhile none of the other presumed partners (UNEP, CI, WWF, etc.) are mentioned as having any role. Please clarify which organizations will be the lead for which components/ outcomes/ activities, their relevant expertise and the basis for their selection. For example, the document "IWLern4 Activity Outlines" provides tables with columns for "Partner Activities", which is a useful means of conveying this information.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Not addressed. Activity Level Budget (42) is useful in clarifying which partners will be responsible for which activities and Annex 4 provides some more information. Please edit the text - there is brief mention of ICES' role in the text, but not the other organizations, which needs to be edited for consistency (add others or remove ICES). There still needs to be an explanation of the basis for selecting the partners for the tasks, including relevant expertise (see next note)d.</p> <p>For the budget allocations, \$130,000 for training modules (3.5) seems high considering less (\$120,000) is allocated for actually conducting the training (3.6). Is this correct understanding?</p> <p>Also, it is useful to have the partner co-financing listed in Table 42, although quite vague. It is assumed the specifics will be determine early in implementation.</p> <p>Finally please check - it seems the leads for 2.1.4 and 2.1.3 are reversed in Table 42.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): While almost all the activities do not note who will actually conduct the activities, there are a few exceptions and these exceptions need justification for</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>selection. In particular there is mention of ICES playing a role in Component 2, Activity 3.5 and Component 4. These roles need to be clarified, including budget allocation to ICES, and justification for selecting ICES based on activities and relevant expertise.</p> <p>Relatedly, sometimes one relevant partner's activities are mentioned, but not others. For example, Activity 2.1 notes the FAO training links, but no other partners' training experiences even though most of the partners have training activities. Please edit the Pro Doc to be comprehensive rather than mentioning only one partner.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Not addressed. Text still only mentions ICES. Please state other partners' contributions throughout as well " not just in Appendix 4. Further in the Annex 4 only CI explains their relevant experience; IUCN and ICES do not. Please add.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed. However, while there is often mention in the Pro Doc of particular partners, such as ICES and NOAA, consideration needs to be given to all the partners with clear oversight and leadership from the PCU. The engagement of the various stakeholders and their more specific roles in the project activities (e.g. who will lead which trainings) needs to be a focus of the inception workshop to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>ensure more equitable than the original emphasis on ICES. For each training or other activity, the identification of roles needs to consider which organizations have relevant expertise in the topic and experience in the targeted region.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Target audience - As noted by the STAP and during the Paris partners meeting, the target audience for this project needs to be clear. During Paris there was discussion regarding the breadth of projects that might be engaged and what is realistic “ i.e. GEF IW, GEF (IW, BD, etc) and GEF Partners (e.g. Seascapes) projects. Participants noted that some activities (e.g. in-person training) may be more limited; whereas others (e.g. webinars) may be more open. There is a note in Component 3 that the target is "potentially the entire LME community", but unclear who that is. The only mention of other projects is Seascapes in the title of Component 3 (p26). There needs to be a clear list of relevant projects and a clear explanation of to what extent they will be engaged in the various components and why. Currently it is unclear if the project is aware of the range of potential projects besides LMEs.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Unjustified priority topics for activities</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>“ The selection of priority topics for the various activities is very important for ensuring activities meet project needs. The Capacity Needs Assessment (CNA) is highlighted as the basis for identifying priority topics for the trainings and toolkits; however, the survey was inconsistent and the response rate was low (noted as 10% during July meeting) questioning the validity of the results. Whereas the training survey included over 70 topics, the toolkits included only 30 topics. The training survey missed such major topics as economics which was only one sub-topic despite asking about such specifics as plankton identification and dive safety “ similar with climate change which was only two of 70 sub-topics. Please explain the inconsistencies and basis for the CNA topics that were surveyed and plans to more accurately determine priorities to ensure activities are planned to reflect needs of the projects.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Not addressed. Please state plans to prepare a more comprehensive CNA in Pro Doc.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed. However, this issue needs attention during implementation. The original response to this comment stated there will be a comprehensive CNA during the full project; whereas, the most recent response notes there will not be new comprehensive CNA and instead during</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>the LME meeting/Steering Committee the agenda will include updating needs related to the CNA. While it's useful to solicit input during group meetings, it will be difficult to have a constructive discussion and consensus in a room of likely 15 or more people. An important role of the TA will be to understand and address knowledge needs of the projects, which requires regular communication with the program managers. If it's not possible to have an updated CNA, then at a minimum the TA needs to have regular discussions with the program managers as to priority thematic needs (not just scientific needs, but other topics).