

# Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean - (FishEBM MED)

**Review PIF and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10560

**Countries**

Regional (Albania, Algeria, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Morocco, Tunisia, Turkey)

**Project Name**

Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean - (FishEBM MED)

**Agencies**

FAO, UNEP

**Date received by PM**

3/24/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/17/2020

**Program Manager**

Steffen Hansen

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **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**

H (3.30.2020):

### *International Waters:*

Currently PIF section I table A indicates IW objective 1.1 (Sustaining healthy coastal and marine ecosystems) and IW objective 2.1 (Ensuring sound maritime legal frameworks for the protection and sustainable use of biodiversity in the ABNJ).

Please note that IW objective 1.1. should be changed to 1.2. Reasoning: It is acknowledged that the project targets small scale coastal fisheries, including via a broader multi-sectoral reform agenda, however, fisheries (SSF and IUU) remain the main focus of the project. Subsequently, please change IW objective 1.1. to IW objective 1.2.

IW objective 2.4: When looking on a map of the Mediterranean Sea there are no ABNJ areas. In the alignment with GEF focal area strategies PIF section, please be explicit and explain the link to the ABNJ objective. E.g. will the project collaborate on science gathering with e.g. with Tuna RFMOs? Or is the ABNJ strategic alignment referenced because some of the IUU activities are directly linked to Med ABNJ areas?

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

### *Biodiversity:*

There is a lack of alignment between the BD objectives as listed in PIF part I Table A and the information as listed in the “Alignment with GEF Focal Areas section”. E.g. table A lists BD objective 1.1 and 2.7 while BD objective 2 and 3 are referenced in the “Alignment with GEF Focal Areas” section.

In general, 300,000 BD funding from the Montenegro STAR allocation has been added to the project, however, the project contains no references to relevant national BD strategies and plans (NBSAPs, national Marine Protected Areas plans etc.), while it also does not explicitly include national biodiversity relevant information in the barriers and baseline descriptions. Please add this information throughout the relevant sections of the PIF, including the consistency with national priorities and the alignment with GEF focal areas PIF sections. BD eligibility cannot be evaluated until the above information has been added.

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. Note that while the text inserted into the "The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects" section provides value, this section would benefit from a better structure. Further, the BD relevant section inserted into the "2.a Associated baseline projects" sub-section contains errors. Please address both points and resubmit.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/14/2020

The PIF has been revised accordingly (both under the baseline scenario section as well as under the associated baselined projects section).

4/9/2020

International Waters

The link to IW 1.1 has been changed to IW 1.2, as suggested.

Please, consider the following clarification, justifying the link to IW 2.4. There are several portions of the Mediterranean Sea that are currently ABNJ areas, according to the general rules of international law on the regime and extent of marine spaces within and beyond national jurisdiction. The current jurisdictional picture of the Med is very complex. Not all the Mediterranean coastal States have decided to establish an exclusive economic zone up to now. Some of these States have established beyond the territorial sea sui generis zones, such as a fishing zones or ecological protection zones. While such zones are not explicitly mentioned in the UNCLOS their establishment is not prohibited either (in maiore stat minus, the right to do less can be considered as implied in the right to do more). In any case, they include some of the rights that can be exercised within the exclusive economic zone regime. Still, only a part of all existing maritime boundaries in the Med have been so far agreed upon by the opposite/adjacent Mediterranean States concerned. The peculiarities referred above make the Mediterranean a special case where the existence of ABNJ remains relevant until such day all maritime delimitations will be settled (as in the case of the Black Sea, for instance). For this reason, the Agency considers that there is no need to explain the link to the ABNJ objective in the PiF. This is implied in the project as a result of the application of general international law in the Mediterranean Sea. Furthermore, since some unsettled delimitation issues in the region remain quite controversial and political, the Agency advice is to avoid adding any explicit information focusing on this aspect. Activities foreseen under the different components are going to be relevant to the ABNJ objective in so far as they will also address Mediterranean high-sea areas, as is the case indeed with IUU fishing which by definition is a transnational problem that has to be addressed by the project within and beyond national jurisdiction.

On cooperation with other RFMOs, including ICCAT, in section 7), under stakeholders involvement (page 27), see the wording on this matter with reference to existing memoranda of understanding entered into by GFCM.

