



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT
PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the protection of the Western Indian Ocean from land-based sources and activities (WIO-SAP)			
Country(ies):	Comoros, Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, South Africa, Seychelles, Mauritius, Somalia, Madagascar	GEF Project ID: ¹	4940
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	00849
Other Executing Partner(s):	Nairobi Convention Secretariat	Resubmission Date:	April 4, 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	60 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	Not Applicable	Project Agency Fee (\$):	978,030
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 		

A. **FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK**²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-1 (select)	1.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency, sustainable fisheries with rights-based management, IWRM, water supply protection in SIDS, and aquifer and catchment protection	Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments	GEF TF	1,200,000	10,268,770
IW-2 (select)	2.1: Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) incorporates ecosystem-based approaches to management of LMEs, ICM principles, and policy/legal/institutional reforms into national, local plans	National and local policy, legal, institutional reforms adopted	GEF TF	2,350,000	25,181,970
IW-2 (select)	2.2: Institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management for LMEs and local ICM frameworks demonstrate sustainability	Agreed commitments to sustainable ICM and LME cooperation frameworks	GEF TF	1,925,000	18,367,020

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

IW-2 (select)	2.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, rebuilding or protecting fish stocks with rights-based management, ICM, habitat restoration or conservation and port management produce measureable results	Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments	GEF TF	300,000	3,597,140
(select) (select)	3.1: Political commitment, shared vision, and institutional capacity demonstrated for joint, ecosystem-based management of waterbodies and local ICM principles	National inter-ministry committees established; Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses & Strategic Action Programmes; local ICM plans	GEF TF	4,717,000	20,271,441
(select) (select)			(select)		
Project management cost				375,000	0
Total project costs				10,867,000	77,686,341

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: to reduce impacts from land-based sources and activities and sustainably manage critical coastal-riverine ecosystems through the implementation of the WIO-SAP priorities with the support of partnerships at national and regional levels

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component A: Sustainable management of critical habitats	TA	Outcome A.1: Appropriate tools and methodologies are used to manage critical coastal and marine habitats in order to enhance their resilience and long-term sustainability	<p>OUTPUT A.1.1: National institutions undertake participatory spatial planning to increase the resilience of selected key coastal ecosystems to anthropogenic impacts including the impacts of climate change and variability</p> <p>OUTPUT A.1.2: Management plans developed and adopted for at least five (5) key critical coastal and marine habitats, reinforcing the regional MPA network and mitigating habitat loss and climate change impacts</p> <p>OUTPUT A.1.3: Two key degraded critical</p>	GEF TF	3,403,000	40,329,543

		<p>OUTCOME A.2: Appropriate tools and methods (which integrate economic, social and environmental considerations) support coastal planning and management</p>	<p>coastal habitats restored and resilience increased</p> <p>OUTPUT A.1.4: Pilot actions to build capacity in ICM, demonstrating how ICM can be strengthened at the local level through the empowerment of communities and other actors at demonstration sites</p> <p>OUTPUT A.2.1: Economic valuation of at least three (3) key critical coastal and marine habitats including integration of economic valuation to coastal management and planning</p> <p>OUTPUT A.2.2: Tools and guidelines for vulnerability assessment and spatial planning supports monitoring and management actions</p> <p>OUTPUT A.2.3: Sustainable livelihood strategies regarding extractive use activities developed and adopted for specific coastal and marine natural resources</p> <p>OUTPUT A.2.4. Adoption of regional indicators and baseline assessment in support of critical habitat monitoring and management</p>			
Component B: Improved water quality	TA	OUTCOME B.1: Quality of coastal receiving waters	OUTPUT B.1.1: Cost-effective technologies for municipal	GEF TF	2,215,000	16,385,000

		<p>improved through pilot interventions</p> <p>OUTCOME B.2 Regulatory framework for monitoring and management of pollutant loads, effluents and receiving water quality implemented/adopted at regional level</p>	<p>wastewater treatment demonstrated in at least three (3) sites</p> <p>OUTPUT B.1.2.: Effluents at a minimum of three (3) demonstration sites are collected, treated, recycled and/or disposed of in accordance with international best practices</p> <p>OUTPUT B.1.3: Pilot actions undertaken to build capacity for water quality management and ICM promoted through empowerment of communities and other actors at the demonstration sites</p> <p>OUTPUT B.2.1: Regionally harmonized framework for monitoring pollution loads and water quality standards developed for receiving coastal waters</p> <p>OUTPUT B.2.2: Regionally harmonized standards and monitoring framework for pollutant loads and effluent and marine water quality standards adopted by at least three (3) countries through participatory national and regional consultations</p> <p>OUTPUT B.2.3: Regulatory and human capacity of national and regional facilities/institutions</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			strengthened to promote implementation of water quality monitoring using regional standards			
Component C: Sustainable management of river flows	TA	<p>OUTCOME C.1: Environmental Flow Assessments (EFAs) underpin the integrated management of river flows and coastal areas and implementation of assessment recommendations strengthens ecosystem resilience</p> <p>OUTCOME C.2 Capacity to conjunctively manage river flows and coastal areas strengthened</p>	<p>OUTPUT C.1.1: Environmental flow assessments conducted in at least two (2) pilot river basins to determine the environmental, economic and social trade-offs in water allocation and the need for management of river flows with respect to coastal areas</p> <p>OUTPUT C.1.2: Implementation of flow assessment recommendations and participatory river basin management approaches yield environmental, economic and/or social benefits as a result of improved river flows to the coast</p> <p>OUTPUT C.2.1: Institutional arrangements for implementation of climate sensitive environmental flow assessments developed, taking into consideration the environmental flow into the coastal areas and estuaries</p>	GEF TF	1,125,000	16,999,941
Component D: Governance, learning and exchange	TA	<p>OUTCOME D.1 Updated policies and strong institutions underpin WIO-SAP implementation</p>	<p>OUTPUT D.1.1: ICZM protocol developed and adopted at the regional level</p> <p>OUTPUT D.1.2: LBSA protocol ratified in at least four (4)</p>	GEF TF	3,749,000	3,971,857

