



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Western Indian Ocean Large Marine Ecosystems Strategic Action Programme Policy Harmonisation and Institutional Reforms (SAPPHIRE)			
Country(ies):	Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Somalia, South Africa, Tanzania (France as a non-recipient partner)	GEF Project ID: ¹	5513
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5262
Other Executing Partner(s):	Nairobi Convention Secretariat (Comp 1, 2, 3 ,5, 4.1) Government of Mauritius (Comp 4.2)	Submission Date: Resubmission Date: Resubmission Date:	10 July 2015 4 Nov. 2015 18 May 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	66
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	987,920.19

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-2			GEFTF	10,976,891	333,428,294
Total project costs				10,976,891	333,428,294

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To achieve effective long-term ecosystem management in the Western Indian Ocean LMEs in line with the Strategic Action programme as endorsed by the participating countries

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1: Supporting Policy Harmonization and Management Reforms towards improved Ocean Governance	TA	1.1 Policy, legislative and institutional reforms and realignment in support of the SAP are implemented at national and regional and sub-regional level as appropriate, with emphasis given to strengthening and supporting existing processes and mechanisms including	Realignments and changes in legislation, policy and associated institutional and administrative arrangements in line with the SAP requirements Agreement and adoption of various regional and national bodies (both policy level and scientific) that will coordinate SAP	GEFTF	3,586,000	236,201,966

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

		<p>regional bodies (such as Conventions, Commissions, and Regional Scientific Bodies).</p> <p>Coordination and management mechanism are strengthened at both national and regional levels</p>	<p>implementation at the different geopolitical levels</p> <p>A Science-Based Governance process operating at the managerial and policy level based on the various scientific and technical processes that will be implemented through the SAP</p> <p>Translation of the information and results in the national MEDAs into National Action Plans that embrace the various concepts of Local Economic Development planning, ICM, Ocean Policy, etc.</p> <p>The EBM approach adopted into national legislative processes, especially any legislation that involves regulation of ecosystem goods and services</p> <p>Appropriate innovative management tools and mechanisms for delivering an EBM tried and adopted along with training in their use</p> <p>National initiatives that promote and complement SAP implementation assisted and supported (e.g. ocean policy; small-scale fisheries policy; development of blue economy and spatial planning processes. Where appropriate, this will be promoted through demonstration activities that will 'pilot' best practices</p>			
		<p>1.2 Technical and institutional capacity developed to deliver Knowledge-Based Governance</p>	<p>Capacity strengthening and development delivered for effective Science-to-Governance processes</p>			

		<p>approaches by delivering scientific results to management and policy makers for adaptive management decision-making</p>	<p>A weight-of-evidence and peer review process for Dynamic Management adopted as part of the Science-to-Governance process</p> <p>Pragmatic and up-to-date options and guidance for adaptive management and policy decisions delivered and in use by governments and IGOs.</p> <p>Adoption of indicator-based ecosystem monitoring methodologies and strategies through multi-stakeholder cross-sectoral partnerships</p> <p>Development and adoption of marine spatial planning techniques (particularly in partnership with the UNEP GEF WIOLAB SAP Implementation Project) that are up-scaled across the LMEs</p> <p>Ecosystem valuation and cost-benefit analysis techniques in common use on the ground and demonstrated to be part of an effective ocean governance and ecosystem management process</p> <p>Improved coordination of access, management, handling and distribution of regional data and information</p>			
		<p>1.3 Collaborative and cooperative mechanisms agreed and strengthened between national, regional and global partners and stakeholders</p>	<p>On-going and effective coordination and collaboration of all SAP implementation activities</p> <p>Effective SAP-related decision-making processes in place at the regional level and linked to national level decision-making</p>			

			<p>Reciprocal sharing of information between appropriate activities and initiatives/projects working on SAP-related issues (particularly through physical representation on corresponding steering and technical bodies)</p> <p>Strengthening of the WIOSEA partnerships and closer collaboration between the partners and all regional activities and bodies to deliver more effective ecosystem monitoring, capacity building, training in support of adaptive management</p>			
Component 2: Stress Reduction through Community Engagement and Empowerment in Sustainable Resources Management	TA	2.1 Integrating the Ecosystem-based Management approach into existing Local Economic Development Plans at selected communities Pilot level and stress reduction demonstrated and captured for replication (including community stakeholder engagement and awareness of LME Goods and Services	<p>Definitive demonstration of communities actively engaged into the LME monitoring, management and SAP implementation process</p> <p>Integration of the ecosystem approach into the community-based Local Economic Development plans (as previously created through the UNDP GEF ASCLME project)</p> <p>Cost-benefit analysis and ecosystem valuation of goods and services integrated into the overall LED business planning</p> <p>Community demonstrations of this 'EBM within LEDs' approach capturing the needs and priorities of youth and gender</p>	GEFTF	1,240,000	4,056,368
		2.2 Stress reduction through ecosystem-based practices among artisanal and subsistence fisheries	Artisanal fishing communities directly involved in design and implementation of management interventions within the			

			<p>overall EBM and SAP implementation approach</p> <p>Four demonstration communities directly addressing key issues identified through the MEDA/TDA/SAP process (e.g. declining catches, user conflicts, mitigation of harmful methods and practices such as poorly managed coastal development, pollution, habitat destruction, foreign fleets, and local/industrial fishing conflict)</p> <p>Local fisheries management approaches and community rights-based fisheries needs integrated into the development of hybrid LEDs that incorporate project management goals with local perceptions and institutions</p> <p>Options demonstrated for addressing the ‘drivers’ of low-living standards and health issues among artisanal fisheries communities, including alternative livelihoods (with appropriate consideration given to youth and gender issues and challenges)</p> <p>Capacity development delivered in relation to handling, processing, storage, transportation and marketing of artisanal catches as well as business management and access to micro-financing and credit facilities.</p> <p>Appropriate training and awareness given to locals in gear improvements,</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>safety of life at sea (including navigational skills) and conflict resolution (to support creation of local management boards)</p> <p>Coordination mechanisms in place between relevant national and regional activities addressing similar community issues</p> <p>In particular, coordination through SWIOFC elaborated and adopted to ensure any activities or interventions implemented are those that allow collaboration between projects and programs and avoid duplication and dilution of the skills and knowledge available in country</p>			
Component 3: Stress Reduction through Private Sector/Industry Commitment to transformations in their operations and management practices	TA	<p>3.1 Private Sector engagement and participation in SAP implementation and through risk reduction and contingency response mechanisms using public-private sector partnership agreements along with regional partners (Nairobi Convention, WWF, IUCN, etc.). Furthermore, facilitate the adoption and implementation of mechanisms which would aim to facilitate Private Sector engagement in SAP implementation, ecosystem monitoring and associated stress reduction activities. The Private Sector will work with SAPPHERE and its partners to 'mainstream' the ecosystem approach into their daily activities so as to</p>	<p>Strong working partnerships developed with the private sector and maritime industry and between the private sector / industry and governments as well as other stakeholders</p> <p>Concrete benefits realised from such partnerships by way of private sector voluntary controls and regulations within the LMEs related to SAP implementation and promotion of the ecosystem-based management approach</p> <p>Private Sector groups working closely with project partners and participating countries / IGOS to capture information of ecosystem welfare through monitoring of specific, selected indicators and through analysis of such</p>	GEFTF	755,000	16,810,008

		<p>reduce and mitigate impacts on EQOs.</p>	<p>indicators as a foundation for adaptive management</p> <p>Mainstreaming of the SAP implementation requirements and the 'ecosystem' approach into private sector activities and everyday management and operational practices</p> <p>Completion of a detailed and comprehensive Strategic Environmental Assessment of the potential impacts from oil and gas exploration and development within the WIO region and its LMEs</p> <p>Regional contingency plans for hazardous spill response (along with a Regional Response Centre) negotiated and adopted in close collaboration with appropriate national and regional bodies</p> <p>Inter-country mechanism / forum adopted for dialogue and decision-making on the management and mitigation of the potential and actual impacts from the oil and gas industry in the region</p>			
<p>Component 4: Delivering Best Practices and Lessons through Innovative Ocean Governance Demonstrations</p>	TA	<p>4.1 Identifying Innovative Management options for High Seas areas within LMEs</p>	<p>New management partnerships for high seas areas and ABNJ tried and tested within the WIO LMEs (e.g. voluntary management and regulatory approaches)</p> <p>Development and negotiation of management options for benthic/seamount/deep-water management areas and regimes (including VMEs and MPAs) along with realistic sustainable</p>	GEFTF	<p>3,749,391</p> <p>(of which \$2,210,391, the amount allocated to 4.2.A, is governed by a JMA project document)</p>	22,220,516

			<p>funding and coordination mechanisms</p> <p>Strong partnerships and alliances negotiated and active between the countries that border the high seas area and the non-country stakeholders that access, potentially impact on and (in some cases) directly utilise the resources of those areas (e.g. maritime industries such as shipping, fisheries, mining, etc.)</p>			
		4.2 Identifying Innovative Management options for High Seas areas within LMEs	<p>Case studies and demonstrations delivered showing best practices in:</p> <p>A. Joint ocean governance and management of resources within extended continental shelf areas</p> <p>B. Implementation of ocean policy and spatial management with a focus on intersectoral collaboration and management mechanisms</p> <p>C. Marine Spatial Planning within a Blue Economy framework in selected areas within participating countries for further replication and transfer of lessons throughout the region</p>			
Component 5: Capacity Development to Realise improved Ocean Governance in the WIO region	TA	5.1 Capacity for improved Ocean Governance strengthened through training and support	<p>Capacity development for ocean governance and SAP implementation strengthened throughout the region through agreed national and regional work-plans</p> <p>Road-maps adopted for training that capture country and regional priorities for addressing MEDA and TDA root causes and delivering on SAP implementation</p>	GEFTF	1,106,500	53,316,547

		Partnerships to deliver on training and capacity development identified and agreed by participating countries and appropriate regional bodies (including through consolidation and strengthening of WIOSEA)		
Subtotal			10,436,891	332,605,405
Project Management Cost (PMC) ³			GEF TF	540,000
Total project costs			10,976,891	333,428,294

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the Project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
National Government	Comoros	Cash/In-kind	20,915,032
	Kenya	Cash/In-kind	109,395,556
	Madagascar	Cash/In-kind	14,500,000
	Mauritius	Cash/In-kind	2,051,887
	Mozambique	Cash/In-kind	94,410,885
	Seychelles	Cash/In-kind	51,560,000
	Somalia	Cash/In-kind	7,270,150
	South Africa	Cash/In-kind	3,666,384
	Tanzania	Cash/In-kind	7,270,150
	Joint Commission for Mascarene Region	Cash/In-kind	15,600,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash/In-kind	72,000
Multilateral Agency	IMO	Cash/In-kind	250,000
Multilateral Agency	IUCN	Cash/In-kind	1,700,000
Bilateral Aid Agency	NOAA	Cash/In-kind	2,541,250
Others (Scientific Organization)	WIOMSA	Cash/In-kind	2,110,000
CSO	BirdLife	Cash/In-kind	50,000
CSO	Future Ocean Alliance	Cash/In-kind	65,000
Total Co-financing			333,428,294

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	International Waters	Regional (Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Somalia, South Africa, Tanzania)	10,976,891	987,920.19	11,964,811.19
Total Grant Resources				10,976,891	987,920.19	11,964,811.19

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	465,500	5,100,000	5,565,500
National/Local Consultants	2,138,347	12,400,000	14,538,347

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

NOT APPLICABLE

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

NOT APPLICABLE

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

NOT APPLICABLE

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The baseline project and the problem that it seems to address remain substantially the same as what is presented in the approved PIF, although the structure presented in the Project Document has been slightly refined and streamlined from the original structure presented in the approved PIF. Actual sequencing of the Outcomes, Outputs and Deliverables under the Components have been adjusted to better reflect countries’ needs and to strengthen the logic of the document.

Under Component 4, the scope of demonstration to be supported by the Project has been expanded – to the extent the available budget allows – to include a few other innovative ocean governance demonstration activities in the WIO region in order to incorporate requests from the countries. In addition to its original focus on adjacent high seas management

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

approaches within the LMEs as well as its support to the innovative joint management strategy for the Seychelles-Mauritius Extended Continental Shelf, Component 4 now includes a few more interventions related to the implementation of Ocean Policy, application of Marine Spatial Planning, which together support the countries to promote the sustainable Blue Economy in the WIO region.

Under Component 5, the mention of AfriCOG as a regional/continental mechanism for delivering capacity building and training has been removed. The countries agreed not to ‘preselect’ AfriCOG or any other specific entity in the Project Document as an entity through which a series of capacity building activities would be delivered. The countries noted that this would not prevent AfriCOG or any similar body or agency from working with or collaborating with the project in the future on capacity building and training activities. What is avoided in the Project Document is a pre-selection of any single entity.

- A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

NOT APPLICABLE

- A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

NOT APPLICABLE. Mandatory UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) has been followed during the project preparatory phase and it is attached to the Project Document.

- A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

Coordination efforts ongoing and strengthened further during the project preparatory phase. In particular, UNEP, UNDP and Nairobi Convention Secretariat met a few times during the preparatory phase of the UNEP-GEF WIO SAP project and the UNDP-GEF SAPPHERE project to agree on the WIO coordination mechanism to be followed throughout the implementation of the two projects. The coordination with the UNEP GEF WIO SAP project is now built into the project document. The fact that the two SAP implementation projects are now aiming to start at the same time and are making use of the same Executing Agency (The Nairobi Convention) makes the coordination and collaboration much easier.

In addition, Nairobi Convention is strengthening WIO coordination among various partners including academic institutes, NGOs and CBOs through the WIO-Consortium. A number of other projects financed by GEF or non-GEF are coordinated through WIO-C (e.g. FAO-UNEP-GEF ABNJ project, IUCN-French FEM Deep Sea Ecosystem project, Northern Mozambique Channel Initiative). The SAPPHERE project will work closely with the NBO Convention and the WIO-Consortium to achieve better coordination and collaboration with other initiatives. Further, the project will also work closely with a series of World Bank-GEF SWIOFish projects.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

- B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

An inclusive and comprehensive engagement in the implementation of the SAP and overall LME management will be achieved through A. broadening the scope of community involvement and B. Enhancing the input from, and engagement with the private sector and maritime industry. Actions at the local level of communities and localised artisanal fishery areas (often defined by small biological communities and habitats) will be piloted and incorporated into municipal, provincial and finally national approaches to SAP implementation and national action plans (particularly linked to the MEDAs). The private sector is also taking a keen interest in engagement in LME management and SAP implementation and the ASCLME project has already built a strong partnership with the private sector which can be strengthened and enhanced through this new SAP implementation initiative. In particular, the development and demonstration of an ocean-industry initiative that would see the private and public sectors collaborating on the collection, and analysis of data related to appropriate ecosystem monitoring indicators would be very valuable. This would fit in very well alongside both the Ecosystem Assessment and monitoring and the Science-Based Governance and Adaptive Management Components in delivering much –needed data, assisting in the analysis of this data, and using the results and conclusions to refine company policies and to develop and adopt self-regulatory approaches. The

Project Document provides a detailed and comprehensive list of stakeholders identified by the countries and included as Table 6. This table highlights the general roles and responsibilities of those stakeholders and furthermore highlights their specific functions and responsibilities in relation to SAP implementation. Section 2.6 of the Project Document goes into considerable detail regarding the various stakeholder involvement and collaborative activities intended. Broad engagement of all stakeholders is a common and repetitive theme throughout the activities and outputs of all 5 components.

B.2. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The socioeconomic benefits of goods and services provided by LMEs and the need for sustainable management of resources and impacts on LME goods and services in order to secure such benefits has been well documented and is central to the SAP implementation process. At that national level, SAPPHIRE will work closely with the communities to demonstrate implementation of local economic development plans that embrace the ecosystem-based management approach and will use best lessons and practices from these pilot demonstrations to advise other municipalities in other countries. The Project Document clearly identifies the requirement for both youth and gender-related issues to be fully integrated into these demonstrations and into the LEDs. At the regional and sub-regional levels, the project will be working closely with its partners in the region to develop marine spatial planning as an effective governance tool. This will focus on the interactive and multi-stakeholder 'blue economy' approach which recognises the primary importance of a sustainable and healthy socioeconomic environment

The MEDA and TDA development and adoption process undertaken by the UNDP GEF ASCLME Project identified the Main Areas of Concern for the countries in terms of transboundary impacts on and within the WIO LMEs. Ecosystem Quality Objectives were subsequently developed, to guide the implementation of the SAP. The proposed Ecosystem Quality Objectives and the actions that would be taken to achieve them are ultimately aiming to secure socioeconomic stability and community welfare in line with the Millennium Development Goals, the World Summit on Sustainable Development's Plan of Implementation, and the conclusions and objectives from the Rio Plus 20 Conference. The modular approach to LME TDA development and the subsequent monitoring of indicators of change within the SAP implementation process recognises the critical importance of appropriate indicators for assessing and reporting on the socioeconomic status and changes within the countries. SAPPHIRE will utilize its long-term partnerships (through WIOSEA) to carefully monitor any changes in the status of the region's marine ecosystems, the effects and impacts of those changes on the socioeconomic welfare of the countries, and develop mechanisms for mitigating or adapting to those effects and impacts through adaptive management and policy realignment.

In summary, the socioeconomic benefits of SAP implementation will comprehensively address the sustainability of vital LME goods and services in the region and contribute enormously to food security, improvement in livelihoods and standards of living, and alleviate potential poverty, especially where all of these areas are likely to be impacted by climate change. The SAP Implementation process will provide major assistance to the countries in terms of adaptive management and being able to recognise and respond to climate change-related impacts in good time.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

One of the strengthened emphases of the SAPPHIRE project now is on strong collaboration and cooperation between various national and regional initiatives that are addressing marine and maritime activities that relate directly to SAP implementation. The WIO LMEs are situated in a part of the world that has been identified as a hotspot for climate change and consequent impact on living marine resources and dependent communities. Furthermore, this area is about to undergo a major phase of oil and gas resource exploration and probable extraction. At the same time, population growth in this region is predicted to be some of the highest in the world over the next 50 years. Various funding is now being invested in this critically-important region of the world's oceans and it is this coordination and collaboration strategy that SAPPHIRE will be pursuing with the various partners (as clearly articulated in the Project Document) that will ensure cost-effective use of resources (financial, human, political, etc.). In particular, the UNEP GEF WIO LAB SAP implementation project will be dealing primarily with the land-based impacts on LME resources, goods and

services as is highlighted as the main Project Objective in their Project Document (*'To reduce impacts from land-based sources and activities and sustainably manage critical coastal-riverine ecosystems through the implementation of the WIO-SAP priorities with the support of partnerships at national and regional levels.'*). This 'division of labour' in terms of land-based and offshore will provide substantial cost-effectiveness across such a huge area (22 million square kilometres with its small island states and hundreds of remote island groups) as long as these two projects are closely coordinated as has been negotiated by the participating countries and the implementing agencies and captured in the Project Document. The UNDP GEF ASCLME project also undertook an initial cost-benefit analysis of the 'business-as-usual' approach versus SAP implementation and the ecosystem-based management approach. LME goods and services, even at a conservative estimate, contribute well over US\$22 billion per annum to the GDP of the participating countries. Just looking at more effective management of fisheries through a SAP implementation approach indicates improvements of many millions over-and-above a business-as-usual approach and strengthen both job and food security for many millions of people. This cost-benefit analysis will be expanded in detail through the SAPPHIRE Project activities so as to strengthen this understanding of the value of LME goods and services and what this means in long-term GDP and job/food security versus the absence of an ecosystem-based management approach.

At a localised community level, the LEDS will be reviewed (and expanded as necessary) through the SAPPHIRE Project to ensure full integration of the ecosystem-management approach within an overall blue economy strategy. Community level activities will also focus on defining and demonstrating the renewable goods and services available and the cost-benefits of maintaining those goods and services which will result in more cost-effective long-term resource management at the grass-roots level.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project's Monitoring and Evaluation plan has been budgeted at \$169,000 (excluding the inputs from Project staff and countries and cost associated with M&E responsibilities carried out by UNDP as the GEF IA). This includes an Inception Workshop, Quarterly reporting to the Implementing Agency, Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports, standard Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation and site visits. In addition to this, the project intends to undertake annual 'progress-chasing' which has proved so useful during the UNDP GEF ASCLME project in relation to keeping the project on course for delivery and to advise the Steering Committee of progress status. On a larger global scale of M&E, results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate in as relevant and appropriate, scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. There will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus. In particular, the Project will participate within the GEF IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN networks, (contributing a minimum of 1% of project budget to IW portfolio learning), the African LME Caucus and other appropriate regional and global initiatives in an effort to network between International Waters projects both regionally and globally, sharing lessons learned, and developing and deploying innovative ocean governance tools and methods. Other relevant networks will be harnessed where appropriate.


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
(Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

Name	Position	Ministry	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)
Ali Mohamed Solihi	General Secretary and GEF OFP	Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, Industrial Development, Artisan Artifacts & Environment Comoros	10 July 2013
Alid Mohamed, CBS	Permanent Secretary/GEF OFP	Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources Office of the Permanent Secretary – Environment Kenya	21 May 2013
Ralalaharisoa Christine Edmee	Director General of Environment/GEF OFP	General Directorate of Environment Madagascar	16 May 2013
Ali Mansoor	Financial Secretary and GEF OFP	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development Mauritius	4 July 2013
Marilia Telma Antonio Manjate	GEF OFP	Ministry of the Coordination of Environmental Affairs Cooperation Directorate Mozambique	14 June 2013
Didier Dogley	Special Advisor to the Minister and GEF OFP	Ministry of Environment and Energy Seychelles	6 May 2013
Ahmed Mohamed Iman	Director General, Fisheries and Environment/GEF OFP	Ministry of National Resources Somalia	8 May 2013
Zaheer Fakir	Chief Policy Advisor: International Governance & Relations and GEF OFP	Department of Environmental Affairs South Africa	19 June 2013
Julius Ningu	Director, Environment and GEF OFP	Vice-President's Office Tanzania	21 st May 2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator		18 May 2016	Akiko Yamamoto	+251 91 250 3316	akiko.yamamoto@undp.org

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Not Applicable
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17): 2.5. Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation 1.3. Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: IW Objective 2: Catalyse multistate cooperation to rebuild marine fisheries and reduce pollution of coasts and Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) while considering climatic variability and change
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 2.1. Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) incorporates ecosystem-based approaches to management of LMEs, ICM principles and policy/legal/ institutional reforms into national/local plans Outcome 2.2. Institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management for LMEs and local ICM frameworks demonstrate sustainability
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 2.1: Implementation of national/local reforms; functioning of national inter-ministry committees. Indicator 2.2: Cooperation frameworks adopted & include sustainable financing

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
Project Objective: To achieve effective long-term ecosystem management in the western Indian Ocean LMEs in line with the Strategic Action programme as endorsed by the participating countries						
Component 1: Supporting Policy Harmonization and	Outcome 1.1 Policy, legislative and institutional reforms and realignment in support of the SAP are	Ecosystem-Based Management not effectively captured within current policy, legislation or	Adoption of revised legislation and policy reforms and realignments at national (and, where appropriate, regional levels) to capture the overall ecosystem based management approach	Legislative and Policy Reforms in line with SAP and its implementation are taken through due national process for inclusion in national	Revisions and improvements to legislation and policy relevant to ocean governance clearly	All countries have the capacity to form national intersectoral policy and technical level committees

WIO LME SAPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
Management Reforms towards improved Ocean Governance	implemented at national and regional level as appropriate, with emphasis given to strengthening and supporting existing processes and mechanisms including regional bodies (such as Conventions, Commissions, and Regional Scientific Bodies). Coordination and management mechanism are strengthened at both national and regional levels	<p>institutional management mechanisms. (Lack of capacity). Where appropriate structures exist, they are often poorly implemented.</p> <p>Regional Bodies accept need for closer collaboration within a Strategic Action Programme to deliver an effective EBM approach for the WIO LMEs</p> <p>Countries need capacity building and assistance at regional and national level to deliver SAP Implementation, especially in areas related to monitoring and scientific studies. The WIO LMEs area is a vast area of coastline and ocean that has not been studied at all in any detail or depth (until WIOLAB, SWIOFP and ASCLME Projects came along)</p> <p>Cost benefits and values of ecosystem goods and services have not been included effectively with the region in multi-sectoral or economic and development</p>	<p>Assistance to countries to meet national commitments to regional and global Agreements, Conventions and Protocols, as well as the need for more vigorous monitoring and compliance/enforcement. Ensure effective implementation thereof.</p> <p>Support to the development/adoption of appropriate regional and national intersectoral institutional management mechanisms to ensure ongoing SAP Implementation</p> <p>Mechanisms developed to capture the various information products (such as adaptive management/policy reform guidelines and Annual Ecosystem Monitoring Reports) arising from the science-based management and governance mechanisms and anchored institutionally at both the national and regional level,</p> <p>Outputs from Ecosystem Valuations adopted into national economic development and to advise policy reforms</p> <p>Outputs from Marine Spatial planning processes (including lessons from UNEP GEF WIOLaB SAP Implementation Project and reporting from Nairobi Convention) adopted as part of effective broad-scale LME management and governance mechanisms, and implemented where feasible</p> <p>National Action Programmes derived and elaborated from MEDAs (with clear policy reforms identified and initiated at the national level in support of regional SAPs)</p>	<p>legislation and policy, with appropriate institutional and / or administrative capacity development and realignment as required and including appropriate SAP-relevant implementation of international / regional / RFMO / IGO / Convention / Protocol regulations.</p> <p>Regional SAP Implementation Policy (PSC) and Technical (STAP) Committees established (with membership from all participating countries) and driving SAP Implementation through frequent meetings, dialogue and agreements on action and monitoring changes and variability in the LMEs and implications for communities</p> <p>Regional SAP Implementation Technical Committee advising Policy Committee on results of monitoring processes and consequent adaptive management requirements and policy options</p> <p>National Level LME SAP Intersectoral Committees established (or evolved from existing bodies) in each country and A) ensuring the LME SAP management concept is followed at national level while B) providing input to regional SAP Implementation Policy Committee</p> <p>National Level Technical Committees established (or evolved from existing bodies) and overseeing national monitoring programmes A) guide adaptive management</p>	<p>captured and gazetted through government channels</p> <p>Revisions and improvements at regional level clearly documented within meetings and CoPs of Conventions / Protocols / IGOs / RFMOs</p> <p>Minutes from appropriate established intersectoral (steering/ technical / policy) bodies at national and regional levels reflect frequency of meetings and monitor effectiveness of guidelines and actions taken to implement the SAP and to deliver an ecosystem-based approach for WIO LMEs; appropriate intercessional communication / activities are documented</p> <p>Advisory documents sent from National and Regional Technical Committees to National and Regional Policy Committees</p> <p>National and Regional Committees have an active M&E process to 'track' adaptive management measures and policy responses and to feedback into the Science-Based Governance data capture and review process</p> <p>New national and regional institutional or administrative arrangements adopted</p>	<p>An appropriate regional Scientific Body needs to be in existence and identified as well as to have the capacity to carry out such a tracking and evaluation process</p> <p>Policy, management and legislative reforms can be effectively realised in all countries during the lifespan of the project</p> <p>National and regional institutions will participate to the extent required</p> <p>Adequate capacity for MCS exists or can be developed within the available budget</p> <p>MEDA information needs to be up-to-date and complemented by recent valuations of ecosystem goods and services</p> <p>Countries are willing to develop and adopt appropriate NAPs based on MEDA information</p> <p>Measurable changes in EQOs can be realised / detected in</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
		management and policy decisions		<p>decisions and policy options at country level and B) that feed into the overall regional WIO LME monitoring programme through the regional Technical Committee.</p> <p>Ecosystem valuation and cost-benefit updates influencing national economic development plans as well as policies in various related sectors</p> <p>MEDA outputs and conclusions captured within appropriate National Action Plans (Economic, (I)CZM, ocean policy, local community development plans) and influencing policy decisions that support overall regional SAP Implementation and vision; regular revisions of regional TDA</p>	<p>(where appropriate and deemed necessary by mandated regional bodies and countries)</p> <p>Strengthened MCS activities supporting successful implementation of Protocols/ Conventions/ Legislation show positive impacts on EQOs</p> <p>Formal linkages and lines of communication established between appropriate academic & scientific institutes/bodies and management organisations at both national and regional levels to ensure reliable communication of adaptive management guidelines and policy options</p> <p>Appropriate Ecosystem-Based National Action Plans negotiated and adopted based on MEDA recommendations, ecosystem valuation and cost-benefit results and linked into national economic development policies</p>	<p>the timeframe of the project</p>
	<p>Outcome 1.2</p> <p>Technical and institutional capacity developed to deliver Knowledge-Based Governance approaches by delivering scientific results to management and policy makers for adaptive management decision-making</p>	<p>Insufficient regional capacity for sustainable SAP implementation in a number of skill areas</p> <p>Capacity development needs to focus on institutions rather than just individuals in order to ensure</p>	<p>Regional, National and Local Ecosystem Indicator Monitoring Programme (Using WIOSEA partnerships) to support adaptive, dynamic management and decision-making process (to include indicators of ecosystem variability, climate change, socioeconomic status, community livelihoods and welfare, etc.)</p> <p>Regional standards negotiated for marine water quality and associated EQOs in partnership with the appropriate mandated</p>	<p>Effective Science-Based Governance mechanisms adopted at both national and regional level and anchored through appropriate institutions</p> <p>Adaptive management recommendations acted on by governments and by regional intergovernmental bodies as appropriate</p>	<p>Annual review of Science-Based Governance mechanisms and approaches by an appropriate regional scientific body and recommendations sent to Regional and National Level Policy and Scientific Committees</p>	<p>Assumes that In-country capacity available and sufficient for undertaking standard ecosystem indicator and other monitoring programmes</p> <p>Similarly, assumes that countries have capacity to undertake</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
		<p>ongoing sustainability</p> <p>Data and Information management / handling / dissemination / insufficiently rigorous and not harmonised throughout the region</p>	<p>bodies (e.g. IGOs, Conventions, national counterparts)</p> <p>Marine Spatial Planning capacity developed and techniques enhanced (working closely with UNEP GEF WIOLaB SAP Implementation Project and other partners) to support and guide the designation of management areas as part of a dynamic management process (with a focus on zoning of marine coastal areas and development of community management frameworks for those zones – to link in with development of LED plans where possible and appropriate)</p> <p>Harmonised regional data and information management, handling and distribution</p> <p>Development and adoption of an active Peer review process for Trend identification for dynamic management decisions and to guide policy realignment/reform</p> <p>Adaptive management & policy reform guidelines disseminated (with a 'feedback' process adopted to guide monitoring and data analysis priorities)</p> <p>Use of Cost Benefit Analyses and Ecosystem Valuations in national economic development plans (and as part of NAPs) and to advise management processes and justify policy/legal reforms</p> <p>Collaborate closely with UNEP GEF WIOLaB SAP Implementation Project to strengthen capacity for communities to engage in participatory Marine Spatial Planning and associated management</p>	<p>Policy guideline options adopted by national governments and regional bodies /conventions /commissions as appropriate</p> <p>Regional Ecosystem Indicator Monitoring Programme negotiated at regional level, adopted by countries and implemented at both national and regional levels, reflecting cooperation with TWAP, AoA and other partners for indicator development.</p> <p>In close collaboration with the Nairobi Convention Secretariat, develop a formal water quality monitoring programme adopted at regional and national levels with regionally agreed compatible indicators reflecting TWAP and AoA, in close collaboration with UNEP</p> <p>Regional standards and limits/indicators or guidelines adopted for microbial contaminants, alien and exotic species, ship and platform based solid and liquid waste discharges and oil and other hazardous chemicals (taking into account existing conventions such as LDC, Ballast Water Convention, other MARPOL conventions and protocols)</p> <p>Marine spatial planning adopted by all countries as a tool for Science-to-Governance mechanisms and translating data and knowledge into management and policy responses</p>	<p>Annual monitoring reports from each country and annual regional consolidated report (with extrapolation and guidance for national and regional adaptive management)</p> <p>National monitoring measures and capacity in place at pilot sites to demonstrate compliance with standards for contaminants, alien and exotic species, oil and hazardous chemicals and waste discharges</p> <p>National adoption of regional standards for marine spatial planning as a national requirement under ocean policy and IC(Z)M legislation</p> <p>Regional data and information management, handling, access and distribution agreement relating to SAP information and SAP implementation negotiated and adopted by the countries</p> <p>Peer Review body / mechanism agreed and adopted through formal document of Agreement with other SAP bodies</p> <p>Marine Spatial Planning framework adopted by all countries as reflected in meeting reports, and demonstrated in pilot sites.</p>	<p>Marine Spatial Planning and other Science-to-Governance processes</p> <p>Countries may not be willing to share data or allow access to national data</p> <p>Assumes that managers and particularly decision-makers will acknowledge management guidelines and policy briefs and act on them</p> <p>All countries can accept and implement a standardised Marine Spatial Planning approach as part of their economic development strategy</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
				<p>Marine spatial planning adopted as a zoning, regulatory and management practice for coastal and marine resources and activities by countries as and where feasible and through regional standards</p> <p>Integrated regional mechanism for data handling (as a formal agreement) with national nodes identified</p> <p>Effective Peer Review process developed (and agreed / adopted by countries at SAP technical and policy level) which can identify trends in changes in the LMEs that affect the SAP implementation and which need acting on</p> <p>Regular process of management guidelines and policy briefs/updates from peer review body / process going to SAP Technical and Policy level bodies at both national and regional level updates of MEDAs</p> <p>Adoption of a standardised regional approach and implementation at the national level of assessment techniques for evaluation ecosystem goods and services and cost-benefits of the ecosystem-based management approach in parallel with local and national economic development planning</p> <p>National adoption and delivery of regional standards for</p>	<p>Management guidelines and policy briefs minuted in records of national and regional level SAP administration / implementation bodies</p> <p>Feedback processes from options selected for adaptive management and policy realignment minuted and feedback given to Peer Review body and technical bodies to fine-tune research requirements</p> <p>Regular Policy briefings provided by countries and to countries on ecosystem value of goods and services and cost-benefits of EBM (using data from MEDAs and TDA updates)</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
				reporting of altering trends in ecosystem goods and services along with cost benefit analysis, and integration of results/conclusions into NAPs		
	<p>Outcome 1.3 Collaborative and cooperative mechanisms agreed and strengthened between national, regional and global partners and stakeholders</p>	<p>A multitude of regional organisations, bodies and associations exist. Some of these have bilateral arrangements for coordination and activities but many do not. SAP Implementation will require activities to be undertaken by the appropriate responsible and mandated bodies but will also require effective cooperation and collaboration at the regional level through appropriate formal bodies that currently do not exist but which the SAP document proposes to create (i.e. a Regional Policy Body and Technical Body)</p> <p>There are limited resources currently available to many of the responsible bodies and organisations to carry activities and functions related to SAP implementation</p>	<p>Assist strengthening of mechanisms for coordination of SAP implementation at regional level through support to the existing responsible IGOs and other mandated regional bodies (i.e. Nairobi Convention, SWIOFC, IOC-UNESCO, WIOMSA, COI-IOC)</p> <p>Coordination and facilitation of partnerships developed under WIOSEA to deliver priority activities as defined in the SAP document; delivery of a strengthened and expanded WIOSEA partnership in support of ongoing SAP Implementation</p> <p>Re-establish and formalise the Regional Project Coordination Forum; facilitate and support biennial LME Science Symposium; Facilitate and support WIO LME Donor and Partner conferences with appropriate stakeholder involvement</p> <p>Provide feedback from various scientific and technical meetings into the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) of the SAP (under 1.1.3 above)</p>	<p>Mutual collaborative and cooperative activities defined through MoUs and work-plans / road-maps</p> <p>Reciprocal membership and attendance of SAPPHIRE in various Steering Committees and Technical Committees / IGO / RFMO / scientific working groups</p> <p>WIOSEA partnerships consolidated under a single working arrangement that extends also to supporting the WIO LME SAP implementation needs of various national and regional institutions and bodies</p> <p>Revival of the Regional Project Coordination Forum (Mauritius 2008) through agreement with the various regional institutes and projects (possibly anchored through WIOMSA) and with clear objectives</p> <p>Regular reporting to STAP on outputs from various scientific and technical meetings for STAP consideration and further guidance to Regional SAP Steering Committee</p>	<p>Records of meetings held/attended</p> <p>MoUs signed between SAPPHIRE Project and appropriate IGOs / regional organisations identifying areas where support from SAPPHIRE project can assist regional bodies in implementing SAP</p> <p>Adoption of a single Alliance arrangement for collaboration and for cooperation and support of ongoing SAP Implementation</p> <p>Minutes and Actions from regular (Biennial) meetings of the Regional Project Coordination Forum with evaluation of delivery of actions and any decisions by an anchoring institution</p> <p>Formal reports to STAP and STAP minutes record discussions and input to SAP Steering Committee</p>	<p>Requires close collaboration and cooperation between SAPPHIRE, as a funding activity, and the appropriate responsible regional bodies mandated to oversee coastal and marine resource and ecosystem management</p> <p>WIOSEA partners need to be agreeable to a single agreement that can facilitate assistance and support to the national and regional bodies responsible for SAP implementation</p>
<p>Component 2 Reduction through Community Engagement and</p>	<p>Outcome 2.1 Integrating the Ecosystem-based Management approach into Local Economic Development Plans at</p>	<p>Countries need capacity development at a national, regional and local level to</p>	<p>Support to the countries to revise and implement selected LED plans into LED-EBM plans and activities</p>	<p>Selection criteria developed and used to identify pilot/demonstration communities for LED-EBM</p>	<p>Minutes from meetings, clear action plans, experts appointed, selected LED-EBM plans completed</p>	<p>All countries have the capacity to participate. Local experts are present and available to participate. WIOMSA</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
Empowerment in Sustainable Resources Management	selected communities Pilot level and stress reduction demonstrated and captured for replication (including community stakeholder engagement and awareness of LME Goods and Services	<p>complete the LED plans</p> <p>Local Economic Development (LED) plans do not adequately capture the ecosystem approach, including stress reduction</p> <p>Ecosystem cost benefits of goods and services not clear in current LED framework</p> <p>LED plans require a clear link between artisanal fisheries development and broader goals including alternative livelihoods</p> <p>Community stakeholder awareness of LME goods and services not widespread</p> <p>Countries are not able to effectively implement the LED plans or undertake informed participatory ecosystem based management approaches</p>	<p>Mechanisms developed to fully capture the ecosystem approach into the LED plans incorporating stress reduction mechanisms – creation of LED-EBM “toolkit”</p> <p>Cost benefit analysis undertaken and outcomes incorporated into LED-EBM plans</p> <p>Broader goals at a community level fully incorporated into the LED-EBM plans</p> <p>Communities sensitised to values of LME Goods and Services</p> <p>Community-level input into management and policy dialogue through appropriate involvement of community leaders or other effective mechanisms</p> <p>Selected LED-EBM plans are effectively implemented by the end of the project</p> <p>Capture of best lessons and practices for use by countries in further development and implementation of ecosystem-based LEDs</p>	<p>Experts identified and LED-EBM committee minutes reflect clear action points. Clear, viable mechanisms developed to incorporate the ecosystem approach. LED-EBM plans reflect the ecosystem approach</p> <p>LED Committee established (with membership from all participating countries) and driving selected pilot LED-EBM development through frequent meetings, dialogue and agreements on action. Regional and Country experts identified and appointed to drive the pilot projects</p> <p>Local and regional capacity is developed as appropriate and gender issues are fully incorporated into plans</p> <p>Experts identified and appointed to work with the communities in undertaking cost benefit analysis. Cost benefit analysis process and mechanism understood by communities and clear participation in the process through workshops. Cost benefit analysis completed for all selected communities</p> <p>LED-EBM committee to appoint a focus group to identify and develop the linkages between artisanal fisheries and broader community goals. Local experts well versed in broad community based development work appointed to the pilot projects. Framework for the process agreed. Broader goals</p>	<p>Local participants are identified for capacity development. Regional capacity building Committee (as identified in the SAP) identifies and coordinates activities. Local participants trained</p> <p>Experts appointed, mechanism adopted by communities, workshops undertaken, cost benefit analysis results incorporated into the LED plans</p> <p>Ratio of women in decision-making positions in the common interest groups</p> <p>Communication strategy developed (and implemented, where feasible). The number of communities to be approached clearly demarcated. Interventions like radio, workshops and television to have estimates of audience numbers clearly denoted in reports</p> <p>Selected LED-EBM plans complete. Implementation of selected aspects underway by year 2</p> <p>Reports provided to countries (via STAP and Regional SAP SteerCom) on best lessons and practices for ecosystem-based LED development and implementation</p>	<p>will be able to assist with the process</p> <p>Communities accept the requirement to revisit the current LED plans and spend the time incorporating the ecosystem approach</p> <p>Communities are able to understand and participate in the cost benefit analysis. Experts are available to be able to undertake the study. Local expertise will be important</p> <p>Community experts with a broad knowledge base can be identified and appointed.</p> <p>The communities are widespread and not easy to get to. Any communications strategy must be able to access the greatest possible number. It is assumed that there will be a multi-focused approach to achieve the objectives</p> <p>Countries have the capacity to begin implementing selected aspects of the plans. It is anticipated to work with other regional bodies/projects in the implementation</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
				<p>incorporated into the LED plans</p> <p>LED-EBM “deployment toolkit” created and available for dissemination / replication</p> <p>A communication strategy developed and undertaken broadly across the region</p> <p>Regional LED-EBM committee has chosen the plans that have the best chance of immediate implementation. Plans are being implemented by year 3</p> <p>Lessons and practices captured from implementation of plans and A. reported to IW:LEARN and B. circulated to countries for use in further development and implementation of ecosystem-based LEDs</p>	<p>Reports provided to IW:LEARN on best lessons and practices for ecosystem-based LED development and implementation</p>	<p>process such as SMARTFISH, SWIOFISH, FAO, WWF and WIOMSA</p>
	<p>Outcome 2.2</p> <p>Stress reduction through ecosystem-based practices among artisanal and subsistence fisheries</p>	<p>Broad information on different categories of small scale fishing communities in the region not available and no current overview of past, present and planned interventions.</p> <p>Without a sound knowledge of the social structure and local governance mechanisms within communities rational decisions on intervention are not possible</p>	<p>A suite of social and ecological context criteria for distinguishing between different types of fishing communities in the region developed and an overview of activities in the region compiled</p> <p>The spatial structure of different types of fishing communities in the regions, providing GIS referenced information.</p> <p>Criteria are developed to provide a mechanism to choose appropriate communities</p> <p>Local regional selection panel established and four communities chosen.</p> <p>Local knowledge systems of each community are fully understood in the context of possible interventions.</p>	<p>Clear social and ecological criteria are established.</p> <p>A comprehensive overview of all pertinent activities is compiled</p> <p>GIS referenced fishing community types is compiled and useful for selecting communities for interventions</p> <p>Communities chosen are suitable and representative of the criteria developed</p> <p>Regional selection panel established</p>	<p>Criteria are used to clearly differentiate between types of fishing communities in the region</p> <p>Interventions do not overlap with existing and planned interventions in the region</p> <p>Spatial structure of communities is used to select suitable communities for interventions. Initial discussions with government agencies are initiated.</p> <p>Selection panel is successful, and</p>	<p>Communities are willing to cooperate in the local area management of artisanal fisheries</p> <p>National Governments are willing to engage communities and artisanal fishing groups into the national fisheries management process</p> <p>Local Economic Development Plans are available or under development which can be fine-tuned and revised.</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
		<p>The contribution of artisanal fisheries to food security is threatened by reducing catches, stock depletion, user conflicts (e.g. tourism), a localised high level of exploitation and habitat destruction, resulting from inappropriate gear/methods and climate change (e.g. Dynamite fishing, coral bleaching, industrial pollution, coastal discharges)</p>	<p>Concrete steps taken to address key issues at selected demonstration sites</p> <p>Selected interventions undertaken to demonstrate more effective access to information and more effective use of information for management and sustainability</p> <p>Delivery and adoption of Artisanal Fisheries Management Plans (AFMPs) for selected demo sites</p> <p>Community-level AFMPs incorporated into overall national fisheries management strategies/plans</p> <p>Demonstrate the integration of local fisheries management improvements and strategies into Local Economic Development Plans</p> <p>MCS strategies refined through testing and implementation in selected demonstration sites concentrating on Local Fisheries Management (in conjunction with SMARTFISH and other regional partners)</p> <p>Agreed policy and selected training undertaken in conjunction with regional partners</p> <p>Improved BMU governance and efficiency</p>	<p>Local communities are fully involved in the process of selecting and implementing interventions (including active and equitable involvement of women and youth)</p> <p>Regular data collection from local fisheries management areas and communities feeding into fisheries reviews and management processes</p> <p>Overall National fisheries management plans in Demos site countries include community-level Artisanal Fisheries Management plans</p> <p>Regular socioeconomic reports on the contribution of artisanal and recreational fisheries to the economies and region completed</p> <p>Local Economic Development Plans refined toward a more ecosystem-based management approach including artisanal fisheries components and recognising socioeconomic value of small-scale fisheries sector</p> <p>Improved capacities for MCS at selected demonstration sites acting as 'best lessons' for replication</p> <p>Training programmes on 'priority' issues (as agreed with communities) undertaken</p>	<p>interventions are proposed</p> <p>Interventions are accepted at the local community level</p> <p>Policy briefs on importance of coastal fisheries (artisanal, small scale, recreational) prepared and disseminated</p> <p>Artisanal fisheries data incorporated into annual catch statistics and into annual planning meetings and processes</p> <p>LEDs revised and reflecting EBM approaches to locally managed fisheries as well as socioeconomic issues related to community-level fisheries and potential for credits and micro-financing identified</p> <p>Specific report (possibly a section in LEDs) advising on gear improvements, catch handling, storage etc. to improve value</p> <p>Government paper (where appropriate) on use of rights-based fisheries to improve livelihoods of communities while evolving better management of local area artisanal fishing</p> <p>National and regional training programmes</p>	

WIO LME SAPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
					agreed and delivered with feedback to Governments and regional IGOs	
<p>Component 3</p> <p>Stress Reduction through Private Sector/Industry Commitment to transformations in their operations and management practices</p>	<p>Outcome 3.1</p> <p>Private Sector participation in SAP implementation and through risk reduction and contingency response mechanisms using public-private sector partnership agreements along with regional partners (Nairobi Convention, WWF, IUCN, etc.). Furthermore, facilitate the adoption and implementation of mechanisms which would aim to facilitate Private Sector engagement in SAP Implementation, ecosystem monitoring and associated stress reduction activities. The Private Sector will work with SAPHIRE and its partners to 'mainstream' the ecosystem approach into their daily activities so as to reduce and mitigate (negative) impacts on EQOs</p>	<p>No existing Private Sector participation in SAP Implementation; no systematic involvement of Private Sector in data capture, analysis and dissemination (although some ad hoc "vessel of opportunity" occurs); no formal programme of self-regulation by industry; private sector not generally directly involved with implementing various international Conventions; no existing, functional regional emergency control/coordination centre.</p> <p>Private Sector companies generally unaware of LME concept; do not "mainstream" it within their activities.</p>	<p>PPP Scientific and Management Body established and accepted within overall SAP management process</p> <p>Private Sector fully engaged in data collection, analysis, co-management and impact monitoring across relevant sectors.</p> <p>Private Sector self-regulates activities to achieve stress reduction within LME</p> <p>Private Sector demonstrates innovative involvement in meeting / exceeding commitments to regional / global Conventions and their associated Protocols, Guidelines and Activities.</p> <p>Private Sector companies recognise the LME Approach and "mainstream" it (and support of the SAP implementation process) into their everyday activities with recognition of the need to reduce and maintain accepted limits of impacts on EQOs.</p> <p>Full Strategic Environmental Assessment of the oil and gas development and concession areas initiated through a broad stakeholder discussion (and appropriate funding and monitoring processes adopted)</p> <p>Identification of a mechanism or forum that can facilitate inter-country dialogue and decision-making with respect to impacts from the oil and gas industry in the region. This could be a function of specialised working groups under the STAP and/or Regional Policy Steering Committee.</p> <p>A Regional Response Centre exists which can effectively and swiftly coordinate regional responses to emergencies, with a focus on shipping (SOLAS/Search and Rescue; Maritime Domain Awareness) and</p>	<p>PPP Scientific and Management body functional and operating within SAP management structures</p> <p>Appropriate Agreements created and mechanisms implemented to ensure private sector participation in impact monitoring and mitigation activities</p> <p>Data from SO-SI actively included in data assessments and reviews of impacts (i.e. through MEDA-TDA updates as well as through regular Ecosystem indicator Monitoring programme and Science-to-Governance processes)</p> <p>Ongoing deployment of instrumentation by / on board private sector vessels and other platforms</p> <p>Self-regulation process adopted with a focus on achieving improvements in ecosystem health through measurable stress reduction / EQO impacts.</p> <p>Private Sector adopts and takes action to meet (as appropriate) the sectorally relevant global and regional Conventions & Protocols (e.g. IMO / GloBallast / MARPOL / CLC / OPRC / UNCLOS etc.).</p> <p>Collaboration with other regional partners (e.g. WWF, Nairobi Convention, etc.) on undertaking a regional SEA to be conducted for the entire oil and gas development region</p>	<p>Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Terms of Reference</p> <p>Reports of activities</p> <p>Existence of appropriate Policies and legal instruments.</p> <p>Deployed instrumentation contributes to databases & regional monitoring & decision-making (input into Science-to-Governance processes)</p> <p>EIA processes are entrenched within countries</p> <p>Existence of regional centre, as shown by regional Agreements, physical existence and ongoing maintenance and demonstrated ability to respond, along with demonstration of supportive policy instruments and other activities.</p> <p>Working group or similar forum established for regional dialogue on oil and gas industry impacts and issues</p>	<p>Private Sector organisations will be willing to participate.</p> <p>Country stakeholders will be willing to participate (e.g. by allowing Private Sector input into the relevant regional fora).</p> <p>Adequate financial (cash) and in-kind contributions commensurate to the scale of required interventions can be realised.</p> <p>Smaller companies can be effectively identified and reached.</p> <p>Other stakeholders (e.g. scientific/technical organisations) will welcome participation by private sector.</p> <p>Multilateral agreements can be brokered.</p> <p>Countries will have capacity to handle potential volume of EIA requests.</p> <p>Ecosystem impacts / stress reduction can be monitored and detected within the timeframe of the project.</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
			<p>response to oil and gas and other marine pollution incidents likely to show effects at transboundary scale, with access to requisite training, materials and expertise and able to facilitate/support responses to national/local events.</p> <p>Bilateral and regional agreements are negotiated to facilitate rapid movement of personnel and equipment without delay through customs and immigration in responding to regional emergencies, supporting the activities of the regional response centre.</p> <p>Coordination with other regional projects and organisations in realising public / private sector partnerships in ocean governance (notably UNEP/WIOSAP).</p>	<p>(strong focus on the northern Mozambique Channel)</p> <p>Close inter-country dialogue developed through a formal working mechanism</p> <p>Regional Response Centre created and staffed, with access to sufficient equipment and chemical stores to respond to threats in time with supportive communications equipment, real-time information resources, databases, equipment, training and regular test exercises conducted with appropriate regional legal/institutional/policy frameworks in place.</p> <p>Partnership agreed with appropriate hazardous spill contingency planning and response organisations and specialists (such as ITOPF, IPIECA and IMO)</p> <p>Industrial Fisheries Sector contributes to overall Private Sector involvement in SAP implementation, with Industrial fisheries representation on appropriate bodies; other relevant maritime companies not well represented in WOC encouraged to consider joining it</p> <p>Private Sector involvement demonstrated in SAP implementation and ecosystem-based management; the LME Approach understood & implemented within maritime companies</p> <p>Evidence of the Use of "triple bottom line" accounting and / or other clear indication of</p>		

WIO LME SAPPHERE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
				"mainstreaming" ecosystem concerns within management demonstrated.		
Component 4 Delivering Best Practices and Lessons through Innovative Ocean Governance Demonstrations	Outcome 4.1 Identifying Innovative Management options for High Seas areas within LMEs	ABNJ and proposed ECS areas within LME management boundaries currently not 'managed' through any agreements or partnership arrangements – yet activities along the ABNJ boundaries with EEZs inevitably have transboundary effects and management and/or exploitation of ECS will also have transboundary consequences	<p>A High Seas Policy Development Group established to negotiate with stakeholders and users of ABNJ</p> <p>New management initiatives negotiated and adopted (where appropriate) for ABNJ that fall within LME management area (through Alliance/Partnerships)</p> <p>Specific voluntary management and regulatory approaches agreed for high seas VMEs under threat of impact, also using the partnership/alliance approach).</p> <p>Support and pilot the negotiation and designation of high seas benthic/seamount MPAs as important ecological areas</p> <p>Identify financial mechanisms to support management strategies for ABNJ</p> <p>Cooperate and collaborate closely with UNEP on Marine Spatial Planning needs and development related to ABNJ</p> <p>New management practices evolved for ABNJ and ECS areas</p>	<p>Alliances and partnerships evolved and tested between countries bordering ABNJ and stakeholders using or traversing ABNJ (high seas waters) that fall within LME management boundaries</p> <p>Marine Spatial Planning concepts and processes/practices adopted for high seas areas within LME management boundary</p> <p>Voluntary regulatory agreements adopted with resource users and stakeholders operating within the LME/ABNJ areas</p> <p>Specific management strategies and designations (MPAs, BPAs, VMEs) negotiated and agreed with ABNJ stakeholders</p> <p>Financial mechanisms identified and implemented for monitoring of sensitive and managed areas within LME-ABNJ and to support and ensure compliance mechanisms</p> <p>Proposed ECS and CAHSA management strategies approved by participating countries as 'best practices'</p> <p>Close collaboration with other regional and global bodies directly involved in development of ABNJ management approaches (e.g.</p>	<p>Formal agreements for cooperation in various management and regulatory processes (e.g. with maritime industry stakeholders)</p> <p>Spatial Planning and Management Strategies identified for ABNJ within LME Management areas</p> <p>Regulatory agreements and compliance monitoring processes adopted by all stakeholders as part of an ABNJ 'Cooperative-Management-through-Alliance' process</p> <p>Regulatory agreements linked to agreed, adopted MPAs, BPAs and VMEs as part of overall Stakeholder Alliance formal decisions</p> <p>ABNJ-LME Technical Management Group adopted for WIO LMEs</p> <p>Standardised ECS and CAHSA Management Strategies published as guidelines for all countries</p>	<p>Assumes that currently non-regulated stakeholders are willing to cooperate in management and regulatory partnerships for ABNJ</p> <p>Will require closer collaboration and cooperation between 'agencies' that currently view themselves as having primary jurisdiction over development of high seas management processes</p> <p>Such collaborative partnerships can be developed through trust but may require actual brokering from the maritime sector stakeholders to resolve</p>

WIO LME SAPPHERE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
				FAO, UNEP, IUCN, DOALAS, etc.)		
	<p>Outcome 4.2 Demonstrating effective ocean policy implementation with emphasis on marine spatial planning, intersectoral cooperation, adoption of a blue ocean economy approach, innovative management mechanisms and capture of lessons for transfer and replication</p> <p>N.B. It should be noted that, under Outcome 4.2. One separate deliverable (4.2.1 - Identifying Innovative Management options for High Seas areas within LMEs) will be implemented through a separate UNDP Project Document (see Section 5 – Management Arrangements for further explanation).</p>	<p>Marine spatial planning is not currently a standard methodology or requirement as a tool to support a blue economic approach and ocean policy and governance <i>per se</i></p> <p>No management mechanism currently exists (yet) for the ECS area – although an Agreement and Joint Commission are in place.</p>	<p>Support to Mauritius and Seychelles for improved planning, coordination and management capacity for the joint management of their shared Extended Continental Shelf</p> <p>Strengthened technical and managerial capacity for marine spatial planning in close collaboration with UNEP and the WIOLaB SAP implementation Project</p> <p>A data and information system established and supported by a data capture and gap-filling programme</p> <p>Best lessons and practices for joint ECS management captured</p> <p>Spatial Management exercises completed and subsequent Ocean Policy developed (South Africa)</p> <p>Coordinated sectoral ocean and coastal ecosystem management approach (South Africa)</p> <p>Integrated Environmental Planning adopted as a mechanism (South Africa)</p> <p>Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (South Africa)</p> <p>Best Lessons and Practices Publication (in collaboration with IW:LEARN) on development of national Ocean Policies</p> <p>Marine Spatial Planning within the Blue Economy framework demonstrated at selected localised areas within countries</p> <p>Best Lessons and Practices for MSP within Blue Economy framework captured (in</p>	<p>Detailed capture of baseline data within a focused transboundary diagnostic analysis for the Joint Management area</p> <p>Additional data capture undertaken as required by Joint Management Commission (JMC) and results extrapolated into an initial management strategy</p> <p>Long-term monitoring programme for Joint Management Area developed by JMC and countries with support from SAPPHERE and other appropriate bodies</p> <p>A Joint Management Strategy refined and adopted by the countries</p> <p>Institutional arrangements within and between the two countries evolved by JMC and strengthened as appropriate</p> <p>Negotiations with non-country stakeholders over management of adjacent ABNJ area (Saya de Malha Bank)</p> <p>Formal adoption of an Ocean Policy for South Africa</p> <p>Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services established in South Africa</p>	<p>A specific TDA document drafted and adopted by JMC for the Joint Management area to guide development of a management strategy</p> <p>Best Lessons and Practices for Joint Management of an Extended Continental Shelf and adjacent ABNJ captured in a formal report/publication</p> <p>Results of data capture exercises analysed and conclusions used to advise on management process</p> <p>Data reviews and studies published by countries and JMC as they feel appropriate</p> <p>A formal Joint Management Strategy adopted by the two countries for the ECS</p> <p>A proposed management strategy adopted by the two countries for the adjacent ABNJ</p> <p>Management strategy for adjacent ABNJ area (Saya de Malha Bank) negotiated and operational within an Alliance or partnership with non-country stakeholders</p>	<p>Principle risk will be full agreement by JMC of two countries to collaborate with SAPPHERE and any other partners in collection of data and translation of data into draft management plans and strategy</p> <p>Countries and private sector groups will agree to act on voluntary practices</p> <p>SAPPHERE and two countries (JMC) need to agree on a firm policy of data handling and ownership to recognise any sensitivities over resource management</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Project Strategy				Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Delivery	Outcome	Baseline	Output			
			collaboration with IW:LEARN) and made available at a global level	<p>Best Lessons and Practices for Ocean Policy Development published</p> <p>Blue Economy frameworks adopted at local community levels</p> <p>Best Lessons and Practices for MSP within Blue Economy framework available on IW:LEARN website</p>	<p>Cabinet minutes / proceedings confirm adoption of an Ocean Policy for South Africa</p> <p>Formal documentation confirming the establishment of an Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform</p> <p>Best Lessons and Practices for Ocean Policy Development available on IW:LEARN website</p>	
<p>Component 5 Capacity Development to Realize improved ocean governance in the WIO region</p> <p>(Please note that this component will be closely linked and aligned with IW:LEARN and at least 1% of the GEF grant will be allocated to supporting IW:LEARN activities)</p>	<p>Outcome 5.1 Capacity for improved Ocean Governance strengthened through training and support</p>	Partnerships for SAP implementation activities have grown successfully but still need more effective coordination and prioritisation	<p>Development of Partnerships (Regional Training Coordination Platform) for Capacity Building for Sustainable Marine Ecosystem Management</p> <p>CB&T priorities agreed and delivered (where feasible) as per MEDAs, TDA, SAP, National Training Plans and Regional Training Needs analysis.</p> <p>WIOSEA partners and countries adopt priority CB&T elements into a work-plan and road-map for capacity development for SAP implementation</p> <p>Specialist training courses in agreed priority areas such as Marine Spatial Planning, Blue Economy, Taxonomy, Ocean Governance, etc.</p> <p>Provide support to country and regional involvement in IndOOS and IOGOOS as appropriate</p> <p>Gender balance and support for under-represented groups targeted</p> <p>Close collaboration with IW:LEARN to deliver lessons learned and best practices to the global LME community</p>	<p>Priorities for Capacity development reviewed at national/regional level in first year of SAPPHIRE project and based original on MEDA-TDA-SAP findings and guidance</p> <p>Capacity development priorities reaffirmed from MEDA-TDA-SAP process</p> <p>Priority needs relating to SAP Implementation identified and responsibilities for support secured from Alliance partners</p> <p>Courses agreed and delivered on priority topics (including the annual IOI Ocean Governance course)</p> <p>Wherever possible, support given to IOGOOS through physical location and/or personnel/resources</p> <p>Gender balance and support as well as support to underrepresented groups and previously disadvantaged groups enshrined in SAPPHIRE business plan and work-plans</p>	<p>Close coordination with Regional Economic Communities engaged into the SAPPHIRE work programme development process (through direct representation)</p> <p>Regional agreement on SAP priorities for Capacity Development along with a road-map for action and a work-plan</p> <p>Specific areas of support and responsibility with Alliance partners captured through formal agreements and letters of intent</p> <p>IOI 4-weekcourse in Ocean Governance delivered, along with regional partners, on an annual basis</p> <p>Regional practitioners and specialists in priority CB&T areas established, specifically for marine spatial planning, blue economy, taxonomy, etc.</p>	<p>Most of these are already captured in the Aide Memoires and Memoranda of Understanding between Alliance Partners and the ASCLME Project; assumes parties to these agreements will be willing to extend them to a single working partnership brokered by SAPPHIRE.</p>

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer’s Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the nine participating countries are eligible for GEF funding	July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes all nine OPFs have endorsed the proposed project.	July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (Including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):			
	• The STAR allocation?			
	• The focal area allocation?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project amount of 10,976,891 is available under the IW focal area. Please do make sure that the amount listed in Table A is not different from the actual proposed project amount (fees and PPG excluded). Please do correct.	July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access			
	• The SCCF (Adaptation of Technology Transfer)?			

⁵ Work Programme Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Nagoua Protocol Investment Fund • Focal area set-aside? 			
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the project is fully aligned with the IW results framework. However, Please consider to rewrite the objective of the project to something along the lines of " To Achieve effective long-term ecosystem management in the Western Indian Ocean LMEs in line with the endorsed Strategic Action Programme. "</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project is fully aligned with the national marine ecosystem diagnostic analyses and will translate these to national actions during project implementation. Please do make sure during preparation that coordination with countries will be undertaken, to maximise country ownership.</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. See points under #7 related to lack of coordination.</p>	<p>Comment was addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet.</p>
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the</p>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the baseline for this project is</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
	<p>baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>sufficiently described. The project will be investing to support and coordinate the NAPs to facilitate regional actions and results.</p>		
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the components, outcomes and outputs in Table B is clear. Please do include wording to support the fact that 1% of the GEF grant will be allocated to support IWLEARN activities. Please do at time of CEO Endorsement include quantifiable outcome and output indicators into the project framework.</p> <p>Please do make sure that during project preparation coordination will be taking place on the use of tools developed and MPAs defined by other GEF funded activities in the region.</p> <p>Under the Component on Stress Reduction, please do make sure to coordinate with other activities in the region, so that there will be no overlap.</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer):</p> <p>Overall A. The Executing Agency is unclear. It is noted as "N/A" in the Request for CEO Endorsement, but then noted as "UNDP Seychelles" in the Pro Doc. Within the Management Arrangements section is noted, "PCU hosted by Government of Seychelles and housed in the UNDP Government of Seychelles Programme Coordination Office," and that the "project will be implemented directly by UNDP". Is UNDP proposing self-execution? Please note this is only allowed under exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>B. There needs to be an explanation of plans for creating a long-term governance strategy that will continue regional efforts following the closure of the project. This may be the plan for the SAP Implementation Policy Steering Committee and STAP, which needs to be noted. Plans for a long-term structure need to be part of</p>	<p>The Execution of the project was a matter of considerable discussion at the Policy Advisory Committee meeting in Jan 2014. The 9 countries formally and unanimously requested UNDP direct implementation and this is minuted in the PAC decision. Following the request, UNDP Mauritius secured the required approval for the Direct Implementation of this project from UNDP HQ.</p> <p>However, following GEF's comment and requests that a regional entity with most relevant mandates execute the project, the Executing Agency be changed from UNDP (direct implementation) to the Nairobi Convention Secretariat. After informal consultation with Nairobi Secretariat who confirmed their interest, UNDP formally approached the countries for their agreement on this new modality. UNDP received no objection from the countries. Subsequently, the</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
		<p>On a general note some of the outputs may be a bit ambitious, e.g. please consider to insert a / into following project output, just after REVISED, before UPDATED: Regional and national marine ecosystem cost-benefit analysis and goods-and services assessments revised/updated and delivered at community level.</p>	<p>the discussion regarding links to the other project structures.</p> <p>C. It also needs to be clear how these new entities relate to existing regional bodies (e.g. SADC, EAC) and there needs to be clear justification for creating these new bodies instead of using existing entities (a major concern raised by STAP at PIF).</p> <p>D. The project is focused around addressing stresses; yet there is very little mention as to what stresses will be addressed. There are plans for working on legislation, policies, engaging the private sector, but not what about. There is reference to the WIO SAP, which identified water quality degradation, habitat and community modification, declines in living marine resources and environmental variability and extreme events. However, these stresses are not discussed in the explanations of outcomes, outputs, deliverables and activities. These need to be discussed throughout the text. This is especially important since there are many similarities with WIOSAP and SWIOFish activities.</p>	<p>Management Arrangements in the Project Document (see P. 137 onwards) have now been formally amended to recognise the Nairobi Convention Secretariat as the Executing Agency for SAPPHIRE Comp 1, 2, 3, 4.1 and 5. This is also reflected in the appropriate Tables and Annexes throughout the document as well as in the CEO Request for Endorsement.</p> <p>It is also noted that, whereas both the Nairobi Convention and the SWIOF Commission were originally listed as a potential member/observer on the Project Steering Committee, FAO was not. FAO has now been added to the list in view of their leading role for the GEF ABNJ project and ABNJ discussions in general which are highly relevant to LMEs</p> <p>The Executing Arrangement for the sub-project focusing the Joint Management Area under the joint custody of Seychelles and Mauritius, which is under Component 4 (Outcome 4.2.) of the SAPPHIRE project was also</p>