Biodiversity

For the BD part, general information about the Mediterranean Sea and Adriatic Sea (relevant in particular to Montenegro) has been added in section 2 (baseline). Moreover, references to the BD related process ongoing under the Barcelona Convention system have been added in section 2B, as these are highly relevant to the proposed PIF and will contribute to its successful execution. Even in the baseline projects, the entry relating to the MAP, has been expanded upon to better clarify the BD dimension this project has, though this is secondary to the fisheries dimension. Additional references to the project contribution to global processes, including

contribution to the Aichi targets, and the NBSAP's in Montenegro, have been added in section 7. These elements will be expanded during the project preparation phase.

#### **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**

1. **Project Objective:** The PO also contains Core Indicator descriptions. Note that indicator descriptions should be captured under the PIF Core Indicator section and not the PO description.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

2. **PIF table B outputs:** Note that while it can be acceptable to have more generic outputs at PIF stage, it remains important to select some basic indicators per outcome at PIF stage and to provide tangible targets per output when feasible (e.g. for management plans there might be a current baseline of zero and the target might then be e.g. management plans in x number of countries; for investment plans the current baseline might be zero and the target might then be x number of investments plans developed; for countries applying the ad-hoc IUU methodology the current baseline might be zero and the target might be methodologies applied in x out of x countries etc.). Please carefully go through each table B output, assess the baseline, and be more specific on tangible targets per outputs.

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. Both output 1.1 and 1.2 reference a "potential target of 18 countries", however, only 10 countries part-take in this project. Please edit the target for both outputs and resubmit.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

3. component 5: Outreach and KM is crucial towards the success of the project itself, while it can provide significant value to other regions and stakeholders. The component 5 description should specifically mention that project results will continuously be featured as part of the Med Sea Program knowledge sharing platform. Also, how exactly will public and private partnerships be advanced as part of output 4.1? Please add information. Finally, how exactly will FAO use this project to advance uptake of lessons learnt across other of its IFMOs?

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. Thanks for adding additional information to the component 5 description. Please note that the component 5 description would benefit from a shorter and clearer structure. Please apply edits and resubmit.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/14/2020

On the indicators, the value of potential targets was amended, where needed, with a view to account only for GEF eligible countries participating in the project. In the accompanying footnote, it has been explained that under the expected co-financing the project will try and pursue, where possible, higher values of the relevant potential targets given that all GFCM/MAP Members are concerned by the execution of the project.

On component 5, the relevant section in the PIF has been amended according to the guidance provided by the GEF Secretariat.

4/9/2020

1. On project objective: the indicators description has been deleted, as requested.
2. Indicators and baseline/targets information at the output level have been added in table B, as requested. More details will be made available during the PPG phase, both on additional indicators and targets.
3. Additional information has been provided in the PIF under the specific section describing component 5 (Part II – description of the alternative scenario).

## **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**

SH (3.30.2020):

Table C:

1. In the “describe how any investment mobilized was identified” section, FAO points towards further detail being available throughout the PIF. Note that this information should also feature in this section and not only throughout the PIF. Please provide 1-2 lines description per investment mobilized stakeholder. This then implies 1-2 lines specific to each country and specific to each CSO.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

2. 2. Private sector plays a big role in the project theory of change and is relevant throughout a series of outputs, including the introduction of new monitoring equipment etc. Please add to table B commitments from private sector,

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

SH (4.15.2020): Please have a careful look at the co-financing table C categorizations, including the subsequent investment mobilized descriptions. Right now all co-finance for both projects is categorized as “Grant”, which seems very unlikely. For the majority of the Table C columns, the selection of the “in-kind financing” category seems more suitable.

Please note the following logic:

**Grants** are financial resources (cash) from recipient governments, executing agencies, bilateral or multilateral institutions, the private sector, and civil society organizations (national or international) that are used to carry out or support specific activities defined in the GEF project document. Grant co-financing is provided without expectation of repayment.

**In-kind co-financing** refers to contributions in the form of goods or services other than money, including but not limited to time dedicated to project activities equivalent to salaries and wages, office or venue space, utilities and related projects and initiatives. These contributions may be used to carry out specific activities defined in the GEF project document (e.g., training workshops) or may enhance the execution of the GEF project, including through operational support, synergies with complementary activities, capacity building, the use of knowledge tools and access to relevant data. Examples of in-kind co-financing include:

- The time equivalent of salaries and wages of staff from governments, other stakeholder organizations and local communities for activities that contribute to the activities of the GEF project (e.g., the national focal point for International Waters; government staff that review project documentation, contribute to the establishment of inter-ministerial committees, advise on the design of monitoring systems, or the inventory of legal and policy instruments; staff from other organizations that support capacity building or awareness-raising activities; etc.).
-

- Projects in the region financed by governments, the private sector, civil society organizations or others that will contribute to the objectives of the GEF project (e.g., national program to build climate resilience in local fisheries communities, private sector initiative to improve sustainable fisheries (new tech applications etc), civil society capacity building program to promote aspects related to fisheries/marine biodiversity etc.). Projects proposed for co-financing must be active within the life cycle of the GEF project (from the development of the project concept to the closure of the project).
- 
- **Recurrent expenditures vs. investments mobilized:** Finally, please explain if GFCM and UNEP-MAP will not provide cofinance in the form of operating costs, overhead costs, fixed costs, and salaries? Such contributions are recurrent costs and should not be listed as investment mobilized.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared. By CEO endorsement stage, FAO should have confirmation to document the nature of the co-finance.

## Agency Response

4/16/2020

Table C has been updated. GFCM and MAP contributions have been re-categorized to in-kind contributions. These are also no longer accounted for as investment mobilized. Other co-financing has not been changed, as representing grant contributions to the project.

4/9/2020

1. Text was added, as requested, under the “describe how any investment mobilized was identified” section. Please, also note the amendments made to the table C.

2. Concerning commitments from the private sector in table C, at this early development stage, only a general interest has been expressed by some private sector actors, but none have come forward with actual commitments that could be added under table C. The Agency, having regard to the current covid-19 related emergency and how this has been having an impact on the business operations of the private sectors, prefers to exert caution at the PIF stage. Consultations with the private sector will be resumed throughout the PPG phase, during which more precise inputs (such as usage of monitoring equipment, etc.) will be reflected as private sector commitments under table C, leading to fruitful partnerships supported by signed co-financing letters. Section 4 in the PIF on private sector engagement has been revised (pages 31 and 32).

#### **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**

SH (3.30.2020);

Yes, cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

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

SH (3.30.2020);

Yes, cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

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

SH (3.30.2020);

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

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

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

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

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

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

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

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

**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**

SH (3.30.2020);

Yes, cleared.

**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**

SH (2.30.2020):

**1. Core Indicators:**

1. (A) Please make entries for the relevant biodiversity indicators.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

2. (B) No entry has been made into Core Indicator 2. Please populate this indicator while noting that the table B Objective section states that “Indicators: 2. Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use, Target: 1255484 hectares\*?”. Also, please note that this indicator should include a description of the applied methodology.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

3. (C) No entry has been made into Core Indicator 7 and its sub-indicators. Please populate this indicator.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

(D) An non corrected # has been entered into Core Indicator 8. Please correct the numbered entered while noting that the PIF text states a target of 238000 metric tons of fish brought towards greater sustainability. Also note that in the indicator description it is not enough to simply state the name of the fisheries along with a number. Subsequently, please include a description of the applied methodology when reaching the 238000 metric tons.

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. Please also enter the applied methodology when reaching the 238,000 tonnage estimate.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared, but please have a look again and make sure that it is possible to differentiate the methodology specific to Core Indicator 2 from that of Core Indicator 8. Right now they appear merged.

5. (E) Please consider if Core Indicator 5 should be populated?

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

6. (F) No entry has been made into Core Indicator 11. Please correct and note that at this stage the # entered can be based on a rough estimate of stakeholders targeted per intervention sight/envisoned capacity building activity at the national/regional levels.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

**2. Rio Markers:** Rio Markers is a mandatory tag for all GEF-financed projects. Indicate whether the project targets climate change adaptation and/or climate change mitigation using the OECD DAC Rio Markers: 0=does not target; 1=targets as a significant objective, 2=targets as the principal objective. Please refer to the OECD DAC Handbook for further details: [https://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Revised%20climate%20marker%20handbook\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Revised%20climate%20marker%20handbook_FINAL.pdf)

The project has selected CCM #0 and CCA #0. Provided that CCA is integrated into the fisheries EBM approach, then please consider if the CCA # should be adjusted to 1?

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

## Agency Response

4/16/2020

Sub-titles have been provided in the explanatory box of the CI worksheet, referring explicitly to the relevant core indicators.

4/14/2020

The methodology relating to Core Indicator 8 can be found in the footnote of the Core Indicators table in the GEF portal.

4/9/2020

Core indicators:

1. Information on BD indicators has been added in the portal.
2. More precisely, the relevant entry for Core Indicator 2 in the portal has been populated and a note on the methodology has been added in the portal.
3. On Core Indicator 7, action has been taken accordingly.
4. For Core Indicator 8 the correct figures and the methodology have been added in the portal.
5. Core Indicator 5 is not considered under the project.
6. Estimates have been provided for Core Indicator 11 in the portal and in the PiF.

Rio Markers: CCA marker has been amended.

#### **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**

SH (3.30.2020);

Yes, cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **Part 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**

SH (3.30.2020):

Root causes 4: lack of capacity:

1. Firstly, to keep a clear focus, please consider shortening this sub-section.
2. In addition, please give some practical examples of what lack of capacity means at the country level? Currently, this section speaks mainly about GFCM and MAP and perhaps less about lack of capacity. While the two are interlinked, please better explain if the envisioned GFCM-MAP synergies (encapsulated by NAP+) will help build national level capacity as part of an integral set of blue economy investment-driven policies.
3. Please consider removing language like “call for entrusting the execution of the project to the GFCM”. The justification for GFCMs role as executing partner is provided in the coordination section.
4. Has the concept of the NAPs been explained prior to this section? Please spell out NAPs the first time your use it acronym = National Action Plans.

SH (4.10.2020): all of the above points are cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/9/2020

All comments have been addressed in full, and revisions have been made in the relevant sections of the PIF.

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

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

SH (3.30.2020):

Baseline section and World Bank related projects: please check if the “MED Integration of Climatic Variability and Change into National Strategies to implement the ICZM Protocol in the Mediterranean” is a WB implemented project? Please also explain why the the Long-term Financial Mechanism to Enhance Mediterranean MPA Management Effectiveness is listed as an CC focal area project implemented by the WB? This is an IW financed project implemented by Conservation

International. While the project should be mentioned and constitutes a relevant baseline to build from, it is not correct to reference it as a WB project. In general, please double check the baseline projects to make sure that other mistakes are corrected as part of the resubmission.

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. Refer to comments in review sheet Part I Box 1.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/14/2020

Action was taken accordingly in light of the comments in the RS under Part I, Box 1.

4/9/2020

The relevant section in the PIF has been amended, addressing the concerns expressed above.

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

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

SH (3.30.2020):

**1. The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project:** in the first para of this section the difference between regional vs national scope and activities is still not entirely clear. Please consider using examples to showcase the difference between the multi-country regional activities and the envisioned NAP + activities, which will integrate with such regional activities.

SH (4.10.2020): Not addressed. The inserted text speaks almost entirely about the NAP+. Instead, the text needs to exemplify the links between the envisioned regional activities and the envisioned NAP+. In other words, please make clear how regional outputs logically link to the NAP+ concept, as presented via box 1? Please edit the inserted text and resubmit.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

2. Box 1: the image quality is poor, please upload a new picture.]

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

3. Theory of Change figure: the image quality is poor, please upload a new picture.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared. A high image quality version of the ToC has been filed under supporting documents.

4. NAP+: Please make sure that the acronym NAP + is spelled out the first time it is mentioned in the project.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/14/2020

Action was taken accordingly via a revision of the relevant section in the PIF.

4/9/2020

1. and 4. The relevant section in the PIF has been amended to address the concerns.

2. and 3. Uploading the images has led to a reduced quality of the snapshot. While the Box 1 was re-created from scratch in the file, the TOC diagram has been removed and uploaded as separate document in the Roadmap section.

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

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

SH (3.30.2020):

1. This regional fisheries project is missing GEF Endorsement Letters from key GFCM member countries and GEF eligible countries. The importance of including these key countries have been discussed before, however, now it seems the countries have been removed entirely from the submission. Please provide these, as well as make sure to include these nations as part of the GEF beneficiary countries on the front page of project submission.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

2. 2. Further to the above, Libya is included in the project. Please explain how the project intends to effectively execute activities the country, which is challenged by political turmoil and challenging on the ground conditions.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared, however, the in-country capacity and baseline should be further assessed during project preparation.

### **Agency Response**

4/14/2020

Duly noted.

4/9/2020

1. The participating countries have been listed, and efforts to secure LOEs from all these countries in due time continue, even though these efforts are challenged by the Covid-19 pandemic.

2. The execution of activities in Libya will be ensured by relying mainly on national consultants in close coordination with the national focal points to the GFCM and the MAP, as per the current modus operandi in place in these organizations when it comes to working relationships with Libya. FAO-Libya will also provide support in the ground. On the other hand, international travels to Libya and/or the travelling of Libyan nationals to be involved in the execution of project activities will depend on security rules in place within FAO/UNEP during the implementation of the project.

**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**

SH (3.30.2020);

1. Please note that when reading the incremental / additional cost reasoning PIF section it becomes unclear if some of the co-finance listed in table C has not been confirmed. Please have a look at the second para of the section and make corrections to the text as needed. Further, this section should be much clearer on how the listed co-finance adds value specific to the anticipated component and outputs under the project. This information could be added via the insertion of a table.

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. Thanks for inserting the table. Note that the inserted text above the table should reference table C and not PIF section 2.b. Per upstream discussion, please edit the inserted text and resubmit.

SH (4.15.2020): not cleared. The inserted table contains miscalculations. Please insert a new table. In general, please provide numbers for all tables/figures throughout the PIF submission (e.g. table 1, 2, 3 etc.). Currently, some of the tables/figures have numbers, while others don't.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

2. Further, this section should be much clearer on how the listed co-finance adds value specific to the anticipated component and outputs under the project. This information could be added via the insertion of a table.

SH (4.16.2020): Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/16/2020

The table has been updated. Furthermore, tables and figures have been numbered throughout the PIF for easy reference.

4/14/2020

Action taken accordingly in the revised PIF.

4/9/2020

1. The language in the incremental cost reasoning section has been amended.
2. A table with the indicative breakdown of co-financing has been added in this section.

**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**

SH (3.30.2020);

Please see comment specific to review sheet part I, box 6.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/9/2020

Duly noted. The section has been slightly amended in the PIF.

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

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

SH (3.30.2020);

Yes, cleared.

### **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**

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

### **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**

SH (3.30.2020):

### **Stakeholders PIF Section:**

1. The project has ticked the “Civil Society Organizations”, “Indigenous Peoples” and “Private Sector” boxes. Subsequently and per GEF policy, please provide as part of the submission a description of the consultations with civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples and Private Sector, which happened in the formulation of the project. Please also provide a description of consultations with relevant national/regional stakeholders. Citing the Policy: ‘Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...’

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. In the portal Stakeholder section, please "un-click" the indigenous peoples box. Please also in the Stakeholder section provide a few lines that references the dialogue to date with the private sector and as part of the PIF development phase.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

2. Please provide a table describing the stakeholder’s anticipated future roles in the project, and with information pertaining to how those stakeholders will be engaged (through which means). Citing the policy: "Agencies provide... as well as information on how Stakeholders will be engaged in the proposed project activity and means of engagement throughout the project/program cycle". Please consider structuring this information on an output by output basis.

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. Please follow the same guidance as for the FAO/GFCM Black Sea PIF and edit the inserted table.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/14/2020

The Indigenous People and Local Communities box has been unselected in the Portal.

Concerning the private sector, specific language detailing how they have been involved thus far in the development of the PIF appears under the relevant section of the PIF. The Agency recommends no text is therefore added to the stakeholders section of the PIF.

The table on the anticipated involvement of stakeholders has been revised consistent with guidance provided by the GEF Sec.

4/9/2020

1. A clarification is needed on indigenous people. As per footnote 33, the PIF specifies that that there are currently no indigenous peoples reported to live in the Mediterranean region.

2. The section has been amended, including the insertion of a table on stakeholders involvement.

#### **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**

SH (3.30.2020);

Yes, cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

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

SH (3.30.2020);

Refer to comments made in review sheet part I, box 3. Further, provide an overview of the private sector engagement to date.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/9/2020

Additional information has been provided in the PIF.

### **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**

SH (3.30.2020):

#### **Risk section:**

1. Concerning the lack of political stability throughout the region, reference should be made to successful mitigation measures conducted under the previous and current series of UNEP-MAP investments in the region.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

2. "Bureaucratic obstacles in the implementation of certain activities": this risk seems generic across most GEF projects and hence irrelevant.

