



"BE-CLME+": Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities Through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus

Basic Information

GEF ID

10211

Countries

Regional (Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Panama, St. Lucia)

Project Title

"BE-CLME+": Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities Through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus

GEF Agency(ies)

CAF, FAO

Agency ID

CAF: CAF-GEF 011, FAO: 658480

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Christian Severin

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

19th of April 2019 (cseverin): No

- 1) Please include names of countries that are part taking in this project. The submission only mentions REGIONAL. The supporting document has a list of ten Caribbean countries.
- 2) Endorsement letters are missing from submission. Please upload these. Please ensure that endorsement letters are mentioning from which FA funding will be allocated. Further, the endorsement letters should reflect upon the entire investment. Please ensure the endorsement letters reflect upon the amount of
- 3) As communicated earlier, the process leading to formulation of cross sectoral marine spatial plans is central towards informing blue economic development. One of the potential investments in conjunction with MSP work is the designation of and establishment of Marine Protected areas. Therefore, please focus the investment on this. One suggestion would be to reformulate the project objective to something like: "Support blue economic development through formulation of national marine Spatial Plans and establishment of Marine protected Areas.". Please make sure to have this focus of formulation of MSPs and Marine protected area establishment for the participating countries to be reflected through out the document. Where needed, please reformulate text to reflect upon this being the starting point.
- 4) The proposal needs to be more specific, the generic term "blue economic strategies" needs to be exchanged with Marine Spatial Plans.
- 5) It is essential to indicate what are the specific national level activities (or possible menu of activities) that countries will be buy-in to with their STAR. Many of the activities listed are eligible under the BD mainstreaming area including MSPs. Value chain work would need a specific justification of how this work will directly benefit biodiversity or how the GEF increment is focused on biodiversity. MPAs with a biodiversity aim and the improve financing and management of MPAs are also welcome. BD funding of restoration requires a very high bar for justification. Supporting opening the door to innovative and/or larger financing opportunities is also interesting.
- 6) Blue Biotrade as such is not supported by IW under GEF 7.

- 7) Please elaborate on the country composition for the proposed investment.
- 8) Please note that the GEF/WB project #9451 "Caribbean Regional Oceanscape Project" will be developing Marine Spatial Plans for following countries: Grenada, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Dominica. Therefore, please specifically ensure coordination with this specific investment and its outputs.
- 9) As mentioned above, the WB project 9451 will be developing MSPs for five out of the 10 countries listed for this investment, hence this project needs to focus on producing 5 MSPs, a regional outlook and have these imbedded as political decision-making tools. As communicated earlier, please lower the amount of GEF IW amount to around 6 mio, if all countries, as indicated, participate. Final envelope will be depending on what the project will be delivering.
- 10) Please elaborate on cofinancing envisioned for this investment. What kind of loans will CAF be providing and likewise what is FAO planning to bring to the project. It is noted that the submission lists a grant from FAO in the size of \$14.5 mio. Considering historical grant investments from GEF implementing agencies, this is remarkably high. Please explain
- 11) On Country Cofinancing, it is an odd coincidence that have enabled CAF and FAO to obtain indicative cofinancing from 5 Caribbean countries of a similar amount, namely of \$3.750.000. Please explain.
- 12) When the GEF grant and PPG amount has been adjusted, please make sure that the funding allocated to each of the implementing agencies for project activities and preparation of the full size proposal needs to be based on an assessment of activities to be carried out. As included in submission, it seems odd that the costs of the included activities split identically between the agencies.

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): the resubmission now includes endorsement letters, so a formal review will now be undertaken.

Please provide more details on the national level investments to be able to assess if activities indeed are eligible under the BD focal are

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, but still many points to be addressed and endorsement letters missing.

8th of November 2019 (cseverin): Please remember that endorsement letters have to be signed by the Operational Focal Points in the countries.

13th of November 2019 (cseverin): all endorsement letters received and uploaded

Agency Response

All the comments have been addressed and received updated LOE's have been uploaded in the portal. Remaining letters will be sent by email, Monday - November 11th.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): No,

1) Please make sure to include specific quantifiable outcomes and outputs in Table B. (there are a couple of # inserted, these should be direct quantifiable numbers, further eg the results framework mentions "Number of fisheries" and other similar formulations. These should be quantified.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

sans-serif

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, The main part of the cofinancing is to be going to Blue Biotrade. However, as blue biotrade is not as such eligible for IW funding and hence should be (and this has partly happened) taken out of the concept, the cofinancing does not align with the proposed GEF investment. Please identify additional/other sources of cofinancing.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

sans-serif

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): The funding is available, however, please provide more information on the national level investments, which wil enable assessment on eligiblity, particular on BD financing. Further, the proposed funding seems to be divided based on another principle than what the need may be in relation to activities to be implemented by the two agencies. This point has been raised before, but seems to still not having been addressed. In realtion to this, please indicated in the results framework and the component description which agency will be implementing which activities.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): There is still nearly a 50/50 split between GEF resources. Please ensure that during PPG that the split gets substantiated by cost of activities. At the moment it seems as being based on a random selection.

