



**REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL**  
**PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project**  
**THE GEF TRUST FUND**

**Submission Date: 11/15/2012**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 3809

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** 113794

**COUNTRY(IES):** Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Sudan, and Yemen

**PROJECT TITLE:** Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Strategic Ecosystem Management

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** World Bank, (select), (select)

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):** PERSGA - The Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden

**GEF FOCAL AREA(S):** International Waters

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** IW-SP1-Coastal Marine Fisheries, IW-SP2-Nutrient Reduction (see preparation guidelines section on exactly what to write)

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:**

Expected Calendar (mm/dd/yy)	
Milestones	Dates
Work Program (for FSPs only)	06/08/2010
Agency Approval date	10/26/2012
Implementation Start	
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	
Project Closing Date	

**A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK** (Expand table as necessary)

<b>Project Objective:</b> The Project Development Objective is to improve the management of marine resources in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden in selected MPAs building on resource protection, incentive systems for communities and the harmonization of the knowledge base of marine resources between PERSGA member countries.								
Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA <sup>2</sup>	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing <sup>1</sup>		Co-Financing <sup>1</sup>		Total (\$) c=a+ b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
1. Strengthening the principles of marine managed areas through stakeholder driven MPA implementation	TA	Member countries develop holistic, incentive based marine resources management system whereby local communities are empowered to balance resource use with sustainability  Provide stronger stewardship of adjacent marine resources through	1.1 Two MPA master plans updated with community input on agreed rights based system, adopted by authorities and implemented, including user based boundary demarcation, zoning schemes and monitoring.  1.2 At least 100 people trained in two pilot communities on incentive driven resource management, adjacent to two MPAs and seeking to enhance these as effective Marine Managed Areas with community-based stewardship;	750,000	14	4,470,000	86	5,220,000

		<p>rights based approach to MPA management.</p> <p>Coastal communities and MPA institutions have the technical capacity to actively protect marine resources and transition to Marine Managed Areas</p> <p>Strengthen PERSGA's regional MPA network</p>	<p>At least 30 institutional MPA staff trained and working with communities to implement MPA master plans</p> <p>1.3 At least 50 PERSGA member country staff attending 10 regional meetings/exchanges between MPA counterparts and MPAs of five PERSGA member countries; countries are seeking to apply lessons in additional MPAs</p> <p>1.4 Education and public awareness materials developed and distributed highlighting the success of rights- and community-based management of MMAs.</p>					
2. Strengthening coastal communities to use incentive based approaches to improve fisheries management and achieve other marine resource benefits	TA and Investment	<p>Net benefits increased for communities adjacent to MPAs.</p> <p>Mangement of fisheries and other living marine resources improved in two pilot areas.</p> <p>Pressure on marine resources reduced due to alternative income sources</p>	<p>2.1 Documented increase in incomes, employment or nutritional benefits for at least 15% of community members from increased abundance of functional groups and fish landings</p> <p>2.2 Institutional and rights based framework for fisheries developed in two pilot communities in tandem with EBM principles applied to living marine resources;</p> <p>2.3 At least 70% of fishermen and other user groups involved in monitoring, control and surveillance systems for fisheries;Baseline</p>	800,000	23.00%	2,720,000	77	3,520,000

			<p>of status of fisheries and socio-economic benefits from marine resources established. Spillover effects on fisheries from MPAs measured: (15% increase in the number of large &gt; 30cm groupers and in Sudan 20% increase in Trochus and Beche de mer in pilot area boundaries</p> <p>2.4 At least two sub-projects identified prepared and agreed by community for sustainable economic activities of marine resources and demonstration of small scale, low impact alternative livelihood activities compliant with environmental and social safeguards.</p>					
3. Regional Environmental and Socioeconomic Research and Monitoring Network supporting Ecosystem Based Management (EBM) and Community Benefits	STA	<p>Countries enabled to conduct policy dialogue based on comparable data of status of marine environment</p> <p>PERSGA strengthened in its role as regional integrator making data comparable and sharable through the strengthening of a regional network of MPAs.</p> <p>PERSGA member countries enabled to</p>	<p>3.1 At least 40 people in PERSGA countries trained and institutions actively conducting research and monitoring along the same parameters leading to revised and updated regional framework for effective biophysical, environmental and social and economic monitoring;</p> <p>3.2 Three regional results and data sharing meetings by all MPAs region-wide in order to effectively compare spatial and temporal progress. Updated PERSGA monitoring manual of 2004</p> <p>3.3 Integrated</p>	1,200,000	14	7,450,000	86	8,650,000

		identify needs for collaboration and to update Strategic Action Plan building on research and monitoring findings	database(s) are being rolled out in five PERSGA member countries that provide analytic support to member governments and also used to support PERSGA's State of the Marine Environment Reporting (SOMER)					
			3.4 Eight training workshops conducted for scientists, research students, MMA managers and community leaders in collaboration with international bodies such as IUCN, GCRMN, UNEP Regional Seas;					
			3.5 Timely and accurate reporting on the IW tracking tool; and participation in IW:Learn activities (participation in IWC, IWENs etc, Website consistent with IW:Learn guidance,); 1% of GEF funds, i.e. 30,000 USD were allocated for this activity					
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8. Project management				250,000	17	1,250,000	83	1500000
<b>Total Project Costs</b>				<b>A3,000,000</b>		<b>B15,890,000</b>		<b>18,890,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.

<sup>2</sup> TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

**B. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT** (expand the table line items as necessary)

<i>Name of Co-financier (source)</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>%*</i>
PERSGA	Exec. Agency	Grant	6,000,000	38
World Bank	Multilat. Agency	Hard-loan	9,890,000	62
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		

	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			B15,890,000	100%

\* Percentage of each co-financier's contribution at CEO endorsement to total co-financing.

### C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	<i>Project Preparation a</i>	<i>Project b</i>	<i>Total c = a + b</i>	<i>Agency Fee</i>	<i>For comparison: GEF and Co- financing at PIF</i>
GEF financing	100,000	A3,000,000	3,100,000	300,000	3,300,000
Co-financing	200,000	B15,890,000	16,090,000		35,000,000
<b>Total</b>	300,000	18,890,000	19,190,000	300,000	38,300,000

### D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)<sup>1</sup>

<i>GEF Agency</i>	<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Country Name/ Global</i>	<i>(in \$)</i>		
			<i>Project (a)</i>	<i>Agency Fee ( b )<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Total c=a+b</i>
World Bank	International W	1W: Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Sudan, and Yemen	3,000,000	300,000	3,300,000
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					

<sup>1</sup> No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

<sup>2</sup> Relates to the project and any previous project preparation funding that have been provided and for which no Agency fee has been requested from Trustee.

### E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF amount(\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	280	490,000	745,000	1,235,000
International consultants*	130	364,000	500,000	864,000
<b>Total</b>	410	854,000	1,245,000	2,099,000

\* Details to be provided in Annex C.

### F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

<i>Cost Items</i>	<i>Total Estimated person weeks/months</i>	<i>GEF amount (\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	142	175,000	500,000	675,000
International consultants*	7	20,000	180,000	200,000
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*			440,000	440,000
Travel*		55,000		55,000
Others**			130,000	130,000
<b>Total</b>	149	250,000	1,250,000	1,500,000

\* Details to be provided in Annex C. \*\* For others, it has to clearly specify what type of expenses here in a footnote.

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT?** yes  no

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your agency and to the GEF Trust Fund).

**H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:** The World Bank will monitor and evaluate the implementation of the project in accordance with established World Bank and GEF procedures. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) will be based on measurable performance indicators through verifiable points, which are elaborated in the context of the project's specific outputs. M&E activities have been budgeted for in the Project Management component.

1. Monitoring: The World Bank's Project Manager or designee will be responsible for monitoring the implementation progress. The World Bank will organize field monitoring and evaluation missions. During these missions, perspectives offered in meetings with country and project Focal Points and other stakeholders directly involved in the implementation of the project will be considered. In addition to monitoring the progress in implementing the project, these missions will also assist in acquainting concerned stakeholders with the reporting procedures.

Monitoring: Day-to-day monitoring of the project's implementation progress will be the responsibility of the PCU based on the project's work plan and its indicators. The PCU will be responsible for producing Quarterly Project Technical and Financial Reports. These reports, as required by the World Bank/GEF, constitute an important reflection of the progress of the project when M&E deskwork is performed. The PCU will seek input from the National Coordinators on day to day progress on the ground and travel to support the project and to supervise as required.

Project performance indicators with their means of verification will be approved at the initial Inception Workshop to launch the project, and which will also be the first meeting of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU). The inception workshop will be attended by the World Bank, PERSGA, relevant government representatives and co-financing partners. Representatives of identified stakeholders will be invited. During this workshop, stakeholders will be briefed on the M&E measures.

A detailed schedule of the project review mechanisms will be developed by project management, in consultation with project partners and incorporated in the Inception Workshop Report. This will include project reporting requirements, relevant advisory and/or coordination mechanisms and project related M&E activities.

After the Inception Workshop, the PCU will present, and PERSGA's annual Focal Point meeting will approve of, a project Inception Report that will include a detailed work plan for year one; a detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation; and detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms. Throughout the implementation of the project these issues will be addressed in the annual PERSGA Focal Point meeting amongst other things.

2. Evaluation: All elements of the project will be subject to evaluation measures of the World Bank. This will include the Project Performance and Evaluation Reports (PPER) and external evaluations. There will be a minimum of two external evaluation/review missions; one at the middle of the project and one at the end of the project.

The mid-term project review will focus on lessons learned from the on-going project experience, including lessons about the project design, implementation and overall management. The final report prior to the end of the project will focus on similar issues but will give strong emphasis to the potential project impacts beyond the initial objectives, checking sustainability of the results. Recommendations for follow-up activities will be included in both reports.

Project evaluation will be based on the Quarterly Project Technical and Financial Reports, technical reports of international experts and workshop reports, in addition to external review reports. The World Bank will carry out review and monitoring missions as it deems suitable to safeguard the project's adherence to the work plan and the use of funds. These evaluations will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outputs and will identify course correction if needed.