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. Well noted that this is a risk worth mentioning, however, please consider if the text inserted in the Risk section can be further refined and in order to reflect the explanation given as part of the below agency response.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

3. Environmental and Social Safeguards: The GEF's updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (SD/PL/03) is applicable to all new projects and programs, including the PIFs/PFDs for potential inclusion into the June Work Program. Please in the risk section (Part II, Section 5) provide information on Environmental and Social Safeguards and/or indicate the relevant project documents.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

4. Please also note that the project would benefit from a more focused description of climate risks and associated actions. Please see the following STAP climate risk screening guidelines:

<http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

SH (4.21.2020):

The PIF, section 5, includes information that ESS screening has taken place and FAO has attached the FAO's Project Risk Clarification. Please note that FAO should provide a complete risk screening report prior to CEO endorsement including information on the type and rating of risks and information on any ESS assessments and measures to address identified risks and potential impacts.

## **Agency Response**

4/14/2020

Action taken accordingly in the revised PIF.

4/9/2020

On point 1, action has been taken accordingly (PIF amended).

On point 2, the Agency notes that, as indicated by the GEF Sec itself, this is the first time ever that a project combining the execution of an RFMO and a RSC convention will be funded under the IW focal area. Consequently, the potential risk stemming from the bureaucratic burden of coordinating two different national authorities in the beneficiary countries (fisheries and environment) must be taken into account. Thus far, in the very collection of letters of endorsement, this has already proven to be an hurdle in that the process has been slowed down by the need of the different national authorities to talk and agree on a common course of action. The Agency hence recommends that the risk, as revised in the PiF, is maintained in the table.

3. Please, note that the result of the ESS risk level is available in the Roadmap section of the Portal.

4. A climate change risk screening has been added in the Roadmap section of the Portal.

#### **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**

SH (3.30.2020):

1. Programme Steering Committee (PSC) section: please have a careful look at the text. Right now it is written as if the PSC members will only have an advisory role, which of course is not correct.

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. The same text has been inserted twice. Please edit and resubmit.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

2. Aspects related to monitoring and evaluation should be added to the coordination section.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/14/2020

Action taken accordingly in the revised PIF.

4/9/2020

Please, consider the following sections in the PIF addressing the above concerns:

“The main role of the PSC will be to provide a coordination forum and a monitoring platform during the implementation phase of the proposed project. It will also provide an overall, high-level, coordination of the technical alignment and synergy between the proposed project components.” It is by no means a technical advisory body, but a decision-making platform for the project. The PSC will act as a coordination forum and a monitoring platform, among others. The role and composition of the PSC will be further detailed during the PPG phase.

### **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**

SH (3.30.2020):

This section should include a table, which briefly describes the needed alignment with all relevant national plans per country.

SH (4.10.2020): Not cleared. The added footnote needs further clarification so that it becomes clear why NAPs are not referenced in the inserted table.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/14/2020

Action taken accordingly in the revised PIF.

4/9/2020

Action taken accordingly in the PIF focusing in particular on fisheries and aquaculture given that these are the areas primarily targeted by the project. A table has been added, mapping specifically these national strategies.

### **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**

SH (3.30.2020):

1. Please enter into this section that 1% of the IW grant will be dedicated towards IW learn activities, including global and regional events and the production and dissemination of experience notes.

SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/9/2020

The reference to the 1% made available for IW-Learn has been added in the PIF.

### Part 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

SH (3.30.2020):

GEF notes that FAO have submitted an LOE from the Lebanese OFP, however, GEF has not been able to confirm the name of the new OFP. Subsequently, GEF is in contact with the Lebanese government to retrieve this information and in order to evaluate the merits of the submitted LOE.

SH 4.10.2020): The merits of the Lebanese LOE has been confirmed. Please note that LOEs from Egypt, Turkey, Algeria and BiH are missing.

SH (4.15.2020): Thank you for submitting the LOEs specific to Algeria and Turkey. Please note that LOEs from BiH and Egypt are missing.

SH (4.16.2020): LOEs are missing. Please address and resubmit.

SH (4.16.2020): Egypt and BiH have been removed as project beneficiaries, but may join and be fully incorporated into the project during the PPG phase.