			<p>countries and supported in all countries through the development of policy briefs, model legislation and capacity building to practitioners</p> <p>OUTPUT D.1.3: Implementation of the WIO-SAP succeeds at national level through the coordination and guidance of interministerial committees and regional task forces</p> <p>OUTPUT D.1.4: Establishment of a funding pipeline to support long-term implementation of the SAP through Nairobi Convention including coordination of stakeholders and facilitation of learning and exchange in support of WIOSAP project implementation</p> <p>OUTPUT D.2.1: Existing Nairobi Convention Clearing House Mechanism expanded to incorporate information on national and regional investments and projects, climate variability and change, guidelines, methodologies and success stories, among others</p> <p>OUTPUT D.2.2: Established science-policy exchange platform under the</p>			
		<p>OUTCOME D.2: Improved knowledge management systems and exchange mechanisms support WIO management, governance and awareness creation</p>				

			Nairobi Convention for policy and for consensus on key LBSA and ICZM issues in the WIO Region			
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal					10,492,000	77,686,341
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEF TF	375,000	
Total project costs					10,867,000	77,686,341

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Comoros	In-kind	5,900,000
National Government	Kenya	In-kind	12,000,000
National Government	Madagascar	In-kind	1,200,000
National Government	Mauritius	In-kind	4,500,000
National Government	Mozambique	In-kind	19,000,000
National Government	Seychelles	In-kind	4,600,000
National Government	Somalia	In-kind	168,400
National Government	Tanzania	In-kind	14,600,000
National Government	South Africa	In-kind	5,280,341
Nairobi Convention Secretariat		(select)	1,750,000
UNEP DEPI			1,565,000
Birdlife International			1,262,600
WIOMSA			4,110,000
WWF			1,750,000
Total Co-financing			77,686,431

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	International Waters	Somalia, Kenya, Tanzania,	10,867,000	978,030	11,845,030

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

			Mozambique, South Africa, Seychelles, Mauritius, Somalia, Madagascar			
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				10,867,000	978,030	11,845,030

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	335,000		335,000
National/Local Consultants	1,596,000		1,596,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

No change from the original PIF – however some key updates and expanded information is provided, particularly with regard to updating of national strategies and plans governing protection of the coastal and marine environment in each of the participating countries.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

Somalia was not involved in the implementation of the WIO-LaB project because of the political instability and insecurity in the country and for the same reasons was not involved in the PIF preparation. In recognition of the recent positive developments in the political and security situation, it was recommended during the Validation meeting held in Nairobi, Kenya in November 2014, that Somalia be included in the WIO-SAP implementation and

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

a number of strategic assessment type activities aiming at providing baseline information on the status of coastal and marine environment of the country be included in the WIO-SAP proposal. Such information will assist the country and the programme to identify priorities for action.

- A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: No change from the PIF – no additional information required, and more detail on links and coordination with other UNEP and non-GEF initiatives is also provided in the project document
- A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: Some changes from PIF – some technical and presentational changes resulted from the stakeholder consultations and assessments that were carried out during the PPG phase of the project. The project rationale was clarified and expanded, and the project logical framework was revised, improved and detailed. Some changes in the project logical framework were also made to clarify specific technical issues and/or to address GEF and STAP review comments. The revised project framework is summarized in Part I, Section B of this document. The Project Rationale, Logical Framework and a detailed description of outputs and activities table are presented in the project document.
- A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

A.5.1 Incremental cost reasoning:

There remains a need for international assistance and catalytic financing in the WIO Region, especially to address regional, transboundary coastal and marine issues through technical assistance and multi-lateral cooperation. The existing and future baseline level investments without GEF will address mostly national-level requirements, and will not adequately generate the required regional collaboration in policy, legal and institutional reforms that are necessary for addressing the root causes of the priority transboundary issues (see Table 10). The GEF Increment of the WIOSAP implementation project will be handling the identified and agreed transboundary concerns of the member states and also strengthen the management of the interlinked WIO freshwater and coastal ecosystems as follows:

Component A: Sustainable management of critical habitats: This component recognizes the enormous value of healthy critical coastal and marine habitats for the future well-being of people in the WIO region. The GEF increment will strengthen transboundary collaboration and management through on the ground activities related to spatial planning, site-specific management interventions and habitat restoration (outcome A.1).