3. Audit: The project is subject to financial audits as required in accordance with the World Bank/GEF rules and regulations.

Evaluation activity	GEF Funding	Co-financing
Independent consultant for Mid Term Review	10,000	
Independent Consultant for Terminal Evaluation	15,000	
Day to day monitoring country level		50,000 (10 person days/months in five countries of NCs)
Day to day monitoring and quarterly reporting PERSGA		50,000 (5 person days/month in PERSGA)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:** In addition to the following questions, please ensure that the project design incorporates key GEF operational principles, including sustainability of global environmental benefits, institutional continuity and replicability, keeping in mind that these principles will be monitored rigorously in the annual Project Implementation Review and other Review stages.

**A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:** **THE ISSUE:** Marine resources of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden have provided prosperity for the region for many centuries by providing food, trade and livelihoods. However, in recent years, these resources are facing many threats, including over-exploitation of species, destruction of spawning, nursery and feeding grounds, pollution, improper resource management, and weak governance of marine resources. Coastal cities around the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden have experienced a rapid boom in investment. Tourism and industrial center development (with desalination water projects, free zones, and other infrastructure) have accelerated the already rapid growth and development rates. Several coastal cities that were mere outposts in the 1950s, have shown phenomenal growth rates of inhabitants and tourists during the last fifty years. Industrial and commercial activities have also been increasing, with development of oil, marina, mineral export and other industrial facilities. The categories of human activities that are of particular environmental concern with regard to maintaining healthy habitats of mangroves and coral reefs include tourism, boat anchoring, excessive sport and commercial fishing, shipping of oil (and other hazardous materials), oil production, dumping of debris and litter, wastewater disposal, marine aquaculture and coastal industrial development. Assessing the net benefits versus risks of such human activities to social and economic well being remains a critical, yet poorly understood dimension of coastal communities within the Region and management plans have not sufficiently built on incentives of local stakeholders to steward the existing resources.

**THE APPROACH:** Rights and ecosystem-based management (EBM) can be an important organizing principle to existing fisheries and habitat management schemes, especially protected areas. Where Integrated Coastal Management (ICZM) collectively considers all existing stakeholder activities and sectoral interests, EBM further considers the functioning and services provided by whole ecosystems, including humans and the environment, rather than managing environmental resources independently, or in isolation, as it is often done with fisheries for example. A comprehensive ecosystem-based management approach (i.e. for livelihood activities and MPAs) requires managers to consider broad ecological processes and human influences and interactions. The approach also recognizes that humans are an essential component of the ecosystem in which use of the marine environment occurs, and so it focuses on the interactions between coastal and marine ecosystems, living marine resources and

people, represented as user groups. The rights based EBM approach supports incentives for user groups through rights and responsibilities in stewarding the marine resources. This is in contrast to current fishery management practices within the Region that focus largely on individual species and laws to protect them, and do not manage for the broader habitat and marine system that supports the life histories and ranges of critical interactions between species and ecological processes and that collectively support viable populations. At the same time, this more holistic approach requires active monitoring and adaptive management of new information to better inform managing resources and the human activities affecting them. Coordination with Regional and global monitoring initiatives, such as the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network through the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI), will help scientific and management communities with useful information and resource decisions based on rigorous historical data, and to promote standardized approaches for monitoring in the region.

**THE PROJECT:** The project will build on the work done in phase I by emphasizing the role of Marine Managed Areas (MMAs). These are expanded marine spatial areas that include both marine resource protection and a gradient of sustainable-to-extractive uses. Marine zoning plays a crucial role in this process. The goal of this phase II project is to identify selected MPAs, currently with limited management capacity and adjacent to selected coastal communities, that can be strengthened through community-based stewardship while also supporting an ecosystem based approach to fisheries and living resources management and conservation. Through pilot and demonstration projects, application of a rights based approach and effective ecosystem and socioeconomic research and monitoring, the integration of sustainable use and stewardship will exemplify the role that MMAs can play for the Region by sustaining benefits while balancing conservation objectives. Adjacent to MPAs, communities are engaging in livelihood and commercial activities, including fisheries and other uses. The goal is to actively involve communities in the creation and management of MMAs and through the application of a rights based approach. This will first be piloted in participating MPAs along with various supporting activities, such as alternative livelihoods and income generation, establishment of community-based fisheries organizations, stakeholder participation, training and inter-regional exchanges, knowledge sharing and learning, and conflict resolution. Ecosystem Based Management will be introduced to all participating PERSGA member countries through the harmonization of their research and monitoring of marine resources as well as the supporting socio-economic system and uses of the resources. Establishing common parameters for research and monitoring will strengthen the countries as well as PERSGA to play its role of enabling knowledge exchange and as an integrator of regional policies and decision making that is based on a common and comparable fact base. Therefore, component 3 of the project is the major enabler of regional cooperation that GEF funding can achieve through the regional entity for the conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden.

**THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT OBJECTIVE:** The global environmental objective (GEO) is the protection of vital marine habitats and fish stocks in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (RSGA) Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) to the benefit of current and future generations. The project activities are closely aligned with the strategic priorities for the GEF-4 International Waters focal area. Specifically, the project will support IW Strategic Objectives 1 and 2, which aim at fostering international cooperation on priority transboundary concerns and catalyzing action to address water concerns. The project will execute activities to improve the management and effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas on a national and regional scale, and assess and respond to issues such as overexploitation of fish stocks, monitoring and sustainable management. These objectives are consistent with SP1 (Restoring and Sustaining Coastal and Marine Fish Stocks and Associated Biological Diversity) and SP2 (Reducing Nutrient Over-Enrichment and Oxygen Depletion from Land-Based Pollution of Coastal Waters in LMEs).

**B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL AND/OR REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:**

Improving the governance and management of the marine environment of the RSGA is a stated priority of the countries, as manifested in the regional Strategic Action Plan and in the universal support (including annual member contributions) for the efforts of PERSGA in organizing resources to implement the Plan. Phase I of the Regional Project for the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) for the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden was aimed at protecting coastal and marine environments in the Region through SAP implementation. Wide support for Phase 2 is a testament to the alignment of project objectives with national and regional priorities and supports the institutional mandate of PERSGA. The project responds to the countries' key concerns to urgently initiate on-the-ground activities in order to reverse the growing threats to the marine resources and improve their sound management as well as enhance transboundary collaboration and heighten public awareness. This collaborative approach is actively supported by the countries since the benefits will only accrue if there is shared vision for the protection and management of the Red Sea and coordinated joint action.



**C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:**

The project activities are closely aligned with the strategic priorities for the GEF-4 International Waters focal area. Specifically, the project will support IW Strategic Objectives 1 and 2, which aim at fostering international cooperation on priority transboundary concerns and catalyzing action to address water concerns. The project will execute activities to improve the management and effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas on a national and regional scale, and assess and respond to issues such as overexploitation of fish stocks, monitoring and sustainable management. It will support regional integration through bringing countries and their agencies together on research as well as on the implementation of novel approaches in the region such as community stewardship of MPAs and rights based approaches. These inter-country exchanges and harmonization of approaches will also enhance the role of the regional entity for the conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden. These objectives are consistent with SP1 (Restoring and Sustaining Coastal and Marine Fish Stocks and Associated Biological Diversity) and SP2 (Reducing Nutrient Over-Enrichment and Oxygen Depletion from Land-Based Pollution of Coastal Waters in LMEs).

**D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES.** The suggested financing support is a grant for the benefit of achieving regional cooperation, and coordination in the management of the shared resource of the Red Sea littoral countries.

**E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:** The GEF project complements other ongoing investments financed by national governments, the private sector, local communities and other donors. The GEF sources have been allocated to fill the gap at the regional level, supporting the countries in the cooperation and coordination of the management of the shared resource, reflected in the harmonization of monitoring of the resources and regional exchange on the knowledge base, experiences in EBM to fisheries and MPA management. The local pilots for community driven MPA functionality, EBM to fisheries and other alternative livelihood projects were identified based on an analysis of ongoing projects in the beneficiary countries aiming at filling the gap between ongoing projects such as UNIDO, UNDP and World Bank financed projects. Throughout the RSGA region, these investments aim to protect valuable marine resources and coastal livelihoods. However, with additional technical and financial capacity from GEF financing, these objectives will be enhanced to achieve higher order environmental benefits at a global scale through reinforcing regional level cooperation.

**F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH [INCREMENTAL REASONING](#) :** The total expenditures under the baseline scenario are estimated to be US\$ 15.89 million, while the total expenditures under the GEF alternative are estimated to be US\$18.89 million. The incremental costs under the GEF alternative are therefore estimated to be US\$3.0 million. GEF funding is requested to finance the incremental costs of US\$3.0 million.

Baseline Scenario: Under the baseline scenario, it is expected that the RSGA countries would nonetheless pursue a program to meet selected national development objectives in coastal and marine areas as MPAs are recognized as the principle tool for conservation management throughout the region. This would include institutional and financial support to meet the needs and obligations of established MPAs both through national programs and through membership in PERSGA. Support from other donors is also visible, such as UNIDO investments in fish landing and processing sites in Sudan and UNDP projects to strengthen financing and management in protected areas in Egypt and Djibouti, or the Yemen fisheries project by the World Bank, focusing on fisheries research, monitoring as well as cooperative development, among other initiatives. However, limited capacity among implementing agencies could potentially produce isolated and inadequate results and reduce the effect of intended development impacts. Furthermore, on-going interventions by national governments, local communities and other donors do not adequately address issues of regional concern, and thus are not able to tap into or contribute to a shared knowledge pool with neighboring countries. GEF funds will support harmonization among different national efforts, supporting countries and communities without other donor support of on ground activities and regional tools for knowledge exchange on innovative approaches in the region such as rights based and community driven MPA management. The research and monitoring work proposed will enable PERSGA and the member countries to track progress in a harmonized and comparable manner. Thus, implementation of the baseline scenario in the absence of GEF assistance would result in limited progress towards achieving a more holistic, ecosystem-based management approach whereby local communities can be empowered to balance resource use with sustainability and help provide stronger stewardship of the marine environment. In addition, little regional collaboration and knowledge sharing would be realized, and the opportunity to catalyze a regional monitoring network to better inform scientists

and decision-makers of the state of the larger marine ecosystem in RSGA would be foregone. Implementation of the baseline scenario would result in: (i) Long-term planning and investment in the protection and conservation of marine environment through support to established MPAs; (ii) Capacity building and knowledge sharing primarily limited to national environmental issues and stakeholders and lack of data comparability; (iii) Small-scale investments in community projects and basic needs; (iv) Outreach to and coordination of donor assistance to leverage technical and financial support; (v) Continued funding and upgrading of established monitoring networks and equipment, and; (vi) Participation in on-going PERSGA activities with partner countries. Total expenditures under the baseline scenario are estimated at US\$6.0 million.