</p> <p>Relatedly, one of the many keys to the success of this project is ensuring it builds a learning network among projects. Doing so requires an emphasis on south-to-south learning, particularly within regions. Consequently, only in situations where no regional/national expertise and experience is available should outsiders be engaged. This approach needs to be considered when developing training plans in particular. It also needs to be considered in developing the working groups. Currently there is a great deal of co-financing from ICES from their existing working group on integrated ecosystem management implying they plan to play a leading role; however, this group is entirely Europeans and Americans. The PCU, as lead, will need to identify the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>most appropriate partners for a WG.</p> <p>This learning network also requires listening to the projects regarding their priority interests and needs, which means soliciting their input through regional representation in the Steering Committee as well as regular, candid communication between the PCU and the PMs regarding knowledge needs for training, cross-site learning products and twinning.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): New topics - Unexplained new topics also arose under the toolkits and trainings that are not reflected in the CNA . For toolkits (Component 2), in addition to the CNA priority topics of governance, social aspects and environmental economics, another 3 topics appear in the outputs (p 22) “ nutrient over-enrichment, LME valuation and satellite remote sensing were noted. Not only were these new 3 topics not prioritized by respondents, they were not even listed in the survey. In addition, in reading through the description of this activity (p24), a series of new topics are listed “ the LME strategic approach toolkit, the LME assessment toolkit, the GEF LME toolkit and marine spatial planning and meanwhile there is no mention of toolkits on nutrient over-enrichment, LME valuation and satellite remote sensing. Activity 3.5 notes training will have modules on "coastal and marine risk and vulnerability</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>mapping from climate and non-climatic factors and risk and vulnerability assessment methodology development." This topic is not reflected in the CNA. Activity 3.6 also seems to have predetermined topics on climate change, rather than the needs assessment. While all of these are interesting topics, priority needs to be given to topics of priority to the projects (the target audience). If I recall correctly, these are toolkits or trainings already being planned by partners. There are no doubt numerous activities planned by the many partners (some were discussed in the partners meeting) – why are these specific ones listed? And even if funded by other sources, there is still the time and effort of supporting and promoting these efforts among projects. Please justify these new topics or else remove.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Explained – thank you.</p> <p><b>COMPONENT &amp; ACTIVITY SPECIFICS</b>  5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer):  Website - Activity 4.1 Related to linkages points above – the LME learn website needs to be fully embedded into IWLEARN. LMELearn cannot have its own distinct website. There is a great deal of duplication across the two projects – LMELearn Pro Doc notes doing visualization, sharing achievements, having site profiles – all</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>things IWLearn is planning. The contribution of LMELearn to the IWLearn.net needs to be clear. For example, while it is exciting and useful to link to Google Earth, what is the plan for linking with the UNEP planned visualization tool?</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed except how Google Map plans relate to the IWLearn visusalization tool. Please explain.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Similarly, where will the latest LME/ICM/MPA project news be reported, webinars and toolkits posted, the calendar of training and key conferences posted?</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Not addressed. There is extensive explanation of external communication plans, but not regarding knowledge sharing among projects. Please confirm the site will include recorded webinars/trainings, access to toolkits/experience notes/synthesis materials, and have a calendar of events (trainings, conferences, webinars) and anything else to facilitate knowledge sharing.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): To</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>ensure integrated, there near needs to be a clear team for the website team. Yet, UNEP, which is planned to lead the IWLearn website, is not even mentioned in plans but IUCN, Google, SCPA, Mission Blue, Nat Geo, NOAA and others are. IWLearn is planning to work with OpenChannels.org, which is focused on ocean issues, so all the more reason to engage in LMELearn. Please provide a clear plan for what you expect the LMELearn project to contribute to IWLearn.net and the structure of the team.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (lkarrer): Not addressed. Relationship with IWLearn well explained, but it is not clear who will be responsible for the LMELearn pieces “ will this be UNDP or UNEP or other? And how will the site draw from partners' sites, such as CI Seacapes, NOAA (which has regular webinars) and other relevant such as Mission Blue?</p> <p>20th May 2015 (lkarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (lkarrer): Component 2 “ It is important that these toolkits draw on project experiences, which is not discussed in this description. In all cases, the working group developing the toolkit should review project experiences (particularly site-specific) and highlight relevant lessons learned to the topic as case</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>studies to illustrate points. Only the Governance Handbook description mentions it will include best practices from GEF projects and then there is mention of TWAP and Blue Forest specifically. For each activity, there needs to be consideration of not one global project but all relevant including site specific projects. Drawing lessons learned from projects needs to be noted for all these activities.