



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

GEF ID:	4582		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	ABNJ: Strengthening Global Capacity to Effectively Manage Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-4; IW-4; BD-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$4,599,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,599,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Kevern Cochrane

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Global project - N/A	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Global project - N/A	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, FAO, has a comparative advantage in handling ABNJ fisheries and related BD conservation issues. FAO has close working relationships with tuna RFMOs and its Committee of Fisheries (COFI) is the only global inter-governmental forum addressing fisheries on a global scale.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, global fisheries and supporting ecosystems and species conservation issues are instrumental to FAO's Fisheries and Aquaculture Department's program and strategic objectives.	

Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>With the scaling back of activities highlighted below, it is recommended that this project become a MSP and the focal area resources (50%IW, 50% BD) adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>[9/1/11] Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>With the scaling back of activities highlighted below, it is recommended that this project become a MSP and the focal area resources adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p>	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>The proposal will need to be realigned with the appropriate results framework based on the recommendations given in this review.</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>The proposal will need to be reevaluate the appropriate focal area objectives based on the recommendations given in this review.</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p>	

	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>The proposal will need to be revised based on the recommendations given in this review. Please also delete Nagoya Protocol info which is not relevant to the program (Section A2).</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>Yes, capacity development is integral to the project and sustainability via better trained ABNJ stakeholders, especially decision makers, at the global level is a key outcome of the proposal.</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. 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?</p>	<p>The baseline is unorganized and lists too many activities that are unrelated to this proposal (e.g. all of third para of p 9, GOOS and MARPOL on p 10). Global Oceans Forum needs to provide the specific baseline activities they are already doing and results from completed activities.</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>[10/3/11] Project cost-effectiveness has been demonstrated by capitalizing on the networks and effective capacity of the project partners, specifically GOF and FAO. The alternative of creating new networks is not only cost-prohibitive, but will create added confusion to an already crowded realm of ocean conservation partnerships.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>what will happen with and without GEF needs to be clearly elaborated</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed</p>	

14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?

No, proposal consists of a number of redundant activities that will be taken up by the other ABNJ projects. Many of the activities in Component 2 are redundant and will be accomplished through the project websites that are a requirement of all IW projects via IW:Learn. Components 2 should be eliminated from the project except for the following

- Output 2.2.1 (Cadre of journalists/practitioners...) should be written into the Component 1 and be more specific (eg # and types of material published by cadre).
- Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.2.1 should be removed and the "standard" IW:Learn language needs to be included as outputs

-e.g. 1% of IW budget is allocated for IWLearn activities including IWlearn project website, experience notes, participation in IWC events, and IW tracking tool.

Further, aspects of Component 3 (project M&E) are unnecessary for a project with such a limited scope. The following changes are proposed to the project design:

- The project should focus its efforts on Component 1 (Global and regional coordination) within the scope of ensuring sustainable fisheries and and conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the oceans. It should include platforms for advocacy for policy reforms, networking, and outreach towards high level decision makers, including Ministers of Finance,

- adding a last output (1.2.4) that brings experienced stakeholders together with program participants via working meeting(s). These may include the North-East Atlantic regional experience with NEAFC and the OSPAR Commission; the Sargasso Sea Alliance, and the South Pacific and the Indian Ocean regions with recently endorsed new ocean frameworks. A working meeting between these parties, the t-RFMOs/countries, the fishing industry, the IAs, EAs and GEFSEC could be organized at the program's inception. Also of importance is reaching out to major decision makers including: Ministers of Finance, Fisheries, and Environment. Two GEF projects, the GLOBE Legislator Forest Initiative and Sustainable MED are examples of provisions of such forum.

- The program's focus is on sustainable management of high/deep seas fisheries ecosystems and conservation of BD vulnerable deep ecosystems and species, using available knowledge and information (e.g known priority VMEs and EBSAs) related to ecosystem-based approaches to fisheries and BD conservation management and scientifically-based decision. To maximize impacts limited available funding cannot be allocated to a project which claims that it will resolve all the cross sectoral issues (see outcome 1.1) and test including transformational changes and environmental benefits on p.11.

[AH 9/1/11] Please include language stating that the project will report both BD and IW tracking tools during project inception, mid-term, and termination.

[9/13/11] Addressed.

[9/21/11] The project needs to be realigned to better highlight the role of the GEF at the global level on all aspects of ABNJ that are being addressed through this program. Please make the following changes:

- 1) A PPG will not be provided for this PIF.
- 2) A Project Steering Committee will be established to be made up of GEF, FAO, GOF, and other key partners. The Steering Committee will seek to ensure that the overall program is proceeding according to plan as well as the specific components of this PIF. Given GEF's central role as the key donor to the program, GEF will co-chair the steering committee with FAO.
- 3) Please explicitly identify the GEF as one of the participants in the multi-stakeholder dialogues being held under Output 1.1.2 and amend elsewhere in the text where necessary.
- 4) Output 1.2.1 - the Steering Committee should be responsible for selecting the ten leaders for the ABNJ training program. GEF should also be listed as one of the partners of middle

programs). Please clarify this in the text.

5) Under outcome 1.3, which involves raising public understanding and communication activities, please explicitly note in the PIF that all communication about the program and its associated projects will clearly highlight the role of the GEF in advancing the management of ABNJ through this program.