Under the GEF alternative scenario, the RSGA countries will be able to build on current development objectives and enhance the management and conservation of marine protected areas (a) by piloting the introduction of rights and ecosystem-based approaches in select communities, (b) by targeting low-cost investments to locally identified needs on the ground as a means to diversify incomes, engage communities as stewards of the environment and reduce pressure on the marine resources, and (c) by moving towards standardized monitoring approaches between the participating countries, making data comparable and sharable through the strengthening of a regional network of MPAs and their research and data collection. Without the grant from the GEF, the following specific outcomes will not be possible within the project time frame. Implementation of the GEF alternative scenario would result in: (i) Improved functionality of MPAs through the application of MMA principles, including ecosystem-based management of marine resources with sustainable community stewardship; (ii) Improved awareness of holistic approaches to managing the marine environment among a broad set of stakeholders, including the community, decision-makers, local and regional scientists; (iii) Empowerment of local communities to participate in the daily management of marine resources; (iv) Support to development of livelihood alternatives to relieve pressure on fragile natural assets; (v) A broadened focus on improving marine ecosystem research and monitoring capacity in RSGA with support to the expansion of monitoring beyond ecological aspects to include socio-economic data in order to enable an EBM approach across the region, and; (vi) Sharing of lessons learned across countries in the RSGA. Total expenditures under the GEF alternative scenario are estimated at US\$9.0 million.

**INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES:** Implementation and execution of the project might be confronted with some risks and barriers. But these have been considered and mitigation measures have been proposed. Some of the key risks, barriers and corresponding mitigation measures are:

1. Inadequate cohesiveness of the project partner countries and their willingness to collaborate in the implementation of the project and jointly overcome political differences and pressures to focus on achieving results. Mitigation: The project will be executed by PERSGA and will involve its member states that have shown outstanding support and effective collaboration in marine environmental issues since and even before the signing of Jeddah Convention.
2. Inadequate commitment of funds from the project counterparts to ensure successful execution of the project activities. Mitigation: Counterpart funds for execution of the project will be provided mainly by PERSGA member countries who have expressed their support to the project through their individual support letters and have confirmed their commitment to providing the counter fund regularly by the Focal Points in a project finalization workshop carried out in at PERSGA Headquarters in Jeddah just before submission of the PIF and a second just before submission for CEO endorsement.
3. Inadequate ability to maintain momentum, develop the authority to convince stakeholders to participate and successfully achieve the program objectives. Mitigation: PERSGA has shown proven success over the last four years in maintaining momentum in its projects and executed successfully a number of on ground activities in all project partner countries. Useful lessons have been learnt from the shortcomings of the first Red Sea project and smoother execution of the project is supported by the national teams in all subject areas that have been prepared in the first project.
4. Inadequate capacity to manage and execute the project. Mitigation: This risk is considered low, since PERSGA has developed a strong core team which has developed solid experience. PERSGA is also responsible towards its partner countries and international organizations that it deal with to apply stringent standards in selecting its employees. The project includes an incremental component of training and technical support to ensure that this capacity is consolidated and transferred to the country actors. Furthermore with the World Bank being the sole Implementing Agency of the coordination between the implementing and the executing agencies will be direct and effective and will allow the World Bank to apply international quality standards on performance. Institutional set-up has been assessed during missions and discussed with PERSGA focal points.
5. Inadequate ability to convince regional stakeholders and beneficiaries to share the project goals and cooperate in the project activities. Mitigation: The project aims at building early awareness and demonstrating the benefits of

environmental controls and management in order to develop strong support for a common vision and shared responsibility. Accordingly, this risk is considered low, since commitment is already high, as demonstrated by the success of PERSGA in already securing up to US \$6.0m of the project counterpart funding. There is also increasing interest of the private sector in the region more actively involved in environmental conservation activities.

6. Unsustainable results. Mitigation: This phase of project operations will specifically focus on building ownership and capacity beyond the existing structure of the international PERSGA organization and transfer capacity into country-owned results (through their individual National Action Plans) which will ensure continuity of impact beyond the life of the project, consolidate the broader project outcomes and develop the regulations and legislation to enforce them. The project will target establishing a PERSGA Business Partnership that will guarantee sustainable funding for environmental activities.

7. A recent Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis conducted by the Bank on the impacts of climate change in the southern Red Sea and Gulf of Aden concluded that the projected changes in salinity, sea surface temperature, sea level rise, and coral bleaching events are not significant enough to affect the functioning of the marine environment. In addition, the three socio-economic themes identified as the most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change are agriculture, pastoralism and water management - impacts directly affecting livelihoods, food security and poverty. Vulnerability of the fisheries sector is localized along the coast depending on the level of effort. In these instances, adaptation measures and capacity building of local communities and stakeholders are being developed as part of the on-going activity that supports the project objectives.

**G. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:** The selected project design follows a qualitative cost-effective approach to justify the best use of the GEF funds for achieving the stated global environmental benefits. Focusing the external support to one central agency (PERSGA) will achieve high transaction efficiencies for the project and promote a harmonized regional approach to the implementation of the project activities. Additional cost-effectiveness benefits will result from the centralized management of information exchange, regional dialogue and standards and leverage much greater benefits for the investment. Thus, the GEF funding will support activities in individual countries but will be managed by PERSGA which has already established the protocols and procedures to administer the financing, management and oversight roles for the project. PERSGA is also in the best position to leverage the GEF funds by seeking incremental co-financing in support of specific country activities.

### **PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT**

**A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:** The institutional and implementation arrangements will be based on an adapted and streamlined set-up from Phase I of the GEF project with The Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA) as the executing agency and counterpart for the project. The roles and responsibilities of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), the National Steering Committees (NSC), and the National Coordinators (NCs), are described below, and will be further detailed in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM) to be prepared by PERSGA. The World Bank, as the implementing agency, will carry out supervision of the Project. The Project has been conceived and prepared in collaboration with PERSGA and the national counterparts as Phase II.

**B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:** PERSGA is well positioned to execute the project for a number of reasons: (i) its mandate is to address environmental issues in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden basin, thus entirely aligned with the Project; (ii) it led the implementation of two components of the first GEF program aimed reducing the navigation risks in the Red Sea and introducing integrated coastal zone management at a total cost of about USD 6.0 million); (iii) it has internationally recognized capacity to carry out technical and economic analysis on marine and environmental issues and policy discussions; (iv) it has experience working with other development agencies to conduct similar work (i.e. AFD, EIB, EU); (v) it is staffed with qualified personnel familiar with the previous project, incl. a Project Manager, Financial Officer, Procurement Specialist, and other technical specialists; and (vi) it has a network of focal points in each of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden littoral countries.

**THE INSTITUTIONAL AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS WILL BE BASED ON AN ADAPTED AND STREAMLINED SET-UP FROM PHASE I OF THE GEF PROJECT WITH PERSGA AS THE EXECUTING AGENCY AND COUNTERPART FOR THE PROJECT. THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PROJECT COORDINATION UNIT (PCU), THE NATIONAL STEERING COMMITTEES (NSC), AND THE NATIONAL COORDINATORS (NCs) ARE DESCRIBED BELOW, AND WILL BE FURTHER DETAILED IN THE PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION MANUAL (PIM) TO BE PREPARED BY PERSGA. PERSGA WILL MANAGE THE FUNDS FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE MEMBER COUNTRIES FOR ALL COMPONENTS. THE PROJECT HAS BEEN CONCEIVED AND PREPARED IN COLLABORATION WITH PERSGA AND THE NATIONAL COUNTERPARTS AS PHASE II.**

Project Coordination Unit (PCU) - The PCU will be housed in PERSGA located in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia headed by the Project's Manager. It will be responsible for the management of day-to-day activities and the timely and verifiable attainment of project objectives. In the PIM PERSGA staff will ensure the following PCU roles: Project manager, components coordinators, procurement specialist, financial management specialist, Monitoring and Evaluation specialist, and communication specialist. If needed, consultants will be hired to carry out specific tasks. PERSGA will communicate to the World Bank the list of staff who will be part of the PCU, their expertise, their role within the PCU, and the percentage of their time allocated to the Project. During implementation, PERSGA will promptly communicate to the World Bank through the Project manager for update any change in the composition of the PCU. The PCU will inform the regional annual PERSGA Focal Point meeting on project progress and receive advice from the annual meeting.

National Steering Committees (NSC) – NSC will be formed in each participating country as collaborating partners to the PCU during project implementation. In every country the PERSGA focal point will assign a National Coordinator responsible for initially establishing the NSC with representation of project stakeholders such as community leaders, local administrations, NGOs and from the scientific community. The PCU will confirm NSC composition to ensure proper representation of all community and stakeholder groups. The NSC, chaired by the National Coordinator, will have three primary objectives to be further elaborated in the PIM: (i) to advise on the specific activities to be carried out under the Project, taking into account priorities from various stakeholders; (ii) to meet regularly to review project progress on the ground; and (iii) to communicate progress and key issues to the PCU and the national PERSGA Focal Point. The National Coordinator would be a public official, whose time could be considered part of the national in-kind contribution.