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (lkarrer): Not addressed. This point largely addressed in the edited text except for Activity 2.2., which specifically mentions drawing on the Baltic Sea LME. While an important success case, it is only one project and is not in a developing country region like the majority of LMEs. This emphasis on European experiences in this section and elsewhere suggests a North to South learning approach instead of South to South. This concern has been noted previously with regard, for example, to the original Steering Committee which included almost exclusively USA and Europe based entities with limited input from developing country-based organizations. This concern needs to be addressed in the revision and taken into consideration throughout implementation.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (lkarrer): Addressed. However, the process of developing tool kits and other cross-project knowledge</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>products (e.g. guidebooks, policy papers) needs to be well thought out during the inception phase. The Pro Doc only notes lessons learned will be drawn out from the projects without explaining further. For any given prioritized topic, there needs to be criteria for selecting relevant projects and thorough analysis of how and why projects succeeded or failed (i.e. root causes and barriers) related to the topic to then draw out guidance. As the STAP noted in their PIF review, "The design appears to assume that the task is merely to assemble and organize experience and related tools from existing and past projects. The proposal design does not provide for conceptual frameworks by which the very large amount of experience and existing attempts will be examined to identify and codify emerging good practices. Without such analysis, the identification of the knowledge and skills that are proving to be most critical establishing successful governance systems as a result of GEF investments will remain a matter of opinion and tied to the context in which such initiatives have been implemented." Also as noted by the STAP, there is a wealth of existing information and before developing new toolkits, training, etc on the project first needs to identify existing relevant materials and consider to what extent they have proved successful to then build on those experiences.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Relatedly, Activity 2.6 is entirely focused on publishing lessons learned. This activity is potentially very important; however it is remarkably vague suggesting it has not been thought through. For example, focus could be on experiences engaging the private sector, addressing gender issues, and/or incorporating climate change adaptation considerations into projects. This activity needs further clarification or at least a plan for how the topics will be determined, the type of products and how many products will be produced.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Not addressed. The criteria and process for selecting topics need to be clarified, such as drawing from the CNA and the GEF-6 strategy. The type of products that are planned, such as white paper or guidebooks, also need to be clarified. This activity is very important as it is one of the few that will identify cross-cutting topics, assess lessons learned and synthesize analyses across projects.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed and will be part of implementation.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Activity 2.1 - The "Social Aspects" toolkit, the topics noted do not address social aspects, but rather focus only on stakeholder engagement, which is only one aspect of social aspects related to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>ocean governance. "Social Aspects" includes how people depend on resources, how they benefit, equity among users, spatial distribution and many, many other aspects, which were not considered in the survey. This topic needs to be renamed to "Stakeholder Engagement" (or redo the survey to address social aspects).</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed by changing the title to reflect the focus on stakeholder engagement as suggested. However, given the importance of understanding the social aspects (how people benefit, etc " see note), during implementation social aspects need to be considered, such as in Activity 2.6 where topics are to be determined.</p> <p>20th May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Activity 3.6 six trainings over the course of the project is not very many, especially given the effort going into identifying priority. Please add more.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Not addressed. The Pro Doc is intended to reflect all activities form both the GEF funding and the co-financing. Please edit Pro Doc to reflect the points in your response regarding project partners providing additional trainings as part of their co-financing.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>20th of May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Component 4 is focused on sharing the LME/ICM/MPA project achievements and lessons learned. In order to disseminate best practices and lessons learned, it is first necessary to assess and document the best practices and lessons learned of the relevant GEF projects. This fundamental task has to be included; otherwise, what are you communicating? Thought needs to go into what information will be disseminated “ will this be the basics of here are where the LMEs are located, this is how many TDA/SAPs were done, or will this be related to specific topics such as how projects addressed such major issues as climate change. If the latter, some of the case study analysis planned for the toolkits may be useful. However, tying back to the toolkit activities is not mentioned. Furthermore, there needs to be a strategy for what to communicate.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Activity 4.3 There is specific mention of peer reviewed publications; however, given that non-academics rarely read peer reviewed publications, it would be much more effective to focus on policy briefs, guidebooks or other synthesis</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>materials (more akin to Component 1). The priority for a project such as this is getting information to the users, which means mechanisms other than peer reviewed publications. Please discuss plans for non-peer reviewed publications.