[10/3/11] All issues raised at PIF stage (above) have been addressed appropriately, including eliminating PPG requests and involvement of GEF as a co-chair in the Steering Committee.

26th of August 2013 (cseverin): "Global and regional coordination , including exchange of information, on marine ABNJ, to ensure sustainable fisheries and conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the oceans, are fully effective." I would think that this would also entail coordination between the three remaining projects under the ABNJ Programme. I do think that this activity needs to be strengthened, as it does not come clearly across at this moment. It may be entrenched in the suggested components, but please sharpen that. The added value of such MSPs in PFDs is exactly that they can provide the glue that can harness the separate investments under the PFD and their outcomes and outputs and present it as programmatic achievements. But

		<p>component 1 and 4?? If this is the case, could you kindly include a output related to this in Table B</p> <p>26th of November 2013 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, the applied methodology and its assumptions are appropriate for this proposal.	
	16. 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?	yes as applicable	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Please refocus on sustainable fisheries and and conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the oceans</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>The presented risks need to be reworked based on the recommendations of this review. Risks 2 and 3 are now irrelevant. Please reevaluate other outstanding risks based on the suggestions in this review.</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>This proposal is coordinated with the global ABNJ program.</p> <p>26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Under section A2, SWIOPF and ASCLME has been mentioned another couple of strong candidates that I would argue should be mentioned is the CLME.</p>	

		<p>countries of the extended Caribbean LME towards sustainable fisheries as well as the Benguela Current Commission. I do understand that the lists of stakeholders are by no means exhaustive, but still.</p> <p>26th of November 2013 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>The implementation/execution arrangement needs to be reevaluated based on the suggestions in this review.</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		[10/3/11] N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>No, based on the reduction of components suggested above, it is recommended that this proposal be a Medium Sized Project (MSP).</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p> <p>[10/3/11] Project was reduced from FSP to MSP without a PPG. Level of PM has been increased from \$86,364 to \$90,000 as a result of the elimination of the \$50,000 PPG and subsequent increase in per objective costs. PM ratio is 1:4.4 (previously 1:4.6)</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate	The funding and co-funding per objective will need to be adjusted based	

	<p>and outputs?</p>	<p>[AH 9/1/11] Addressed.</p> <p>[10/3/11] Cost per objective has increased as a result of the elimination of the \$50,000 PPG. Per objective costs are still inline with PIF and overall project costs and design.</p> <p>26th of August 2013 (cseverin): When comparing the FAO ProDOc and the Request for MSP approval, there seems to be smaller differences between the components and their costs (the GEF grant differs). Please do address this.</p> <p>26th of November 2013 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>Co-financing ration is now 1:3.3. The indicated co-financing is poorly presented and it is unclear how much is actually committed. All co-financing must either be listed as in-kind or cash. GOF co-financing is missing</p> <p>Further, Section C.1 on the specifics of FAO's co-financing needs to be elaborated.</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] Table C - Indicative Co-financing is confusing. First, please separate out co-financing to be provided by individual organizations, not collective groups. Second, it is noted that there are inconsistencies with this Table C from the current and previous PIF. For example, the decrease in</p>	

		<p>et al., to name a few, and why the overall co-financing has decreased in light of the addition of \$625,000 from Sea Orbiter. Please provide an explanation for this in your review response.</p> <p>Lastly, Section C.1 (Agency Co-financing) needs to be more descriptive what in-kind services are being provided with the listed \$1M from FAO.</p> <p>[9/13/11] Addressed.</p> <p>26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Please do insert in Table C the remaining co-financing amounts. Presently the total does not equal the amount in Table A and B.</p> <p>26th of November 2013 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>[10/3/11] FAO is bringing \$1.5M in grant and in-kind co-financing. GOF, as the executing agency is bringing an additional \$900,000 in grant and in-kind co-financing. With the addition of many other co-financers, the co-financing amount of \$4.325M is acceptable for this MSP.</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>Yes, the Tracking Tools for both BD and IW are included with relevant indicators</p>
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAD? 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		

Secretariat Recommendation

<p>Recommendation at PIF Stage</p>	<p>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>No, the PIF needs considerable work as suggested above. Please also be sure to change the grant type to MSP. With Component 2 removed, knowledge management should be removed from the project title, e.g. "Global Coordination for marine ABNJ"</p> <p>[AH 9/1/11] No, the PIF is not being recommended at this time. Please address the issues raised above. Please also note that per GEF Operations Policy, MSP (\$1M) are inclusive of a PPG.</p> <p>[9/13/11] All issues have been addressed and recommendation is being granted at this time.</p> <p>[9/19/11] Clearance was not granted. A number of changes have been requested as noted above. Please address and resubmit. Further, we suggest a change in title to "Strengthening Global Capacity to Effectively Manage ABNJ" as it better captures the outputs of the project framework.</p> <p>[10/12/11] The PIF adequately reflects the changes requested - thank you. However, upon further consultation on new MSP policy, only the single-step submission for an MSP is being accepted. Please proceed with the preparation of the full MSP project</p>	
------------------------------------	--	---	--

		Request for CEO Approval, including IW and BD Tracking Tools. Please note that this can be submitted anytime following approval of the parent ABNJ program by GEF Council.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		26th of November 2013 (cseverin): Yes CEO Approval of the MSP is being recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 10, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 01, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 14, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 21, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 12, 2011	

* **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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	[9/19/11] A PPG will not be provided for this PIF.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.