National Coordinators (NC) - This should be a senior specialist with experience in project implementation and actively engaged in the project area to support the PCU and chair the NSC and to follow-up on project activities in the country. As such, the National Coordinator will facilitate the activities on the local level, coordinate national stakeholders and activities. The NC would also be a public official whose time could be considered part of the national in kind contribution. Activities on the ground will be implemented through instruments of subcontracts between PERSGA and e.g. consulting firms, NGOs, scientific research centers, etc. which have substantive experience in rights based EBM approaches and community organization for community driven design of livelihood activities. PERSGA project coordinators will ensure quality and enable the generation of knowledge collation and exchange between participating countries from the experiences on the ground. The national coordinator will send proposals per recommendation of the NSCs for sub-projects as described below to the PCU based on criteria described in annex two and detailed in the PIM for PCU review and agreement to proceed with implementation.

Project Implementation Manual (PIM) - The Project would be implemented according to detailed procedures defined in the PIM, to be prepared by PERSGA. The PIM, satisfactory to the World Bank, will be adopted by PERSGA. The PIM will remain a living document throughout Project implementation.

#### **PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:**

The project remains closely aligned with the objective of the original PIF, albeit the PDO now reflects the more nuanced approach of ecosystem based management to be implemented in coastal communities with a goal to sustain threatened marine resources and local livelihoods. The global environment objective remains the same.

Adjustments to project design were made based on three factors: a) reflecting the reality on the ground and respond to the pressures on the marine ecosystem that can be addressed in an MPA approach with community involvement; b) taking into consideration other ongoing activities and avoiding duplication of efforts to target funds on high value add activities; and c) leveraging the convening power of PERSGA and GEF funding to have high impact on the regional level through cooperation and enabling strengthened coordination among member countries.

Therefore, the focus on fisheries has been broadened to reflect the realities on the ground and respond to pressures on marine resources in the selected countries and communities. As described under Part II: A, the state of the marine environment in the RSGA is challenged on a number of different fronts, calling for a more holistic and integrated approach to managing human activities while protecting the future of the natural resources base. Initial stakeholder consultations with both ministry and community officials revealed that in many cases fishery is not the only, or even the main, concern for sustainable development.

As a result, the project components have been adjusted to reflect this:

**Component I:** While policies and laws for fisheries exist in the countries, the concrete application of policies on the ground is the major challenge. This is reflected in an approach supporting governance through a bottom-up approach- community stewardship, strengthening and making MPAs functional that were designated during SAP I

**Component II:** Sustainability of fisheries habitats will be achieved through compliance with zoning schemes of MMAs which are strong tools for stress reduction on fisheries. Incentive based systems to enforce compliance of user groups will be piloted through a rights based approach. In addition, alternative livelihood approaches will further relieve pressure on the resource base.


The number of pilot sites has been reduced to reflect on-going activities by other donors in PERSGA member countries, including Jordan and Djibouti. These countries currently have projects under implementation and preparation, that support functionality of MPAs, fisheries management or alternative livelihood approaches in coastal communities. The approaches in these countries are not identical as the pilots to be financed from the GEF funds, as they are not building a rights based approach, are not necessarily community driven, lack the alternative livelihoods aspects or are not addressing all users of the marine resources. The first pilot site under this project was chosen in Sudan, where there is highest value add of the activities and no danger of overburdening local institutions. The project aims to lay the ground work and possibly some investments for development of activities, however there is a strong desire for some concrete activities from the communities and PERSGA as a follow up to SAP 1. Livelihood investments on the ground be initiated in Sudan and a second pilot identified and prepared in year one of implementation to expand the experience in other member countries, building on their work done and applying new approaches put forward by this project. The project prepared the selected site in Sudan with all due diligence required in consultation and other safeguards work. The same will be done in a second site to be selected, that will replace the initially second site identified for Egypt.

During the last Focal Point endorsement meeting at PERSGA on September 11, 2012, Egypt announced that due to unforeseen events, they were not able to advance a pilot at this stage, however, the Egyptian CEO of EEAA and Focal Point have repeatedly expressed strong interest to PERSGA in staying engaged in the regional activities of the project. This will not change the approach of the project. During the PERSGA/GEF focal point meeting, countries have expressed interest in conducting further demos in their countries, with all countries wanting to participate in regional exchanges on the experiences gathered from the demos. Several countries have interest in hosting the second pilot and an appropriate site will be identified and start implementation in the first year of the project.

Given that the approach of community engagement in the Management of MPAs and transitioning to MMAs based on rights based approaches is novel in the region, the local components include regional exchanges on the experiences gathered in Sudan and a second site, as well as sharing among countries of best practices in MPA management given the different levels of development and ongoing activities. Countries may face similar challenges as development progresses and can avoid negative impacts by sharing experiences before developments occur (such as mass tourism infrastructure developments and their impacts). This is also enabled through harmonized research and monitoring, which allows for comparability of data. This is currently not possible due to lack of common parameters. Therefore, there is strong emphasis on enabling PERSGA to play a convening role based on common research and monitoring of marine resources. Monitoring in component three is not for project activities, but rather country systems for data on ecologic and socio-economic systems and their interaction. A shared knowledge base will enable PERSGA to support country dialogue, knowledge exchange and ultimately decision making among countries. The requested GEF funding amount is kept at USD 3 million and PERSGA co-financing remains at USD 6 million. Project co-financing has been adjusted to only reflect those amounts and investments of the Yemen fisheries project, that are exactly in line with the adjusted project components, including fisheries research, and hardware for monitoring, improved fisheries infrastructure, strengthening of fisheries user groups, and income generating activities for communities. The aligned activities amount to close to USD 10 million vs. the full project amount of USD 25 million in the PIF.

**PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Karin Shepardson, World Bank			Sophie Herrmann (TTL) Song Li (MNA GEF focal point)	(202) 473-4745  (202)473-3488	sherrmann@worldbank.org  sli@worldbank.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
<p>Global Environmental Objective: The protection of vital marine habitats and fish stocks in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Large Marine Ecosystem to benefit current and future generations.</p>					
<p><b>Project Development Objective:</b> The Project Development Objective is to improve the management of marine resources in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden in selected MPAs building on resource protection, incentive systems for communities and the harmonization of the knowledge base of marine resources between PERSGA member countries.</p>	<p>(i) Pilot Marine Protected Areas identified under phase I have updated, incentive based management plans implemented with community involvement.</p> <p>(ii) Marine environmental monitoring activities in PERSGA member states integrated and operational</p> <p>(iii) Countries seeking to apply lessons from documented inter-regional exchanges of community stakeholders, technical skills, training and knowledge to address living marine resource stewardship, protection and sustainable use</p>	<p>The effective management of MPAs remains limited throughout the RSGA Region, based on an inventory of current capacity; management plans of most MPAs are not well implemented and without community stakeholders input; Communities lack incentives for conservation; boundaries remain unmarked and regulations often not observed or are violated. Little or no compliance with no-fishing regulations; monitoring systems are inconsistent, imprecise or under-resourced. A lack of or a documented (e.g. social surveys) disconnect between local communities and marine resource</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designated MMAs are appropriately zoned and under protection</li> <li>• Establish incentive systems through rights and responsibilities in each of the pilot communities identified for PERSGA member countries</li> <li>• Marine environmental monitoring activities operational</li> <li>• Inter-regional exchanges of community stakeholders and specialists achieved and lessons shared and documented</li> <li>• PERSGA stature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surveys on employment and income of community members relying on marine resources</li> <li>• Accurate sectoral statistics (catches, effort, employment).</li> <li>• Poverty alleviation statistics.</li> <li>• National food security statistics.</li> <li>• Management plans updated/ put in place with community input</li> <li>• Sufficiently precise environmental monitoring programs.</li> <li>• Reporting on compliance/enforcement of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal areas remain healthy and sustainably managed.</li> <li>• Fisheries sector remains a major productive economic sector.</li> <li>• Policy and adequate &amp; sustained national financial support.</li> <li>• Regional political stability.</li> </ul>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
		stewardship. Lack of accurate data on the distribution of marine resource benefits; fisheries, and monitoring of marine resources. Several fisheries are over-exploited leading to low levels of income generated from marine resources.	as regional leader and provider of actionable information enhanced, in concert with national agency staff and specialists.	MPAs/MMAs and zoned boundaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented outcomes following Workshop knowledge exchange on biophysical and social and economic monitoring.</li> </ul>	
<b>Project Component 1:</b> Strengthening the principles of marine managed areas through stakeholder driven MPA implementation					
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Member countries develop holistic, ecosystem-based incentive system whereby local communities are empowered to balance resource use with sustainability. Provide stronger stewardship of adjacent marine resources through rights-based approach to MPA management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two MPA master plans updated with community input on agreed rights-based system, adapted by authorities and implemented, including user-based boundary demarcation, zoning schemes and monitoring.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak or no community activity, organizing or engagement</li> <li>Little-to-no relationship with public or private interests.</li> <li>Limited interaction with public officials or agency staff charged with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least two examples of a community-based or co-management initiative begun and sustained.</li> <li>Updated management plans with community input including documentation of rights and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated MPA management plans.</li> <li>M&amp;E reports.</li> <li>Newly adopted or revised marine management plans.</li> <li>Legal/official registration of a cooperative or local enterprise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National governments allow for legal creation of community organizations (e.g., fishing cooperatives).</li> <li>Communities are interested in participating in rights and</li> </ul>



Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
		resource protection.	responsibilities.	demonstrating co-management within a marine managed area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local and national media reports.</li> <li>• Monitoring data documenting MMA/MPA spill-over or other environmental status or trends.</li> <li>• Monitoring report on MPA management plan implementation.</li> </ul>	responsibilities to user groups.
<b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Coastal communities and MPA institutions have the technical capacity to actively protect marine resources and transition to Marine Managed Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 100 people trained in communities in Egypt and Sudan on incentive-driven resource management, adjacent to two MPAs and seeking to enhance these as effective Marine Managed Areas with community-based stewardship</li> <li>• At least 30 institutional MPA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No zoning scheme; poor acknowledgment of MPA boundaries or continued over-exploitation by users, or deliberate violation of regulations; no community stewardship of marine resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MMAs designated and zoned; local community members active in protecting well-defined boundaries, and contacting authorities when violations observed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring reports</li> <li>• PERSGA State of the Marine Environment Reporting (SOMER)</li> <li>• Updated MPA management plans</li> <li>• Records of data transfer/sharing</li> <li>• Increase in documented corrections or citations for use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political will to support MMA designations</li> <li>• Ownership by and willingness of community members to be vigilant with protecting MMA zones</li> </ul>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	<p>staff trained and working with communities to implement MPAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 50 PERSGA member country staff trained in incentive based management and preparing to replicate incentive based management in MPAs in their countries</li> </ul>			<p>violations within MMA boundaries</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 1.3:</b> Strengthen PERSGA’s regional MPA network</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A total of at least 200 attended ten events from five PERSGA member countries in regional meetings/exchanges between MPA counterparts and MPAs of five PERSGA member countries.</li> <li>• Lessons learned were documented lessons (both successes and challenges) and shared with other communities’ authorities in the same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient country-to-country exchanges of counterpart agency staff taking place within the region to discuss mutual issues of concern or share lessons and experiences.</li> <li>• Limited interaction only occurs during events that PERSGA organizes, often only in Jeddah.</li> <li>• Communication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community stakeholders aware of best practices and development pitfalls from other MPA examples</li> <li>• Managers of Marine Protected Areas use lessons learned from shared practices and discuss challenges.</li> <li>• Routine communication between state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting records depicting examples of experience-transfer from one MPA to another.</li> <li>• Back-to-office reports of PERSGA Lead Specialists.</li> <li>• Internal reports that document communication/exchange</li> <li>• Local or national media reports/articles</li> <li>• Publications such</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings are justified and based on actual technical assistance needs and exchanges of lessons or know-how for specific management actions or tasks.</li> <li>• Countries agree to expedite visa requests promptly so that exchange travel is not impeded.</li> </ul>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	<p>country and in PERSGA member countries; countries seek to apply piloted principles in their MPAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education and public awareness materials developed and distributed in universities, secondary schools, MPA visitor centers and recreational facilities in vicinity of pilot sites in pilot countries and other member countries highlighting the success of rights- and community-based management of MMAs.</li> </ul>	<p>and education programs and materials focused on EBM and rights based approaches is currently not sufficiently available for PERSGA stakeholders</p>	<p>agency counterpart staff in Sudan, Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Yemen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raised awareness of rights based approaches in participating countries through communication of progress to the appropriate audience</li> </ul>	<p>as posters, brochures, websites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local or national media reports/articles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PERSGA Board member and high-level government willingness to promote the project, its demonstration sites and rights based principles to elevate their importance to community development.</li> <li>• Interest in/ demand for educational materials by institutions and communities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Project Component 2:</b> Strengthening coastal communities to use incentive based approaches to improve fisheries management and achieve other marine resource benefits</p>					

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Net benefits increased for communities adjacent to MPAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented increase in income, employment or nutritional benefits for at least 15% of community members from fish landings and alternative livelihoods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Catch is decreasing and incomes are low in project communities; lack of alternative livelihood sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fish stocks recover due to spawning areas under protection</li> <li>Community members engage in sustainable livelihoods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment and income statistics</li> <li>Measured increase in fish abundance</li> <li>Reports on compliance with protection plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communities comply with management plans and monitoring of catch data</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 2.2:</b> Management of fisheries and other living marine resources improved in two pilot areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutional and rights based framework established and distributed among stakeholders for fisheries developed in two pilot communities in tandem with EBM principles applied to living marine resources</li> <li>At least 70% of fishermen and other user groups involved in monitoring, control and surveillance activities for fisheries</li> <li>Spawning sites for grouper (i.e. nagil (<i>Plectropomus</i> sp.)),</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No EBM for fisheries is currently underway in PERSGA member countries.</li> <li>National policies vary significantly within the RSGA and many are not compliant with the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF).</li> <li>Community members and user groups do not have an integrated view of current uses and benefits from marine resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate enabling policies and/or legislation to allow for community-based organizations application of ecosystem-based principles and plans</li> <li>Community self-imposed rights based system where appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formation of community-based organizations that focus on fisheries and alternative livelihoods to augment income generation while reducing impacts on fish stocks.</li> <li>Framework documents for community monitoring</li> <li>Baseline reports on fisheries statistics developed by the communities/ lead specialists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Governments and communities understand benefits of a rights based approach and embrace it as a new policy direction.</li> <li>National governments allow for legal creation of community organizations (e.g., fishing cooperatives).</li> </ul>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	<p>snapper (<i>Lutjanis</i> spp.) and other commercially relevant species identified and protected in the pilot MPA master plans by the project mid-term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spillover effects on fisheries from MPAs documented (e.g. % increase in fish density both inside and outside MMA).</li> <li>• Any documented increase in percent coral cover within protected boundaries of pilot sites, but no more than 15% reduction from baseline established at project start (acceptable level of variability).</li> <li>• Increase or no more than 10% reduction in mangrove area for pilot sites.</li> <li>• Increase or no more</li> </ul>				

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	<p>than 10% reduction in sea turtle nesting sites with pilot area boundaries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15% increase in the number of large (i.e. &gt;30 cm) groupers ( Serranidae – i.e. <i>Plectromopus</i>) in pilot area boundaries by the end of the project period based on a baseline assessment at project start.</li> <li>• 20% increase in <i>Trochus</i> and Beche-de-mer (Holothuridae) populations within Sudan pilot area boundaries by the end of the project period based on a baseline assessment at project start.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Outcome 2.3:</b> Pressure on marine resources reduced due to alternative income sources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least two sub-projects identified, prepared and agreed by community for sustainable economic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative livelihoods schemes are either nascent or non-existent with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one alternative livelihood program established and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial reports.</li> <li>• Sales reports.</li> <li>• Fisheries catch statistics.</li> <li>• Sub-project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governments accept and support the benefits of alternative</li> </ul>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	activities tied to marine resources and demonstration of small scale, low impact alternative livelihood activities compliant with environmental and social safeguards.	selected pilot-area communities.	sustained in each of the pilot communities by the end of the project.	proposals with EMPs/EIAs were required.	livelihood initiatives.
<b>Component 3: Regional Environmental and Socioeconomic Research and Monitoring Network supporting Ecosystem Based Management (EBM) and Community Benefits</b>					
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> Countries enabled to conduct policy dialogue based on comparable data of status of marine environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 40 people in PERSGA member countries trained in conducting research and monitoring using comparable parameters and metrics leading to revised and updated regional framework for effective biophysical, environmental and social and economic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current monitoring is of coarse resolution and low precision in detecting environmental change. Regular Social or economic assessment or monitoring among local stakeholders is inconsistent or non-existent.</li> <li>Significant gaps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment by marine managers in each of the member countries to use standardized monitoring methods to report environmental status and trends. Also adopt standard metrics for social and economic monitoring.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional monitoring reports</li> <li>Monitoring reports on community level</li> <li>Country progress reports on MPA status and trends</li> <li>Network newsletters and communications</li> <li>Local or national</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical capacity exists or is developed and PERSGA is successful in continuing receiving high-level commitments to support &amp; coordinate higher-resolution monitoring to inform</li> </ul>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	monitoring	exist in various member countries between local communities, focal points and professional agency staff.	<p>Establishment of an active monitoring network among member countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership in an active network of monitoring professionals from agencies, academia (with PERSGA coordination assistance) using methods that can be replicated and data shared to actively inform management.</li> </ul>	media	<p>management actions.</p> <p>Willingness and political will to share data regionally.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 3.2:</b> PERSGA strengthened in its role as regional integrator making data comparable and sharable through the strengthening of a regional network of MPAs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three regional meetings in which results are used and shared by all MPAs region-wide in order to effectively compare spatial and temporal progress.</li> <li>• Updated PERSGA monitoring manual of</li> </ul>	<p>No member country is routinely employing the monitoring methods researched and developed by PERSGA. Currently methods used are course and imprecise to adequately support adaptive management over the longer term. Monitoring data are</p>	<p>Diversified PERSGA network meetings and training events so that they are more frequent and routinely shared around the region. Greater engagement between PERSGA specialists and NGOs or community co-management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Back-to-office reports of PERSGA MPA Specialist/LMR Specialist on in-country co-management meetings. IW:LEARN experience notes.</li> <li>• PERSGA reports</li> </ul>	<p>Member countries help reduce transaction costs to allow safe but expedient passage of staff to visit various countries MPAs to share lessons and experiences or to organize workshops in building</p>



Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	2004.	not shared between countries to compare and contrast status and trends for the Region.	enterprises. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of a PERSGA coordinated network of marine environmental monitors who communicate regularly to share information on their MPAs.</li> </ul>	and newsletters, national newsletters and communication and outreach materials documenting networking meetings and increased communication and knowledge sharing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in requests for technical assistance from PERSGA, Government Agencies or other public or private sector organizations to help establish co-management arrangements of CBOs.</li> </ul>	stakeholder networks. Local communities demonstrate a desire to engage in cooperatives, grass roots organizations or community-based organizations and engage with National Agency and/or PERSGA professionals.
<b>Outcome 3.3:</b> PERSGA member countries enabled to identify needs for collaboration and to update Strategic Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrated database(s) that provide analytic support to member governments rolled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient country-to-country exchanges of local stakeholders with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three or more lesson sharing exchanges on-site between managers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting records depicting examples of experience-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meetings are justified and based on actual technical</li> </ul>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
<p>Plan building on research and monitoring findings</p>	<p>out in five PERSGA member countries and also used to support PERSGA's State of the Marine Environment Reporting (SOMER)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eight training workshops conducted for scientists, research students, MMA managers and community leaders in collaboration with international bodies such as GCRMN, IUCN, UNEP Regional Seas;</li> <li>• Timely and accurate reporting on the IW tracking tool; and participation in IW:Learn activities (participation in IWC, IWENs etc, website consistent with IW:Learn guidance).</li> </ul>	<p>counterpart agency staff taking place within the region to discuss mutual issues of concern or share lessons and experiences. Limited interaction only occurs during events that PERSGA organizes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government staff report no or poor routine cross-country communication between counterparts to share lessons and mutually discuss challenges or opportunities</li> </ul>	<p>of Marine Protected Areas to share practices and discuss challenges. Routine communication between state agency counterpart staff in Sudan, Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Yemen. Expand communication regionally and with International counterparts.</p>	<p>transfer from one MPA to another. Back-to-office reports of PERSGA MPA specialists documenting exchanges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal reports that document communication/exchanges.</li> </ul>	<p>assistance needs and exchanges of lessons or know-how for specific management actions or tasks. Countries agree to facilitate movement so that exchange travel is not impeded.</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
<p><b>Component 4:</b> Project management Outcome: Successful project implementation through functional staff at PERSGA on various aspects of project management, including FM, procurement and environmental and social impact monitoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PERSGA is actively managing project at the regional and country level involving stakeholders at all levels</li> <li>• Consultations with countries conducted on environmental and social aspects of defined sub-projects in each pilot area</li> <li>• PERSGA staff rained in project management aspects such as safeguards and fiduciary requirements and fully functional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity in project management, financial management and procurement requires strengthening. There are no dedicated staff for environmental and social aspects of projects and limited capacity on environmental and social impact mitigation at the regional as well as local level.</li> </ul>	<p>Awareness of benefits of consideration of environmental and social impacts and mitigation measures in project management. Increased capacity of PERSGA for project management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EIAs and EMPs as well as social documents produced by stakeholders with PERSGA support</li> <li>• Stronger recognition of PERSGA as a successful implementing agency for GEF projects</li> </ul>	<p>PERSGA and local stakeholders identify staff for training that are engaged on a continuous basis</p>

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF)

**BASED ON THIS PIF SCREENING, STAP'S ADVISORY RESPONSE TO THE GEF SECRETARIAT AND GEF AGENCY(IES): MINOR REVISION REQUIRED**

**THE STAP ADVISORY RESPONSE INDICATED THAT MINOR REVISION IS REQUIRED, WHICH STIPULATES THAT STAP HAS IDENTIFIED SPECIFIC SCIENTIFIC/TECHNICAL SUGGESTIONS OR OPPORTUNITIES THAT SHOULD BE DISCUSSED WITH THE PROPONENT AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE DURING DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT BRIEF.**

**THE PROJECT DESIGN WAS PREPARED FROM THE BEGINNING WITH THE ASSISTANCE AND EXPERTISE OF TECHNICAL STAFF OF THE COUNTERPART AGENCY AS WELL AS EXPERTS FROM THE NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS. ASSESSMENTS WERE CONDUCTED OF THE MARINE PROTECTED AREAS AND LIVING MARINE RESOURCES IN THE RED SEA AND GULF OF ADEN BY EXPERTS FROM FAO TO INFORM THE PROJECT DESIGN. IN ADDITION, AN INTERNATIONAL EXPERT WAS HIRED TO ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT APPRAISAL DOCUMENT TO ENSURE BEST PRACTICE IN PROJECT DESIGN. FURTHERMORE, THE SCOPE OF THE ACTIVITIES AND INDICATORS WERE REVIEWED BY TECHNICAL EXPERTS FROM THE WORLD BANK'S ARD AND ENV DEPARTMENTS AS WELL AS OPERATIONAL STAFF FROM OTHER REGIONS.**

**RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS:**

**1- STAP WELCOMES THE PROPOSAL TO BUILD ON THE ORIGINAL GEF-FUNDED WORK THAT LED TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAM FOR THE RED SEA AND GULF OF ADEN AND AGREES THAT FURTHER SUPPORT FROM GEF WILL PROBABLY ENHANCE THE CHANCES OF ACHIEVING A SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES INDUSTRY. HOWEVER, THE PIF FOCUSES MAINLY ON PROCESSES AND DOES NOT PROVIDE ENOUGH DETAIL ABOUT HOW THE WORK WILL ACTUALLY BE DONE. STAP SUGGESTS THAT THE PROJECT DOCUMENT AT CEO ENDORSEMENT SHOULD CLEARLY INDICATE THE RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATIONS.**

- THE PAD HAS CLEARLY INDICATED THAT NATURE OF THE ACTIVITIES UNDER THE COMPONENTS AND HOW THEY WILL BE IMPLEMENTED, AS WELL AS HOW THE OUTCOMES WILL BE ACHIEVED IN A DETAILED RESULTS FRAMEWORK. THE SCOPE OF WORK UNDER EACH COMPONENT WAS DETERMINED THROUGH CONSULTATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITIES, LOCAL AUTHORITIES, NGOs AND COUNTERPARTS.**
- IN REFERENCE TO THE SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES INDUSTRY, THE PROJECT WILL PILOT ECOSYSTEM BASED COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT APPROACHES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES BY HELPING COMMUNITIES PLAN AND UNDERSTAND THE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT OF ALTERNATIVE LIVELIHOODS, SUCH AS THE DEVELOPMENT OF ECO-TOURISM, ENHANCING ARTISANAL FISHING, FISH PROCESSING SMALL SCALE AQUACULTURE OR OTHER ACTIVITIES TO BE DETERMINED BY THE COMMUNITIES THEMSELVES. THE GOAL OF THE COMMUNITY DRIVEN EBM APPROACH, LINKING THE STATUS OF MARINE HABITAT TO HUMAN USES OF THE RESOURCES, IS TO CHANGE THE MIND SET OF USERS THROUGH A RIGHTS BASED APPROACH. THIS IN TURN WILL CONTRIBUTE TO LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS OF MORE SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE SELECTED COUNTRIES.**

**2-THIS WOULD SEEM TO BE A VERY CHALLENGING PROJECT TO CARRY OUT GIVEN THE REGION IN WHICH IT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED AND ITS PROBLEMS IN CONTROLLING ILLEGAL MARITIME ACTIVITIES. THE PIF HAS HAD A LONG LAG TIME BETWEEN THE ORIGINAL WORLD BANK SIGN-OFF AND PIF CLEARANCE THEREFORE STAP IS CONCERNED ABOUT THE PRESENT STATE OF BUY-IN FROM PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES. THE PIF INDICATES THAT THE COUNTRIES GIVE STRONG SUPPORT TO PERSGA BUT OVERALL LACK THE MEANS TO CARRY OUT THE AGREED PLANS. SOMALIA IS NOT ABLE TO TAKE PART BUT YET ITS COASTLINE ALONG THE**

**SOUTH OF THE GULF OF ADEN IS CRITICAL AND UNSTABLE. HOW WILL THE OMISSION OF SOMALIA BE MITIGATED?**

- **SINCE THE APPROVAL OF THE PIF, A PPG WAS PREPARED WITH THE FULL ENDORSEMENT OF THE COUNTRIES AND AN INCEPTION WORKSHOP AT PERSGA IN FEBRUARY 2011 WAS HELD TO AGREE ON THE SCOPE OF WORK UNDER THE PROJECT COMPONENTS WITH THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES. CONSULTATION MISSIONS WERE ALSO CARRIED OUT DURING PROJECT PREPARATIONS IN THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES WHERE THERE WAS NO TRAVEL RESTRICTION. FURTHER CONSULTATIONS WILL BE CARRIED OUT TO PRESENT THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE PAD WITH ALL THE PERSGAS FOCAL POINTS IN SEPTEMBER 2012.**
- **THE PROJECT WILL BUILD PREPAREDNESS AND SCIENTIFIC CAPACITY OF THE EBM APPROACH TO MARINE RESOURCES THROUGH HARMONIZED BIOPHYSICAL AND FISHERIES MONITORING IN THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES. LOCAL EBM APPROACHES WILL BE PILOTED IN SELECTED COUNTRIES THROUGH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND TRAINING. COMPONENTS 1 AND 2 WILL TAKE PLACE IN COUNTRIES AND COMMUNITIES WHICH ARE INSTITUTIONALLY PREPARED FOR IMPLEMENTATION, WHERE THERE IS HIGH VALUE ADDED, NO RISK OF OVERBURDENING COMMUNITIES DUE TO SIMILAR ONGOING ACTIVITIES AND WHERE THE NECESSARY SAFEGUARDS WORK IS FINALIZED AT THE TIME OF APPRAISAL. BASED ON THE REQUIREMENTS, THE TWO PROPOSED COUNTRIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPONENTS 1 AND 2 ARE SUDAN AND A SECOND SITE TO BE IDENTIFIED AND STARTED IN THE FIRST YEAR OF IMPLEMENTATION.**
- **SOMALIA AT PRESENT IS A NON-ACTIVE MEMBER OF PERSGA AND OBTAINING ENDORSEMENT OF THE PROJECT IS DIFFICULT DUE TO THE POLITICAL SITUATION.**

**3-THE COLLABORATION LIST WITH OTHER PROJECTS DOES NOT INDICATE SPECIFIC AREAS OF COLLABORATION BUT IS SIMPLY A GENERIC STATEMENT LISTING THE PROJECTS, AND GIVING THEIR TOTAL SIZE, INSTEAD OF THAT PART OF THEM AND THEIR ACTIVITIES WHICH WOULD BE RELEVANT TO THE GEF WORK IN THIS PIF.**

- **THE CO-FINANCING HAS BEEN RE-FOCUSED TO ALIGN THE PROJECT ACTIVITIES WITH RELEVANT COMPONENTS AND ACTIVITIES FROM THE YEMEN FISHERIES PROJECT.**

**4- CAUTION SHOULD BE EXERCISED AS TO WHAT GEF FUNDS COVER AS SEVERAL OF THE ACTIVITIES, E.G. THE POST HARVEST VALUE ADDING OF FISHERIES PRODUCT, ARE PURE FISHERIES ACTIVITIES AND A CASE HAS NOT BEEN MADE HERE FOR THEIR ENVIRONMENTAL ROLE.**

- **THE PROJECT HAS BEEN RE-FOCUSED TO A MORE HOLISTIC APPROACH TO FISHERIES MANAGEMENT THROUGH THE INTRODUCTION OF EBM PRINCIPLES IN PILOT AREAS, DEVELOPMENT OF SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES PRACTICES AND MONITORING ACTIVITIES THAT MEASURE THE HEALTH OF THE ECOSYSTEM AS A WHOLE. IN TURN COMPONENT 3 OF THE PROJECT WILL HELP TO STANDARDIZE MONITORING APPROACHES BETWEEN THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES, MAKING DATA COMPARABLE AND SHARABLE THROUGH THE STRENGTHENING OF A REGIONAL NETWORK OF MPAs. IT WILL SUPPORT THE EXPANSION OF MONITORING TO INCLUDE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA. DETAILED MONITORING PARAMETERS WILL BE DETERMINED THROUGH CONSULTATIONS AND TECHNICAL EXPERTISE ON THE GROUND. THE INCLUSION OF COMMUNITIES AND THEIR STAKEHOLDER GROUPS IN MONITORING THROUGH THE PILOTS PRESENTS AN ADDITIONAL AND IMPORTANT OPPORTUNITY FOR MONITORING FISHERIES AND MARINE RESOURCES MORE BROADLY. MONITORING STANDARDS AND FINDINGS WILL BE DEVELOPED AND EXCHANGED THROUGH THE REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING NETWORK REMN SUPPORTED BY PERSGA, AS WELL AS THROUGH THE REGIONAL NODE OF THE GLOBAL CORAL REEF MONITORING NETWORK. THIS WILL REINFORCE THE REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE AND CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT, COMMUNICATION AND KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE OF BEST PRACTICES.**

**ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES**

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week*</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
<b>For Project Management</b>			
<b>Local</b>			
Project Management Associate (one)	1,232	142	A regional specialist will be hired to help in different managerial aspects of the project. He / She will work closely with the Project Manager and PERSGA Finance and Administrative Management . He / She will assist in organizational matters and maintain special records of the project's activities and finance parallel to those maintained by PERSGA Administration. He / she will assist in reporting and in maintaining technical and audit reports.
<b>International</b>			
Project Safeguards Specialist (one)	2,800	7	An international consultant will provide training to PERSGA's project team, particularly for managing environmental and social impact monitoring and mitigation during implementation
Justification for Travel, if any: Travel will be mainly to organize project's Management Committee Meetings and to participate in GEF International Waters Meetings			
<b>For Technical Assistance</b>			
<b>Local</b>			
Community facilitator (two) Economist Marine Resources Management Specialist	1,750	250 (total for four consultants in this activity)	Several regional consultants will be hired in short term consultancies to carry out specific tasks in the different technical components of the project. These will be with different expertise in supporting community participation in Marine Parks planning, in MPA zonation and demarcation, environmental and social monitoring experts, public awareness and outreach specialists.
Local Fisheries Law Expert (two)	1,750	30 (total for two consultants in this activity)	Comparative review of fisheries law; Consultancies will also help in field work and in facilitation national and regional workshops
<b>International</b>			
Fisheries and MPA zoning expert (one) Rights based marine resource management expert (two)	2,800	100 (total for three consultants in this activity)	Several International consultants will be hired in short term consultancies. These will be experts who will provide training and supervision during execution of the different project components, including EBM application and rights based

			approach in community management to fisheries, supporting the project with best practices from other protected area contexts. Choice of international consultants will be made in cases where local / regional consultants do not have the necessary expertise in specific areas.
M&E Specialist (one) Auditor (one)	2,800	10 (total for two consultants in this activity)	International consultants will be hired also in auditing and monitoring the project activities.
Marine Resource Monitoring Specialist (two)	2,800	20 (total for two consultants in this activity)	International consultants will also help to facilitate the regional workshops, country and regional level gap analysis in monitoring systems and comparability and best practices for MPA network data sharing
Justification for Travel, if any: The project is of a regional nature. This makes travel of technical consultants essential to participate in executing activities in different countries. Travel will also be essential for international consultants to participate in activities in the region. There will also be travel between the different countries for exchange of knowledge and experience and for participation in national and regional workshops.			

\* Provide dollar rate per person week. \*\* Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

**ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS**

- A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN. PROJECT PREPARATION HAS BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY SUPPORTED BY THE PPG AND THE PLANNED ACTIVITIES AND STUDIES. THE OBJECTIVE OF THE PPG WAS TO PREPARE THE RED SEA AND GULF OF ADEN STRATEGIC ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT PROJECT THROUGH A SERIES OF ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING: (A) ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE; (B) STUDIES UNDERTAKEN AS A BASIS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF EACH PROPOSED PROJECT COMPONENT, INCLUDING STUDIES ON SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF FISHERIES; SUSTAINABILITY OF FISHERIES HABITATS, RESILIENT MEASURES FOR THE COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS, AND OPTIMIZATION AND INTEGRATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING ACTIVITIES IN THE RED SEA AND GULF OF ADEN; (C) CAPACITY BUILDING AND PUBLIC AWARENESS INCLUDING STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS, NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF A ROAD MAP FOR CAPACITY BUILDING; (D) WORKSHOPS AND STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS; (E) REVISIONS AND FINALIZATION OF PRELIMINARY STUDIES BASED ON FEEDBACK RECEIVED IN COUNTRY CONSULTATIONS AND WORKSHOPS, AND (F) PREPARATION OF A DRAFT PROJECT REPORT AND PREPARATION OF THE PROJECT APPRAISAL DOCUMENT FOR THE PROJECT. THE PPG WAS CO-FINANCED WITH USD 100,000 FROM PERSGA AND USD 100,000 FROM WB. AS A RESULT OF THE LEVERAGED FUNDING, THE OVERALL PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED. THE PROJECT DESIGN HAS BEEN ENHANCED THROUGH A NUMBER OF STUDIES THAT DEVELOPED LOCAL ASSESSMENTS AND REVIEWS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN CONCERNED COMMUNITIES, MAKING STATUS OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT, REVIEW OF INDICATORS AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS, AS WELL AS THROUGH WORKSHOPS WITH COUNTRY FEEDBACK ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN AND OUTPUTS.**
- B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY: N/A**
- C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:**

		<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>	
--	--	------------------------	--

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>
Consultancy Sudan MPA- Local status of environment and socio-economic conditions	Completed	12,000	9,600	12,000	0	20,000
Consultancy Egypt MPA- Local status of environment and socio-economic conditions	Completed	16,000	10,000	16,000	0	20,000
Review of project design including institutional arrangements, results indicators	Completed	34,000	23,861	34,000	0	30,000
Workshop stakeholder feedback and support for project design	Yet to complete	38,000	13,471	38,000	0	30,000
Climate change and coastal zone management and community coping strategies	Completed					100,000
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
<b>Total</b>		100,000	56,932	100,000		200,000

\* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

#### **ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)



**GEF Trust Fund CEO Endorsement/Approval Template Preparation Guidelines**  
(This template applies to both FSPs and MSPs)

**Unlock instruction:** The template, by default, is locked to allow the pull-down menu to function. However, in order to access the various documents through the hyperlink, the template has to be in unlocked format. To unlock the template follow this path: Go to **View > Toolbars > Forms**. You will then see a pop up menu like this. Click on the right-most icon (a lock) to unlock.



When inputting information in the fields in the template, please use the “locked” mode.

**Submission date:** self-explanatory

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

The first part is the project core information and standard selections are provided to the extent possible for ease of preparation. The Strategic Programs for each focal area have to be filled in manually, due to limitations by Microsoft Word which prevented the provision of the full range selections for all focal areas through the pull-down menu. For convenience, the strategic programs (SP) in each focal area are listed below. Please write exactly as indicated below. For example, fill in **BD-SP1-PA**, not just SP1 or any other combination.

<b>Biodiversity</b>	<b>Climate Change</b>	<b>International Waters</b>	<b>Land Degradation</b>	<b>POPs*</b>	<b>ODS*</b>	<b>SFM*</b>
<b>BD-SP1-PA</b> Financing	<b>CC-SP1-</b> Building EE	<b>IW-SP1-</b> Coastal Marine Fisheries	<b>LD-SP1-</b> Agriculture	<b>POPs-SP1-</b> CapacityB	<b>ODS-</b> <b>SP1</b>	<b>SFM-SP1-</b> Financing
<b>BD-SP2-</b> Marine PA	<b>CC-SP2-</b> Industrial EE	<b>IW-SP2-</b> Nutrient Reduction	<b>LD-SP2-</b> Forest	<b>POPs-SP2-</b> Investment		<b>SFM-SP2-PA</b> Networks
<b>BD-SP3-PA</b> Networks	<b>CC-SP3-</b> RE	<b>IW-SP3-</b> Freshwater Basins	<b>LD-SP3-</b> Innovation	<b>POPs-SP3-</b> Demonstration		<b>SFM-SP3-</b> LULUCF
<b>BD-SP4-</b> Policy	<b>CC-SP4-</b> Biomass	<b>IW-SP4-</b> Toxics/Ice				<b>SFM-SP4-</b> Policy
<b>BD-SP5-</b> Markets	<b>CC-SP5-</b> Transport					<b>SFM-SP5-</b> Markets
<b>BD-SP6-</b> Biosafety	<b>CC-SP6-</b> LULUCF					<b>SFM-SP6-</b> Biomass
<b>BD-SP7-</b> Invasive Alien Species (IAS)						<b>SFM-SP7-</b> Forest
<b>BD-SP8-</b> ABS- Capacity Building						

\* POPs = Persistent Organic Pollutants; ODS = Ozone Depleting Substance; SFM = Sustainable Forest Management

**Indicative Calendar:** Most dates are expected dates and may change as new developments unfold. The only date that is actual is the date that the project (in the form of PIF) was approved in a work program (Indicate the Council work program month, e.g. April 2008). The purpose of these dates is to see the implementation timeline of the project. For example, the Agency approval date will be included in the CEO Endorsement letter to the Agencies. The GEF Management Information System will be sending alerts to the Agencies about a month prior to the dates indicated in the letter to alert Agencies of the impending deadlines. It is therefore advisable that should there be any delay in the milestone dates in the endorsement/approval letter, Agencies should inform GEFSEC immediately and seek GEF CEO’s concurrence to the new dates/milestones. For all other dates on the template (i.e. Mid-term review, project grant closing date, etc.), Agencies should inform GEFSEC of any deviation from those indicated in the CEO Endorsement Request so that the GEFSEC database could be updated to reflect the changes. Agencies should also indicate any change in the milestone dates in its annual report submitted to GEFSEC. In order to have avoid confusion on the various terms under the Indicative Calendar section, please refer to the definitions below:

**GEF Agency Approval** - The date on which the GEF Agency Board or Management approves the Grant proposal. This is equivalent to the WB's Board approval date, UNDP's Project Document's signature date, or IFAD's approval date.

