



## Blue Nature Alliance to expand and improve conservation of 1.25 billion hectares of ocean ecosystems

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10375

**Countries**

Global

**Project Title**

Blue Nature Alliance to expand and improve conservation of 1.25 billion hectares of ocean ecosystems

**GEF Agency(ies)**

CI

**Agency ID****GEF Focal Area(s)**

International Waters

**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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, the proposal is aligned with the IW focal area, as it primarily will be supporting implementation of Strategic Action Program priorities around marine protected areas.

##### Agency Response

### 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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

##### Agency Response

## 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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Please remove the line under cofinancing, that is currently listed tagged as "Multiple site-specific co-investors (i.e. leverage funders)—TBD (to co-fund site specific activities)". However, please note that even though this is removed at this time. Please work during PPG to achieve the indicative target of raising the additional \$200 mio in cofinancing to this investment.

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed.

### Agency Response

## 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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

## Agency Response

### The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## Agency Response

### The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## Agency Response

### The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## Agency Response

### The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## Agency Response

### Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## Agency Response

### Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## Agency Response

## 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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin):Yes

### Agency Response

## 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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please change core indicator 7.4 to rating 1. Further, core indicator 11 seems extremely low considering the large investment envisioned and the potential impact of the large increase of MPAs

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):: Addressed.

### Agency Response

In regards to indicator 7.4: Noted and changed

In regard to indicator 11: The Blue Nature Alliance had previously estimated the direct beneficiaries for this project as only those people who would be directly involved in project activities, which is why the estimate was relatively low (i.e. ~40,000 people). Given the feedback provided by the GEF, the Alliance is instead estimating direct beneficiaries based on an estimate of the number of ocean resource users who will benefit directly from increased sustainability generated by the MPAs created and/or improved as a result of this project.

There are many types of ocean resource users, but for the purpose of this project, the Alliance will use people employed in the small-scale fisheries sector and associated industries as a proxy for all ocean resource users. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates that there are 37 million people employed in the small-scale fisheries sector, with an additional 100 million employed in associated activities. The FAO estimates that women make up 47% of these workers.

Through this project the Blue Nature Alliance will create or improve MPAs in 1.25 billion hectares, approximately 3.5% of the global ocean. Assuming a straight correlation, the project should impact 3.5% of the 137 million estimated ocean resource users, thus benefiting 4.8 million people. However, to account for the uneven distribution of small scale fishers globally (90% of small scale fishers are in Asia. The Alliance is assuming a similar distribution of associated activities) and the wide range in the number of anticipated resources users across the Alliance's engagement sites (including some areas with relatively low population density), the Alliance is taking a conservative approach, reducing this number by 50% as a lower bound of the estimated number of direct beneficiaries.

The new estimate of direct beneficiaries is thus ~2.4 million, of which ~47% will be women.

© FAO 2008-2019.

Small-scale fisheries - Web Site. Small-scale fisheries around the world. FI Institutional Websites. In: *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department* [online]. Rome. Updated . [Cited 1 November 2019]. <http://www.fao.org/fishery/>

FAO. 2017. Towards gender-equitable small-scale fisheries governance and development - A handbook. In support of the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication, by Nilanjana Biswas. Rome, Italy.

## 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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin):Yes

#### Agency Response

## 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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin):Yes

### Agency Response

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please add a bit more information on projects/investment that provide the baseline for this proposed investment.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed.

### Agency Response

Additional detail has been added on the baseline projects added in the PIF (yellow highlights). Text below:

There are numerous organizations and programs working to support the expansion of ocean protection globally—including CI and Pew (in combination, CI and Pew have helped to facilitate the establishment of more than half, by area, of the world's current marine protected areas under either baseline scenario). A 2017 review of Strategic Action Plans produced through GEF's Large Marine Ecosystem Program showed that while 89% of SAPs included strategies for the identification and adoption of management areas for maintenance of biodiversity and



related goods and services, only 56% incorporated strategies to develop regional networks of connected MPAs. Twelve of the UNDP Ecosystems and Biodiversity (EBD) Programme projects target MPAs, providing \$40 million in grants from GEF and other donors with \$97 million in co-financing to support creation and strengthening of 81 MPAs covering a total of 9.9 million hectares.

In the past few years several major initiatives to create new MPAs have been launched, including The Blue Action Fund which was established December 2016 the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) with the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and The Agence Française de Développement (AFD) joining the effort in 2017 and 2018 respectively; the Waitt Foundation's Blue Prosperity Coalition; and the Wyss Foundation's \$1 billion campaign to protect 30% of the planet (including but not focused on MPAs) by 2030 launched in 2018.

Each of these programs is playing an important role to expand ocean protection and have contributed to the current momentum for MPAs globally, which saw a 15-fold increase in global MPA extent from 1983 to 2016. However, these initiatives, including the recent influx of additional funds, have been insufficient and significant barriers remain to getting to 10 percent of the ocean effectively protected, let alone the 30 percent target.

### 3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, please address following comments:

- 1) The theory of change illustration, mentions 30% MPA coverage. Even though this may be part of the overall aspiration this is not part of the objective. This needs to be broken into two portions, one on the overall global scientific agreement of the need for a 30% coverage, and then a second part that is directly addressing the projects theory of change.
- 2) Site Selection: the structure to be put in place for governance and management of the blue alliance should be mentioned here in a short paragraph or two and then refer to the more full description that you presently have under the "coordination" section.
- 3) Under alternative scenario, please add estimate on how this project will deliver directly (in %) towards the Aichi/SDG14 target of global 10% coverage.
- 4) The past paragraph in section 1 (on international agreements, is primarily focusing on BD relevant conventions, please add regional and global agreements such as the Voluntary Small Scale Fisheries Guidelines, the Global Program of Action for Land based Sources of Marine Pollution, Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (on top of the t-RFMOs that have been highlighted as there are many other species of relevance), Port State Measurement Agreement, Large Marine Ecosystems Strategic Action Programs and regional conventions and commissions, such as the Abijan Convention and the Benguela Current Commission. (please see an overview of some of these here <http://www.cetaceanhabitat.org/treaties.php>). Finally, there is also the regional economic commissions, some of which has strategies for management of marine resources and habitats.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed.

## Agency Response

1) Noted. Theory of Change has been updated to better reflect the project's direct theory of change and its contribution to both the Aichi Target/SDG14 and to the overall global scientific agreement of the need for a 30% coverage.

2) The following paragraphs were added to the site selection section

"There will be two steps to approve a proposed engagement site. In the first step, the Blue Nature Alliance Management Team, which is comprised of senior technical staff from both CI and Pew, will review the detailed engagement framework for the proposed site. The Blue Nature Alliance Management Team will ensure the engagement framework provides a clear opportunity to advance the site towards designation and/or improved management and will evaluate it against the six selection criteria. The decision to recommend investment, will be dependent upon having strong local endorsement, including financial leverage where feasible.

Sites recommended by the Blue Nature Alliance Management will go to the Blue Nature Alliance Steering Council for approval. The Steering Council will consist of those donors who have donated \$25 million or more to the Alliance. As a core \$25 million partner, the GEF would have a seat on the Steering Council. On a six month basis, the Steering Council will review and approve new sites for investments. Once the site is approved, the Alliance will support the implementation of the engagement framework through grants to implementing partners on the ground and by deploying technical experts to the site. The full site engagement process is illustrated in Figure 4. (More details on the Blue Nature Alliance Management Team and the Steering Council can be found in the Governance and Alliance Framework in section 6—coordination)."

3) The following sentence has been added to the project description and the alternative scenario "By directly supporting the conservation of at least 1.25 billion hectares of ocean ecosystems (approximately 3.5 percent of the global ocean), the Alliance will help deliver 35% of the Aichi target and SDG14 target 5 of 10 percent of the global ocean protected and build momentum towards to greater target of 30 percent of the global ocean protected."

4) The last paragraph in section 1 has been revised as follows "Insufficient regional cooperation and transboundary governance: Many species do not recognize maritime borders and during their migrations swim through different countries' EEZs and the high seas. There are different and sometimes competing international and regional bodies for managing tuna, whale, shark, turtle, and seabird species, including a number of regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), and the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment in the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW Protocol). Many of the species with transboundary migrations are unmanaged, for example, none of the tuna RFMOs have set catch limits for sharks and management has only been put in place when species are on the brink of extinction. There are many other regional and global agreements that are in place, but do not necessarily speak to one another to support integrated ocean governance, for example, Voluntary Small Scale Fisheries Guidelines, the Global Program of Action for Land based Sources of Marine Pollution, Regional Fisheries Management Organizations, Port State Measurement Agreement, Large Marine Ecosystems Strategic Action Programs and regional conventions and commissions, such as the

Abijan Convention and the Benguela Current Commission. Finally, there is also the regional economic commissions, some of which has strategies for management of marine resources and habitats. To complicate matters, the interests of these inter-governmental bodies are not always aligned and have different goals related to trade, fisheries, and conservation of biodiversity.”

