

GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS

Country/Region: Morocco
 Project Title: Morocco: MED Integrated Coastal Zone Management-Mediterranean Coast
 GEFSEC Project ID: **4198**
 GEF Agency Project ID: GEF Agency: World Bank
 GEF Focal Area (s): International Waters
 GEF-4 Strategic Program (s): IW-1;IW-2;
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$0 GEF Project Allocation:\$5,181,818 Co-financing:\$20,000,000 Total Project Cost:\$25,181,818
 PIF Approval Date: Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: March 31, 2010
 Program Manager: Ivan Zavadsky GEF Agency Contact Person: Kanta Kumari Rigaud

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Morocco is eligible under the Instrument.	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the Morocco GEF OFP endorsed the project on Oct 19, 2009, including the PPG.	
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	SO 2, SP 1 and SP 2	
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	Yes, the WB has proven history and succesful record of implementation of GEF SAP at national level, comprising investment measures and national reforms leading to improved environmental and natural resources management. The WB is a leading GEF agency in implemenation of the Sustainable MED PA, under which this project is being proposed.	
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?	N.A.	

	• The focal areas?	Yes.	
	• Strategic objectives?	Yes.	
	• Strategic program?	Yes.	
Project Design	6. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	Yes, the GEB is supposed to be accrued by addressing critical issues related to sustainable fisheries, improved management and conservation of coastal zone ecosystems including marine and inland biodiversity, pollution reduction, and eco-tourism promotion in the Lake Nador area, and Moulouya. The focus of the project is on strengthening the institutional coordination, policy, planning, knowledge management and implementation capacities, supporting critical and pilot investments addressing the priorities of both MED SAPs, which have identified hotspots in the environmental plan and identifies these actions as key to ensuring the viability of the ecosystems and biodiversity.	
	7. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		
	8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	Yes, the the project design and proposed project components address the key threats to Morocco's coastal ecosystems on the Mediterranean side, namely the severe environmental situation of the Lake Nador and Moulouya River ecosystem caused by pollution and lack of sound waste management in particular, lack of sustainable fisheries management and lack of pollution control and integrated coastal zone management. The proposed outputs and outcomes are clear and support the overall objective of the project. It is expected that project preparation will result in set of measurable targets and indicators for the project outputs and in line with the GEF 4 IW Tracking Tool, which the project is expected to report on.	

	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?	Yes, the proposed project addresses the coastal zone, one of the Government's priority within the National Development Plan and the NEAP. The national Government is in the preparatory phase of national law on coastal zone, which this project outcomes will rightly feed in.	
	10. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, this project is part of the new PA Sustainable MED, which addresses the priority actions within both MED SAPs, responding to four major transboundary concerns of the Mediterranean Sea. The project aims to work together with other related initiatives as those implemented by the Agency Francaise de Development, the FFEM and handful of WB funded water sector projects in Morocco.	
	11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	Yes, the project will use appropriate economic, cost-benefit, least cost, and cost of degradation analysis in prioritizing and implementing ICZM interventions. This project is also a part of the regional Sustainable MED PA, which includes regional knowledge sharing and improved capacity as well as stronger regional governance systems. The GEF and WB experiences have shown that interventions are likely to be more cost effective when implemented under regional projects in multiple countries as opposed to individual projects.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		
	13. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		
	14. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	Yes, the major risks of achieving project objective in terms of institutional barriers and climate change are clearly articulated and mitigation strategies outlined. It is expected that the WB team, within the project design,	

		preparation and implementation, will elaborate in more detail way on mitigating the risk of broadening the decision making mechanisms concerning the coastal zone management to reach appropriate balance between conservation and development.	
Justification for GEF Grant	15. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?	Yes, the incremental value of the GEF supported alternative, including the activities supported by additional funding focused on the Mediterranean coast can be high due to key project interventions to support ICZM at selected sites at Mediterranean coast and demonstration of ICZM application in the Lake Nador and Moulouya River ecosystems. The relatively limited GEF investment in the project will help to increase the substantial baseline investments and enable the GEF support to cease or be refocused to continued support during the implementation.	
	16. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?	Yes, the grant financing through this requested GEF grant would be of significant assistance to Morocco and will be used as strategic catalyst among various national and international efforts in view of addressing the coastal management in the Mediterranean Sea, resources conservation, and related capacity building in a more systematic and integrated manner.	
	17. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		
	18. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	Yes, the GEF funded project management costs represent less than 8% of the GEF grant, and is in line with the overall co-financing ratio.	
	19. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		

	20. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	Yes, the indicative co-financing 1:4 is adequate to this type of intervention, the overall Sustainable MED co-financing is, however, the target, against which the co-financing should be measured.	
	21. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		
	22. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators?		
	23. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP	N.A.	
	Convention Secretariat	N.A.	
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendations at PIF	24. Is PIF clearance being recommended?	Yes, the PM recommends the PIF clearance into Work programme.	
	25. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	26. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		
Review Date	1 st review		
	2 nd review		
	3 rd review		

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	
Recommendation	5. Is PPG being recommended?	
Other comments		
Review Date	1 st review	
	2 nd review	
	3 rd review	

wb21049

C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf

8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM