



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

GEF ID:	5753		
Country/Region:	Regional (Angola, Namibia, South Africa)		
Project Title:	Realizing the Inclusive and Sustainable Development in the BCLME Region through the Improved Ocean Governance and the Integrated Management of Ocean Use and Marine Resources		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5313 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$10,900,000
Co-financing:	\$174,387,580	Total Project Cost:	\$185,587,580
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Akiko Yamamoto

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes, Angola, Namibia and South Africa are eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 18, 2014 (IW): No, only the Namibia focal point has endorsed the project. Please send from South Africa and Angola. March 26, 2014 (IW): Yes. All three countries submitted.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		

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

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>March 18, 2014 (IW): Given this is the third phase of funding, the region needs to be moving toward self-financing. Consequently, a total of \$6-7M is more reasonable. Since the previous 2 GEF grants invested heavily in capacity building and planning, this grant needs to focus more on implementation activities (Components 1 and 2). Funding for Component 3 (currently \$2.8M) needs to be reduced significantly to \$1.8M. While we agree for the need for more funds for Components 1 and 2 compared with Component 3, \$4.7M for Component 2 exceeds what seems reasonable and needs to be reduced in line with Component 1 at \$2.7M.</p> <p>March 26, 2014 (IW): Justification understood and accepted.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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</i></p>	<p>March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes, it is aligned with IW focal areas IW-2 and IW-3.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<i>achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>		
	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>March 18, 2014 (IW): This project is fully in line with regional and national initiatives. In March, 2013, the Benguela Current Commission was established. Further, in 2000 the first BCLME Strategic Action Program was signed establishing a plan for addressing sustainability in the LME. This SAP has been revised and will be signed in April, 2014, demonstrating a renewed commitment.</p> <p>Please confirm plans to sign the revised SAP in April, 2014.</p> <p>March 26, 2014 (IW): Thank you for confirming that the SAP is expected to be signed at the ministerial level during the upcoming April BCC COM meeting. This is an important achievement for the PPG phase.</p>	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes, the baseline is sufficient for the PIF. For CEO endorsement more detail will need to be added.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>March 18, 2014 (IW): Despite "climate resilient" in the title, there is almost no mention of climate change adaptation measures or analyses in the PIF. Please re-title or change the text.</p> <p>There is mention of conducting economic analyses of the benefits (which by the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>way need to include costs too) of policies (Paragraph 33), which we agree is very useful. However, these analyses are not incorporated elsewhere in the PIF. In particular it would seem the private sector engagement component would greatly benefit from economic analyses demonstrating the benefits and costs of policies. Given the revised SAP has an entire "Human Dimensions" objective, it is important to address in the PIF.</p> <p>While at this phase we agree with the focus on implementation, the revised SAP identifies a series of studies that need to be undertaken. How are those needs being addressed?</p> <p>The targets need to be better articulated and defined during the PPG to be specific amounts (e.g. "establish new MPAs" needs to specify number or ha of marine protected areas).</p> <p>Component 1 Although they need more specificity, there are strong quantifiable regional outcomes that are action oriented (e.g. set pollution standards, establish MPAs) that relate to the major identified threats. However, at the national level the actions are limited to one or two policies and do not address the breadth of threats. Angola is listed as establishing MPAs; South Africa and Namibia as developing ocean policies and conducting MSP exercises. What about setting (or using the regional standards) and implementing regulations</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>for pollution, fisheries, mining in each of the countries? The breadth of threats need to be strategically addressed with clear targets at the national level, not just regionally and more than broad policies. Component 2 discusses demonstrating the benefits of actions, which implies there will be action.</p> <p>Relatedly, Paragraph 37 notes various activities for South Angola, including sustainable recreational fishery development. Why aren't these plans included in the national plans discussed in paragraph 29?</p> <p>Component 2 The discussion of community engagement heavily stresses youth engagement. While youth are important, the focus needs to be on changing behavior, which means the users. Equal if not more thought needs to be put into working with user groups.</p> <p>The private sector engagement section needs to discuss the purpose and include the breadth of sectors. Paragraph 43 implies it's to raise funds; however, given the emphasis on action and, therefore, changing behavior, it would seem the purpose needs to be tied to changing behavior toward sustainable practices. Paragraph 46 mentions "...agreement on stress reduction targets and voluntary actions... participation in the stress reduction demonstration activities...", which is more in line with implementing.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The engagement to date noted in Paragraph 45 seems focused on attending events, sponsoring events and sharing data - not on changing their actual practices. Consideration needs to be given to changing behavior.</p> <p>It's unclear who in the private sector will be engaged with respect to the threats. Currently Paragraph 44 mentions ballast water (presumably that would involve the shipping industry), oil spill response (i.e. oil and gas companies). The mining, oil and gas and synthetic fuels companies are also noted. What about companies related to the major threats of water quality pollution and over-fishing - fisheries organizations and companies that may be polluting the watershed or coastal waters, developers that may be affecting habitat and polluting?</p> <p>Component 3 (capacity building) There is reference to working with IWLearn, the African LME Caucus and UNDP/GEF LME CoP. What about AfriCOG?</p> <p>There on 2 scientific activities - regional coastal sensitivity atlas and state of the ecosystem information system - which are a bit out of place from the rest of the more institutional and human capacity activities. Why aren't these included in Component 1? And more importantly than where these science activities are listed, why were these selected as the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>priority science needs over other needs listed in the revised SAP? Given the importance of considering socio-economic impacts of policies, how will socioeconomics be incorporated into these two activities?</p> <p>A few of the items in Paragraph 48 seem duplicative: 1st and 2nd; 7th and 8th; 10th and 12th.</p> <p>March 26, 2014 (IW): All points addressed for PIF. Thank you.</p> <p>Economic cost-benefit analyses and incorporation into policy development needs to be expanded during PPG. And, as noted, the targets will be more specifically articulated during PPG.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 26, 2014 (IW): Yes. The project not only supports the regional commitments through the Benguela Current Commission, but also supports Rio+20 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The incremental cost reasoning clearly articulates the benefits of this project and is sound and appropriate.</p>	
	<p>9. 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?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified</p>	<p>March 18, 2014 (IW): Please see points in #7 regarding clarification of private sector engagement to reflect all sectors.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and explicit means for their engagement explained?	March 26, 2014 (IW): Points addressed.	
	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)	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes.</p> <p>March 26, 2014 (IW): The project is in direct support of the Benguela Current Commission and the Benguela Current Convention and Strategic Action Program, which will be signed in April. Further, it complements projects being conducted in the region, such as ECOFISH, and supports many national initiatives articulated in the PIF.</p>	
	<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>March 18, 2014 (IW):</p> <p>In terms of sustainability - the project addresses sustainability at the regional level, but not at the national level. Given that this is the 2nd SAP implementation grant, it is particularly important to incorporate measures to ensure institutional and financial sustainability. The establishment of the Commission largely addresses institutional stability at a regional level; however, what about the national level?</p> <p>The financial sustainability of BCLME post-GEF funding is not sufficiently addressed at the regional and national</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>scales. However, financial sustainability is discussed in the revised SAP where the need to establish mechanisms is discussed, including plans for a tax on companies that use the ocean for commercial purposes. These plans are more ideas, particularly at national level, need to be added.</p> <p>March 26, 2014 (IW): Concerns addressed.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	<p>March 18, 2014 (IW): Please see comments in #3 regarding reducing the total.</p> <p>March 26, 2014 (IW): Budget sufficiently justified.</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	March 18, 2014 (IW): Please recalculate based on new total. Also, in the text (but	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		not in Table B), Project Management is listed as Component 4 (Project Management). Please edit so not a "component". March 26, 2014 (IW): Yes. Budget concerns addressed.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes. However, please lower the PPG so that it fits with the new GEF grant total. March 26, 2014 (IW): PPG level fine.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
	24. Is PIF clearance/approval	March 18, 2014 (IW): No, please address	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	being recommended?	the points above. March 26, 2014 (IW): Yes, project is recommended for approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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