WIO LME SAPPHERE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			<p>E. Relatedly, the role of SAPPHERE with respect to WIOSAP and SWIOFish is not clear. Note that while only the first SWIOFish project has been approved (SWIOFish1 for Comoros, Mozambique and Tanzania) others are in the pipeline and, therefore, it is important to clarify coordination plans. (Throughout the following comments, "SWIOFish" will refer to SWIOFish1 and the anticipated rest of the SWIOFish country projects).</p> <p>F. There is mention of these projects and that there were coordination discussions, but not a clear articulation of the respective roles with regard to mutual interests in fisheries and LBS pollution.</p> <p>G. As written there is significant concern that there is overlap between project efforts. Following are several examples of these two concerns (articulation of which stresses and ties to WIOSAP & SWIOFish). These concern needs to be addressed throughout the text not just with respect to these examples.</p> <p>H. Outcome 1.1 policy, legislative and institutional reforms.</p>	<p>revised in line with GEFSEC guidance against UNDP direct implementation. UNDP communicated to the JMC that UNDP direct implementation is no longer an option available for the JMA sub-project. Subsequently JMC decided that the project will be implemented through the Government of Mauritius on behalf of the JMC with UNDP's support when/as required. This is also reflected in the JMA ProDoc.</p> <p>All other #7 issues were addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet.</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			<p>The Output Descriptions for this outcome discusses "changes in legislation policy and associated institutional and administrative arrangements in line with the SAP requirements," as well as "reviews of national legislation." (further described in Deliverable 1.1.5). However it does not state what stresses these policies, legislation and institutions will address. Instead it notes it will be "in line with the intentions of the SAP". The SAP highlights four areas of concern (listed above). In considering how these will be addressed in SAPPHIRE, there seems to be overlap with WIOSAP and SWIOFish. Water quality legislation is addressed in WIOSAP under Outcome B.2. Habitat and community modification is addressed through WIOSAP under Outcome A.1. Fisheries is addressed through SWIOFish1 Component 2. There needs to be clarification of how these efforts are different and explanation of coordination plans.</p> <p>I. In addition, the deliverables for this Outcome 1.1 includes a SAP Implementation Policy Steering Committee, STAP and national intersectoral committees. The relationship between these bodies with regard to similar institutions</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			<p>planned for WIOSAP (Output D.1.3 “ SAP implementation through interministerial committees and regional task forces) and SWIOFish (Component 4 “ Regional and National Steering Committees and Implementation Units) needs to be justified and explained. The SAPPHIRE description only notes for the Steering Committee that it will "complement and interact directly with the UNEP-GEF WIOLAB SAP implementation policy and steering mechanisms" without explaining how.</p> <p>J. And SWIOFish is not mentioned. Given the related interests, it would seem these should be combined as much as possible. Otherwise there needs to be a very clear explanation of why they are split, what each will do and how they will coordinate.</p> <p>K. Outcome 1.2 technical and institutional capacity. This outcome focuses on capacity strengthening and development of effective science-to-governance processes, including monitoring methods and strategies and marine spatial planning techniques. This description seems duplicative with</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			<p>WIOSAP Output D.2.2, which plans to create a science-policy exchange platform related to LBSA and ICZM. Please consider combining efforts to one platform; otherwise justify having two, clarify how these platforms are different and how they will be coordinated.</p> <p>L. Outcome 2.1: Stress reduction through EBM into Local Economic Development Plans. This outcome focuses on community level LEDs to incorporate coastal/ocean EBM approaches. Similar to Component 1, the description does not discuss what stresses will be addressed. While termed differently, this seems duplicative of WIOSAP Outcome A.2 "support coastal planning and management", A.1.2 "management plans developed" and outcome A.1.1 "national institutions undertake participatory spatial planning of selected key coastal ecosystems" and "pilot actions to build capacity in ICM". Please clarify what stresses this outcome will focus on, how the efforts are different and how this project will coordinate with WIOSAP selection process to choose different local communities.</p> <p>Outcome 2.2 “ Stress reduction</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			<p>through EBM practices among artisanal and subsistence fisheries.</p> <p>M. This section is the first time fisheries is explicitly noted. Therefore there is the impression that these community level efforts lack comprehensive national and regional connections. Once the stresses are better incorporated into the previous sections, this concern may be addressed. However, currently there needs to be a more comprehensive view of how these site efforts fit with broader activities on fisheries at larger scales. There is also no connection to SWIOFish. For SWIOFish1 (Comoros, Mozambique, Tanzania) all three countries have national levels plans that provide a framework for working at the community level. For the Comoros, there are plans for developing community co-management system and plans; for Mozambique strengthening community program design and management plans, including for artisanal fishers; and for Tanzania plans for targeted coastal communities. The link to these efforts is not explained, including how sites will be selected taking into consideration SWIOFish</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			<p>plans.</p> <p>N. Component 3: stress reduction through private sector. Similar to the previous two components, this component does not clarify what stresses will be the focus. While 'maritime industries' are noted, it is not stated what that means " fisheries related organizations? Coastal developers? Shippers? Port developers? Do they mean organizations related to LBS, such as farmers? The only specificity is brief mention "such as WOC and International Seafood Sustainability Forum" within Deliverable 3.1.1. and then oil and gas in Deliverable 3.1.5. These plans need to be linked to SWIOFish and WIOSAP. If interest is in working with fishing industry, then would be relevant to SWIOFish. If pollution related then relevant to WIOSAP. There needs to be very close coordination, which is not noted other than very briefly in Deliverable 3.1.4 . For example, if developing public-private sector partnerships around shoreline development or with upland agriculture, then need to be working with WIOSAP, which is also working on government on</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			<p>water quality standards. If developing PPPs between fisheries agencies and fishers, then need to coordinate with SWIOFish as they are working on government policies and working with communities. The private and public stakeholders need to be noted in the Stakeholders section.</p> <p>O. Component 4: best practices and innovative ocean governance demonstration</p> <p>For this component also it is unclear what stresses would be addressed. Assuming fisheries would be a focus, there is considerable overlap with the ABNJ Deep Sea project activities, which has WIO as one of the two focus areas, including related to marine spatial planning and VMEs. The Pro Doc for ABNJ Deep Sea project needs to be closely reviewed and discussions held with the PM (Chris O'Brien) to determine if and how SAPPHIRE can contribute to the work they are conducting. If there is still a need for this component given ABNJ plans, then this needs to be clearly articulated and how the two projects will be coordinated.</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			<p>P. Component 5: Capacity development. Similar to previous comments on the above components, there needs to be clarification of how these capacity building efforts relate to knowledge sharing efforts in SWIOFish (Component 1 includes regional knowledge management and exchange) and WIOSAP (Component D includes learning and exchange).</p> <p>Q. Having two PADs for one GEF project is unprecedented. That said, as long as there is one PIF, one CEO endorsement request, one PIR and one TE report, is fine. In addition the Trustee will only want cash transfer requests associated with one project.</p> <p>R. With regard to the Joint Mgt Support to Mascarene Plateau Region Project Document, - please confirm and clarify in Pro Doc that Seychelles and Mauritius will still actively engage in the main SAPPHIRE project i.e. the activities in this Pro Doc only apply to the area that is jointly managed; - as above, the stresses to be addressed need to be clarified in the Pro Doc;</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			<p>-similar to above, the ties to the ABNJ Deep Sea project, which includes a component in WIO with heavy emphasis on marine spatial planning, needs to be clarified;</p> <p>- while presumably LBS pollution do not impact the plateau (please confirm), fisheries does. Please clarify anticipated links to future SWIOFish projects in the two countries; the final component is where change will occur (the prior components will provide capacity and data to inform this change). given the importance of this component, a larger allocation of the funding seems warranted. Please consider.</p> <p>S. the EA needs to be reconsidered as noted above.</p> <p>T. Finally, please note the indicators in the Project Results Framework will be reviewed once the following concerns are addressed.</p>	
	<p>8.(a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified?</p> <p>(b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the GEBs have been identified and the incrementality has been described.</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
	9.a) Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes.	
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the PIF includes description of the relevant stakeholder groups.	July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. The private sector stakeholders need to be noted in the Stakeholders section. While the table of "General Public" Stakeholders notes some of the groups, it is not comprehensive (e.g. oil and gas are missing). Once the stresses are better articulated, these can be added.	Comment was addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes a risk matrix including potential mitigation measures have been included.	July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project include thorough	July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. See points in #7 above.	Comment was addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet.

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
	<p>initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>description of the foreseen coordination with a number of key initiatives in the region, with whom coordination will be essential for successful implementation and sustainable outcomes and outputs. The PIF is in detail describing the coordination between UNEP, WB and UNDP activities in the region. Coordination between these three institutions and ongoing/planned activities is understood to be essential for achieving long term sustainable results in the region.</p> <p>Further, please do ensure coordination between the WB/GEF Electronic Highway project, in order to ensure proper linking to relevant project outcomes. Hence making sure that no overlap in efforts will be taking place.</p>		

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): This project is primarily focused on solidifying and delivering on the national and regional policy frameworks that has been established during the TDA/SAP project. A number of innovative approaches, to the region, will be used in order to accelerate the successful implementation.</p>		
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>	
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the indicated GEF financing and associated Co-financing is considered to be adequate. Please do make sure that there is consistency between the amount stated in Table A, B and D.	July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): While the government co-financing has increased significantly since PIF, which is great, the private sector and other organizations' support has decreased. Please explain.	Comment was addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet.
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Composition is fine. However, please do make sure that the cofinancing sources are not mixed. So please do split out in-kind and cash cofinancing. Further, please make sure that there is consistency between amounts listed in Table A, B and C.	July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the listed PM budget is following the GEF guidance.	July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): The split between the main SAPPHIRE project (\$8.77M GEF) and the Joint Management project (\$2.21M GEF) seems unjustifiably weighted toward the joint project. The Joint project is working in a discrete area with 2 countries; whereas the	Comment was addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet.

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			main SAPPHIRE project is working in a much larger area with more activities. Please reconsider and justify the split.	
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes PPG has been requested is within the norm and is understood to be essential for proper planning of the ProDoc, especially considering the multiple countries involved in this project.		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin):NA	24th of July 2015 (Ikarrer): NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes except the indicators noted focus on MPAs and fisheries. LBS pollution, including from irrigation and wastewater, is a major concern. Please reconsider the indicators to include ones related to wastewater, irrigation and water use efficiency	Comment was addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes	

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
	and measures results with indicators and targets?			
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. Given that the STAP PIF review indicated major revisions required, the agency needs to send the Pro Doc for STAP review.</p> <p>A. The STAP in its review of the PIF expressed strong concern regarding the need to focus activities more strategically and to select more focused areas within the region with a clear explanation of how those were selected.</p> <p>B. The Pro Doc does not indicate the activities have been narrowed in scope or selected geographies prioritized.</p> <p>C. In addition STAP notes the need to identify a clear long-term governance strategy for these activities within existing institutions (i.e. not create new institutions), such as SADC and EAC; yet, a new SAP Implementation Steering Committee and STAP are recommended. As discussed in #7, how these new entities fit within</p>	<p>Comment was addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet.</p>

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
			the existing governance in the region needs to be explained or, preferably, the existing governance mechanisms need to be used instead of creating new institutions.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? 		July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. At PIF stage France indicated the need to link the (then) new FFEM project, entitled "Conservation and sustainable exploitation of seamounts and hydrothermal vent ecosystems of the South West Indian Ocean outside of national legislative borders" on the same issue, which was just beginning. In conclusion they noted, "Opinion: we support the initiative and suggest that the program works strongly with UICN/FFEM project especially to ensure a reinforcement of the regional and local capabilities with regards to governance of the ZONL." Please address this comment.	Comment was addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 			
	Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): No, please do address above comments and resubmit.		

WIO LME SAPPHIRE Project Document – 3. Project Results Framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Programme Inclusion ⁵	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Project Proposer's Response
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.			
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. Please address points noted Nov 17, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. Please address final two points in #7.	All comments except final two pts in #7 addressed in 4 Nov 2015 resubmission and confirmed by GEFSEC in 17 Nov review sheet. Addressed in this resubmission
	First review*		July 24, 2015	
	Additional review (as necessary)			
Review Dates(s)	Additional review (as necessary)			

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁶

A. provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$300,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Technical Review	85,000	84,000	0
Component B: Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	115,000	130,000	0
Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments	30,000	27,500	0
Component D: Validation workshop (Local Project Appraisal Committee meeting)	70,000	58,500	0
Total	300,000	300,000	0

Annex D: calendar of expected reflows (if non-grant instrument is used)

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

NOT APPLICABLE

⁶ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.