#### 4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

##### Agency Response

#### 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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, however, the incremental cost reasoning mentions the 30% MPA target, as is also included in the "alternative scenario. Even though this may be part of the overall aspiration this is not part of the objective. Therefore, please break this in to two different sets of justification. One that focuses on the overall global scientific agreement of the need for a 30% coverage, and then a second part that is directly addressing the projects theory of change.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed.

**Agency Response** Edits have been made to clarify that the incremental cost reasoning is directly about the 1.25 billion hectares of new and improved ocean conservation areas to be supported by this project which contribute 35% towards the Aichi target and SDG14 target 5 (10% of the ocean protected) as well as building momentum for the larger goal of 30%.

**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**

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, please adjust core indicator 7.4, the value can not be 4, when the project has not started yet, it should be 1. Further, please reassess core indicator 11. the number of people estimated to be beneficiaries of this investment, seems extremely low considering the scope of this investment.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed

**Agency Response**

In regards to indicator 7.4, noted and changed.

In regard to indicator 11, see explanation above. The revised estimate of direct beneficiaries is ~2.4 million people of which ~47% are women.

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

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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

**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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Not applicable as this project is global. however, a map has been included with points to some potential investment sites, but these can not be confirmed yet due to the nature of the investment.

### Agency Response

## 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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

### Agency Response

## 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**

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, please reassess the information behind core indicator 11. the numbers seems extremely low, considering the size of the investments and the number of livelihoods that the entire investment will impact positively.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed

**Agency Response** In regard to indicator 11, see explanation above. The revised estimate of direct beneficiaries is ~2.4 million people of which ~47% are women.

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

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

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response****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**

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response****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**

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, please note that, 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.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Please note that by time of CEO Endorsement it is expected that, the GEF Implementing Agency (CI) will present (i) a detailed explanation of the mechanism through which the Executing Entities will select the grant proposals and disburse the funds; and (ii) how GEF Implementing Agency (CI) will ensure that the Minimum Fiduciary Standards Requirements (to be approved in December 2019 by Council) are met by each one of the Executing Entities at all levels of the project implementation.

**Agency Response**

Noted. We will work with the GEF Secretariat during the PPG phase on this topic.

**CI-GEF response 11/05/2019:** These requirements are well noted and will be accounted for.

In regard to (i), the Blue Nature Alliance will adhere to a set of operational procedures as defined in an operations manual that will be finalized during the PPG phase. The operations manual will include a detailed explanation of the mechanism by which the Alliance will review grant proposals, select grantees, and disburse funds. The process will include a robust due diligence and risk assessment process as well as environmental and social safeguard screenings. Per previous discussions with the GEF, the process will also include a public and open mechanism to received expressions of interest.

In regard to (ii), CI will complete a due diligence assessment, a financial risk assessment, and a security screening for all executing entities and will develop a grant agreement template that incorporates all GEF requirements, including the Minimum Fiduciary Standards Requirements, which will be used for all grants to executing entities using GEF funds, thus ensuring that all executing entities meet the Minimum Fiduciary Standards Requirements.

### **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**

28th of October 2019 (cseverin):Not applicable at this time, as this is a global project. But the proposed program and its suggested interventions is indeed aligned with the global discourse on increasing MPA coverage.

#### **Agency Response**

### **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**

28th of October 2019 (cseverin):Yes

**Agency Response****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**

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Not applicable as this is a global investment, but "no objection" letters should be provided, pertaining to the different sub investments, as they will be approved by the Blue Nature Alliance.

**Agency Response****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****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**

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, Please address comments.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please address comment

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes, project is recommended for Technical Clearance.

**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"/>	<input type="text"/>
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"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

### PIF Recommendation to CEO

### Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

undefined