#### Agency Response

4/16/2020

Obtaining LOEs from all targeted countries has been challenged by the pandemic, which has resulted in the closure of many of the administrations in these countries. Exchanges with the OFPs and partners in both BiH and Egypt are furthered, interest has been expressed, but more time is needed in order to conclude the bureaucratic processes to conclude successfully in the issuance of an LOE to the regional project.

4/9/2020 - 4/14/2020

Duly noted.

**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**

NA

**Agency Response**

**GEFSEC 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**

SH (3.30.2020): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (4.10.2020): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (4.15.2020): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (4.16.2020): Please address comment specific to Part III box 1 and resubmit.

SH (4.21.2020): Project is recommended for technical clearance.

Note that the following comment was inserted in the review sheet "Risks" section: The PIF, section 5, includes information that ESS screening has taken place and FAO has attached the FAO's Project Risk Clarification. Please note that FAO should provide a complete risk screening report prior to CEO endorsement including information on the type and rating of risks and information on any ESS assessments and measures to address identified risks and potential impacts.

**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
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

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

**Background:** The Mediterranean has sustained fisheries exploitation since ancient times. Today, industrial, semi-industrial and small-scale fisheries coexist in the region, each using a large variety of fishing gear to harvest a multi-species marine environment extremely rich in biodiversity. In contrast with other major fishing areas in the world, where fishing fleets extend their operations well onto the high-seas to target select stocks, the Mediterranean Sea generally lacks large mono-specific fisheries and instead exploits a variety of benthic and pelagic stocks of fish, as well as molluscs and crustaceans. In addition, since the Mediterranean is a semi-enclosed sea, exploited stocks are mostly shared among the fishing fleets of littoral States, which calls in turn for the need to ensure very strong cooperation and coordination among them in the elaboration and implementation of those measures which are essential for the sustainable management of the fisheries. This was corroborated by the TDA for the Mediterranean Sea, which some 15 years ago identified and analyzed in some detail the major environmental concerns in the region, including the decline of biodiversity. In the statement of the causes of such concerns the TDA included invasive species, introduced species, overfishing, by-catch, adverse effects of fishing gear and uses on marine habitats (e.g. bottom trawling), inadequate or non-existent legislation and available enforcement means. Yet only limited attention was given to these concerns, as opposed to that received by other concerns which were outlined in the TDA and implemented as part of region wide SAP-BIO and SAP-MED Strategic Action Plans.

**The project:** A move to more resilient, productive and sustainable fisheries entails an increased focus on the development of value chains, controls (including IUU), integrated management plans (fisheries integrating into the environment agenda) and other tangible measures that have the potential to mobilize both public and private investments. This project contains the following components: Component 1: Strengthened capacity to manage commercial fisheries, with particular focus on Small Scale Fisheries; Component 2: Enhanced integration of emerging monitoring, control and surveillance technologies in the fight against IUU fishing; Component 3: Integrated ecosystem based management tools and ecosystem approach to biodiversity protection and sustainable fisheries; Component 4: Innovative blue economy solutions accounting for the fishery sector; Component 5: Knowledge management and outscaling.

The project will deliver the following GEBs: Improved management effectiveness of 125,845 hectares of Marine Protected Area and 238,000 tons of over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels.

**Innovation, sustainability and scaling up:** Across the project, innovation is advanced in a multitude of ways, including via: a) Facilitating the introduction of certification of fisheries b) introducing business models, including for fisheries value chain and c) by testing and tailoring emerging technology in the field of control and monitoring. Importantly, the envisioned fisheries interventions form part of an innovate partnership between a Regional Fisheries Management Organization (GFCM) and a Regional Seas Program (UNEP-MAP), creating a greater degree of alignment of their respective regional programmes, strategies and action plans, including via pilot level activities which integrates fisheries aspects into the current UNEP-MAP National Action Plan structure. Sustainability is secured via the country buy-in into the GFCM and UNEP-MAP institutional mandates and plans, and via capacity building of a wide range of actors and institutions, including national authorities and SSF associations; the development and demonstration of the feasibility of NAP+ with investment plans; developing strategies towards securing funding in support of small-scale fishers; and the involvement of scientific institutes involved in collecting data via surveys and research campaigns. The scaling up of project interventions is secured via the envisioned integrated governance framework leading to multi-stakeholder platforms, management plans, cross sectoral marine spatial planning etc. Likewise, the NAP+ pilot could be replicated in the region and beyond, which again entails synergies between public and private sectors.