**Implementation Start** - The date on which project becomes effective and disbursement can be requested. This is the equivalent to the WB's grant/legal agreement effectiveness date and UNDP's Project Document Signature Date. This is also the trigger date for the Trustee to allow Agencies to apply for disbursement.

**Project Closing** - This is the date when all project activities are financially committed, but not necessarily all disbursements completed. Generally, Agencies provide a grace period of 6 months, or more, for final disbursement after project closing, but the sums paid may not be increased from the amounts originally committed. Agencies should submit a report to GEFSEC and the Trustee on the financial closure of the project.

A. *Project Framework*: The main objective of the section is to sketch out the overall design of the project and to provide information about what the GEF grant will finance in relation to other sources of funding.

Since many agencies utilize their own terminology for project design, it is important to clarify what the Secretariat is asking for under each heading. The definitions are based on those developed by OECD/DAC, *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management* (2002).<sup>1</sup>

**Project Objective** (refers to OECD/DAC *development objective*): intended impact contributing to global environmental benefits via one or more development interventions.

**Outcomes**: The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs (e.g. energy efficiency of existing heat and hot water supply companies in X city improved, new trust fund for the conservation of the PAs established, laws and bylaws approved to reduce impact of forestry practices on biodiversity)

**Outputs**: The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention relevant to the achievement of outcomes. At CEO Endorsement, outputs should be concrete and where applicable should reflect targets that have been established during project preparation (e.g. 10 staff trained to operate and maintain an early warning system, data capture in 5 regions of coastal lowlands).

The **Project Component** is the division of the project into its major parts; an aggregation of a set of concrete activities (e.g. strengthening regulatory and legal frameworks, introduction of innovative financial mechanisms, investment to overcome financial barriers, institutional capacity building)

The financing of the project should be broken down by Project Component. Indicate also for component whether it is of investment in nature, technical assistance, or scientific and technical analysis.

The percentage under the GEF and co-financing is the percentage of GEF or co-financing to the total amount for the component, i.e. the amount listed under GEF and Co-financing for a particular component will add up to 100% of the component total, i.e., calculate horizontally.

B. *Sources of Confirmed Co-financing for the Project*: Indicate the sources of co-financing that are confirmed with the names of co-financiers in the first column, select co-financing classification in the second column (e.g. project government contribution, GEF Agencies, bilateral aid agencies, multilateral agencies, private sector, NGO and others). Select in the 3<sup>rd</sup> column the type of co-financing (whether it is a grant, guarantee, soft loan, hard loan or in-kind contribution). The commitment letters from all co-financiers should be submitted no later than the four-week Council circulation period and before GEFSEC issues CEO endorsement letter.

C. *Financing Plan Summary for the Project (\$)*: Similarly, this will be an update of the table presented at PIF but with firm amounts at this stage. Please note that the co-financing amounts do not receive an Agency fee. Total in the Project column (3<sup>rd</sup> column, last row) should match the total project costs amount in Table A (the last column by last row). The project preparation column should include all the approved PDF-A/B/Cs and PPG. However, the amount of PDF-A/B/C that was approved under GEF-3 should clearly indicate in the footnote as this amount would not be counted against the GEF-4 resources allocated to the country/focal area. But this amount would be added to the total GEF grant provided for this project. In case there are uncommitted amount of PPG, this amount should be excluded. All uncommitted PPG amounts at the time of CEO endorsement should be returned to Trustee. Details of implementation of the PDF/PPG should be reported in Annex D. Project grant in the 3<sup>rd</sup> column included GEF

---

<sup>1</sup> The full glossary in English, French and Spanish is posted on the following website:  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>

resource and co-financing at CEO endorsement while the project grant in the last column includes the GEF resources and co-financing at PIF stage.

- D. GEF Resources Requested by Agency (ies), Focal Area(s) and Country (ies): This table provides the share of the project and project preparation amounts by focal area, Agency and country. For biodiversity and climate change focal areas, this section provides the amount of resources used by the country from its RAF allocation. For single country, single focal area and single Agency implemented projects, this table could be skipped. In providing Agency fee amount, especially where there is split between/among Agencies, the rule is that total amount should not exceed 10% following the Fee Policy provisions. If for whatever reason the amount is less than 10%, please provide explanation since we will follow whatever amount Agency requested as long as it is within the 10% limit. The explanation should be included in the cover letter that accompanies the submission of Request for CEO Endorsement/Approval to GEFSEC.
- E. Consultants working for technical assistance components: If there are consultants who will work on technical assistance components in the project, list the total estimated person weeks/months needed for the GEF resources. Details of consultant information should be provided in Annex C.
- F. Project Management Budget/Cost: The main items supported by GEF as project management includes consultant services, travel and office facilities, etc. Provide the total estimated consultant person weeks/months needed and amount by sources (GEF and co-financing) for the project management with more detailed information to be included in Annex C. The issue of what could be included under project management budget is under review in the ongoing Administrative Cost Study. Once the study is completed, there will be more clarity on what items could be charged as project management budget/cost.
- G. Non-grant if there is non-grant elements included, check yes and complete Annex E to provide *Calendar of Expected Reflows*. If no non-grant instruments, continue to H.
- H. Describe the M&E plan with budgeted amount. Include a table as necessary.

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:**

Several questions in this section are similar to those at PIF stage. When it is the case (see questions B, C and D), you may just indicate something like "same as PIF" when no new information is available or relevant. Please note however that for other questions (for instance on cost-effectiveness and global environmental benefits), a more in-depth discussion of the issues is needed here than at the PIF stage.

In any case, if there are clear and specific answers to the questions of Part II in your project document, you may simply cite the relevant pages/paragraphs without having to cut and paste the text into the template.

- A. When discussing the issue, state the background and baseline, discuss how the project seeks to address it (GEF alternative), and the expected value added of GEF involvement and global environmental benefits to be delivered (incremental reasoning).
- B. State if the proposed project is consistent with country and/or regional priorities and how it builds on ongoing programs, policies and political commitments. Responding to this question will also show country ownership of this project.
- C. Describe the project's consistency with the GEF focal area strategies and strategic programs. All projects have to be consistent with the focal area strategies to be eligible for GEF financing.
- D. Justify the type of financing support with resources provided by the GEF. For instance, explain the rationale to provide a loan rather than a grant, or setting up of revolving funds, etc.
- E. Describe the coordination with other GEF agencies, organizations, and stakeholders involved in related initiatives; if similar projects exist in the same country/region, including GEF projects, report on synergies/complementarities with this proposal and demonstrate that there is no duplication.
- F. Refer to the June 2007 Council paper on incremental reasoning which is linked to this section. The objective is to describe the situation on what would happen without GEF support and what would be the expected change in global environmental benefits. This differs from Section A in the sense that the former describes what the project will deliver while this section describes the question: what if there is no GEF support?

- G. The objective is to ensure that in designing the project, all risks, including climate change risk have been taken into consideration and that proper measures are in place and that the project is resilient to climate change. Please outline the risk management measures, including improving resilience to climate change that the project proposes to undertake.
- H. Demonstrate that the selected project design is the best use of the GEF funding for achieving the global environmental benefits described in the project (e.g. \$/ton of CO<sub>2</sub> abated). Show the proposed project is cost-effective through demonstration of alternatives that may not be as cost effective.

**PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT**

- A. *Institutional Coordination*: if more than one GEF Agency is involved, discuss the responsibility and role of each Agency and how each will undertake the tasks in the project.
- B. *Project Implementation Arrangement*: Explain the roles of each GEF Agency, if this is a joint project, as well as role of executing partners, and how each Agency and executing partner(s) will undertake the project.

**PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF**: When discussing the alignment, you may like to consider the expected global environmental benefits, co-financing, GEF grant requested and incremental reasoning.

**PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**: This section provides Agency(ies)' certification to the submission as well as contact information for project.

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK**: Self-explanatory

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS**: Agencies' responses to comments received during PIF stage from Council, other Agencies, GEFSEC, Convention Secretariat and STAP. To the extent possible, the responses should be reflected in the Agency's project document as well as Request for CEO Endorsement. In this section, just highlight the responses and direct readers to how the comments have been incorporated into the documents. In some cases, comments maybe responded through brief clarifications in this section.

After review of the Request for CEO Endorsement (RCE), GEFSEC may provide further comments on the RCE and Council may also provide comments when RCE is being circulated before CEO endorsement. These should be responded and RCE resubmitted to GEFSEC before final CEO endorsement.

**ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES**: Provide all consultants to be hired for the project which may include those for project management and those for technical assistance. They may also be local or international consultants. This annex should provide unit cost for each consultant, their position titles, estimated person weeks needed for each consultant associated with the tasks to be performed in the last column and provide justification for travel, if applicable.

**ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS**: This annex should give a full picture of how preparation funding was used, and the activities financed. Respond the questions in A and B and provide figures in C. The important information in the table is to clearly indicate the funding utilization status. All uncommitted money will be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. Please provide the expected fund return date here, if available.

**ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLows**: If non-grant instrument is included in the project, please provide calendar of expected reflows to GEF Trust Fund and/or GEF Agency.