Agency Response Will provide further details and attend during PPG.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 7th of November 2019 (cseverin): STAR funding should be available.

Agency Response

sans-serif

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

sans-serif

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

sans-serif

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

sans-serif

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

sans-serif

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

sans-serif

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 24th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

sans-serif

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): No please make sure to reassess indicator 2, the project document mentions 230.000 HAs of new protected areas, but the indicator has listed these as areas under improved management. Indicator 5 is not mentioning an indicator. The number for indicator 5 would be 1 (one) equivalent to the Caribbean LME. Indicator 7.1 would need to be 4, as the Caribbean LME already have a ministerial endorsed SAP. Indicator 7.4, mentions 4, that is not possible, as the project has not started yet. That indicator should be 1 by beginning of the project. Project results framework mentions 45.000 tons of fish moved to sustainable levels. However, indicator 8 is not filled in, please do so. the project document mentions up to 122.000 beneficiaries, other places it mentions 88.000, which is also the number included as a core indicator. Which one is correct. Further on the latter subject, please consider if the project will not be benefitting more people and especially if the project will not be benefitting more females, compared to the roughly 10% as included at this point in time.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please make sure to address above comments and also ensure that Core indicators align with the project text, so it should be newly created MPAs rather than improved management of MPAs, in relation to the national investments.

8th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

The core indicators have been adjusted in the portal in line and are now aligned with the PIF (table F and annex B)

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, please ensure that the project is tagged correctly in the database entry. In the word document attached the tags seem to be different on what we have uploaded in the database.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): No the project is still not properly tagged. Looking at the taxonomy indicated on the front of the project entry, it is clear that the taxonomy has not been looked at in detail.

8th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Taxonomy has been revised and adjusted in the portal

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, the project still mentions blue biotrade, which is not directly eligible under the IW focal area. please remove this reference.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed

Agency Response

sans-serif

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

sans-serif

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

24th of October 2019 (cseverin):Partly, please include details on what will the investment will be delivering on a national level in the six countries.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed

Agency Response

sans-serif

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, please provide more information on the national level investments.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

sans-serif

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

sans-serif

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please revise core indicators and results framework as indicated above.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Still not addressed, please do so

8th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Core indicators have been adjusted and made consistent in the portal.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): partly, the section does not mention the formulation of the Marine Spatial Plans, as the starting point for informing policy change and investments that will inform sustainable Blue Economy development.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

sans-serif

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): a map of the caribbean has been inserted, however, please ensure during the ppg project to identify the specific sites for the investments, on a national and sub regional level.

Agency Response

sans-serif

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin):yes

Agency Response

sans-serif

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin):Yes, however, please ensure that there is coherency between numbers mentioned in the project document.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

sans-serif

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

sans-serif

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

sans-serif

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin):Partly, the coordination section mentions that CRFM will be the main executing agency, if there are others, please mention them and ensure they are listed in the beginning of the project entry too.

Please note, that as the agencies knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.”

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

sans-serif

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): This will be easier to assess when more information on the national level investments have been included. Further, please make sure to also mention that the project will assist countries in implementing the Small Scale Fisheries Guidelines.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

sans-serif

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

sans-serif

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): Even though endorsement letters have been included, they do not follow the GEF standards, as they need to reflect upon the entire project budget, including PPG. Please provide new letters to that effect.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): Endorsement letters still missing

8th of November 2019 (cseverin): The Endorsement letters from St Lucia and Jamaica has been signed by the Operational Focal Point, as according to GEF policy. The letter uploaded from Panama, has been signed by Political Focal Point, but not the Operational Focal Point, please make sure to obtain letter with correct signature. Further, letters from Belize, Guyana and Barbados is missing. Please make sure all six letters are signed by the operational focal points in each country and that they are uploaded, to facilitate recommendation for technical clearance.

13th of November 2019 (cseverin): Endorsement letters uploaded

Agency Response

LOE have been updated to reflect proper amounts. 3 LOE have been uploaded in the portal (Jamaica, Panama, St. Lucia) and Belize will be uploaded by end of Nov 8th COB. The remaining 2 LOE will be sent early next week Nov 11th

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

sans-serif

EFSEC DECISION**RECOMMENDATION**

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, please address comments provided.

7th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please address comments provided

8th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please address comments provided

13th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes, technical clearance is recommended.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	10/31/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	11/8/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>