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Not addressed. Activity 4.3 still emphasizes journals and does not mention guidebooks/policy briefs/ etc. Please edit text to reflect plans for non-peer reviewed publications.</p> <p>20th of May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p> <p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Activity 4.4 “ Sub-activity 4.4.2 focuses on organizing a biennial conference on ecosystem management and ocean governance focusing on how science impacts governance. This sub-activity is a major undertaking. Similarly, with regard to Sub-Activity 4.4.3 it is unclear why LMELearn would be responsible for publishing conference and workshop proceedings. And finally for Sub-Activity 4.4.4, why is LMELearn proposing to launch a global ABNJ science community effort among the many topics in which LMELearn could lead? Please remove these three sub-activities.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Adequately explained or addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): The Name - Please use the agreed nickname, "LME Learn" (not LME COP or LME Governance). Note in title and throughout text.</p> <p>20th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, this MSP project will support the formulation of a LME/ICM Governance network, reaching out globally, not only servicing the UNDP, NOAA, IUCN, IOC, ICES but also GEF IW and GEF BD funded MPAs.</p>	<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): This project will not directly address the gender issues, but will create socio economic benefits due to the nature of the suggested interventions, while also promoting gender mainstreaming into LME and ICM projects.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, Since this project is building upon a large number of successful regional interventions that includes CSO and local communities, the project will include linkages to these.</p>	<p>5th of December. Yes.</p>
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): the project includes a matrix outlining potential risks and mitigation measures. Climate Change or its consequences are not directly addressed, due to the nature of the proposed project, but will be an integral part when addressing governance of LMEs, MPAs and assessing tools for ICM.</p>	<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes. Climate change is one of the priority learning topics for the project.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes. This global project properly coordinates with relevant initiatives.</p>	<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): No. See points above regarding the need to articulate partner responsibilities related to activities.</p> <p>20th of May 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes. The project collaborates with relevant partners.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): This project will be important in creating a global governance structure for LMEs, MPAs and towards harnessing public and private partners. The approach that this project is taking is highly innovative as it will be able create a governance structure that will allow cooperation and synergies to happen not only with in GEF IW funded projects, but also similar investments within BD in MPA areas, UNDP, IOC, NOAA, ICES, CI and many other partners.</p>	<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): This project is innovative for the GEF in that it is a model for: 1) how to document and share lessons and insights across projects; 2) how to work across diverse partners with similar interests globally; and 3) how to take advantage of traditional as well as progressive social media to communicate experiences and build knowledge.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>
	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to</p>	<p>7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes,</p>	<p>5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes; however, please explain changes in co-financing.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		26th of March 2015 (Ikarrer): The total GEF Grant and Co-Financing amounts are inconsistent between Tables A and B. Please correct.  20th of May 2015 (Ikarrer): Addressed.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes	5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, it is following the GEF guidance	5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): NA	5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		5th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): Corporate and IW tracking indicators are not appropriate for this project, which is a knowledge management project.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		5th of December 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		20th of May (LKarrer): The STAP comments have been addressed. However, it is important to note that during the early phase of the project as each of the toolkits, trainings and other knowledge products are being developed on various topics, there needs to be thorough analyses of existing and past project experiences in terms of root causes and barriers for success and failure. While the Project Document notes lessons learned will be drawn out, this process needs to set criteria for selecting relevant projects and then a thorough analysis of what worked or not related to the topic needs to be conducted. Also, as noted by the STAP, there is a wealth of existing information and before developing new toolkits, training, etc the project first needs to identify existing relevant materials and consider to what extent they have proved successful to then build on those experiences.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		20th of May (LKarrer): NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		20th of May (LKarrer): NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		20th of May (LKarrer): NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is being recommended for Clearance	
	25. Items to consider at CEO		



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		11th of December 2014 (Ikarrer): No. Please address points and resubmit.  20th of May (LKarrer): Yes.
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**