Component B: Improved water quality: The GEF increment will support the implementation of on the ground interventions on the appropriate, cost-effective technologies for wastewater and effluent treatment, including building the capacity for transboundary monitoring, replication and upscaling of the demonstration project (outputs B.2.3 and B.1.1 – B.1.3). A number of on the ground interventions in key hotspot sites have been prioritized according to their contributions to stress reduction, their replicability and potential linkages to other WIOSAP activities. GEF funds will also catalyze the national governments and WIO-C co-financing contributions to the on the ground interventions. At the moment, most of actions are country-based with limited transboundary impact.

Component C: Sustainable management of river flows: Many priority actions in this component of the WIOSAP relate to building the capacity of the participating countries to conduct environmental flow assessments (EFA) and demonstrate the utility of such decision support tools in river basin management. Baseline and co-finance work by IUCN and WWF in testing appropriate methodologies, implementing flow assessments and in building a regional network for learning and exchange, will contribute substantially to the GEF intervention. GEF finance will support flow assessment on the ground interventions in at least two key transboundary river basins where there are already strong linkages between river flows and coastal ecosystems. It is expected that the GEF finance will contribute in establishing the impacts of land-based activities transmitted through river flows over to the marine and coastal areas and interventions measures that need to be undertaken to address these impacts. The EFA scenarios that will be developed will be subjected to participatory stakeholder consultation processes to promote acceptability and replication. GEF funds will catalyze national and WIO-C co-finance to the EFA on the ground interventions including activities focused on controlling land-based impacts to the coastal and marine environment. GEF intervention will also compliment previous and ongoing assessment works in Pangani Basin (through IUCN, GEF and EU support) and Wami Basin (through support from Florida International University, USAID and Coca-Cola)

in Tanzania; and Zambezi Basin (through support from WWF, World Bank, the International Rivers Network, among others). Some of the basins will provide opportunities to complement on the ground interventions on coastal management and water quality (components A and B).

Component D: Governance and Regional Collaboration: GEF support contributes to other important incremental benefits as well: freshwater and marine ecosystems in the region are typically administered through different ministries (water and environment respectively) which in practice means that the holistic nature of these systems and associated global and regional benefits are not maximized. In many cases upstream management actions can have a devastating impact on downstream coastal ecosystems. GEF support will make an important incremental contribution in fostering the integrated management of freshwater basins and their adjacent coastal areas. This will be important pioneering work in the region and these efforts will be monitored closely to promote learning, exchange and replication in other basins and their associated coastal areas. Finally, replication and sustainability of the benefits arising from the GEF increment will be assured through establishment of linkages with the Nairobi Convention Programme of Work as well as the programmes undertaken by the WIO-C partners that have long-term investments in the WIO region. This will guarantee continuity, replication and transfer of best practices from the WIO-SAP GEF investment well beyond the lifespan of the project.

GEF support also contributes to other important incremental benefits as well: Freshwater and marine ecosystems in the region are typically administered through two different ministries (water and environment respectively) which in practice means that the holistic nature of these systems and associated global benefits are not maximized and often upstream management actions can have a devastating impact on coastal resources. GEF support will make an important incremental contribution in fostering the conjunctive management of freshwater basins and their adjacent coastal areas. This will be important pioneering work in the region and these efforts will be monitored closely to promote learning and exchange and replication in other river basins and their associated coastal areas.

Table 10 in the project document provides details on the key outcomes of the WIOSAP Project in comparison to the current baseline.

A.5.2 Global environmental benefits:

The implementation of the WIOSAP Project will result in significant regional and global environmental benefits. The following are the expected global environmental benefits:

- The project will contribute towards the conservation of globally significant species and habitats. The WIO region is characterized by a high diversity of species and communities exists . Over 11,200 marine species have been recorded from the western Indian Ocean region. By addressing the degradation of mangroves, seagrass beds and coral reef habitat by focusing on the protection of these critical ecosystems from land based sources of pollution and activities, the project will contribute in the attainment of global targets on biodiversity conservation and sustain the livelihood of millions of coastal communities.
- The WIO Regions marine and coastal ecosystems such as mangrove forests, seagrass beds including estuaries holds a huge quantity of carbon stock. Thus, the conservation of these ecosystems through a concerted effort is important in that it will contribute towards the mitigation of global climate change by ensuring that huge stock of carbon held in these ecosystems is not released.
- The project will also contributes towards the sustainability of world fisheries resources that are essentially for sustaining economies of both developed and developing countries. These resources at global level are rapidly declining. The WIO Region contributes about 4% to the global fish landing and this contribution could greatly increase with better and sustained management of the critical coastal and marine ecosystems. The conservation of the critical coastal ecosystems is considered important in the sustainability of marine fisheries in view of linkages that exists between the coastal and marine ecosystems.
- Good practices and lessons that can be used in other regions of the world for the conservation and or protection of the critical coastal and marine ecosystems particularly mangroves, seagrass beds and coral reefs. The implementation of the project in the WIO countries will enable the project to draw on and promote exchange of best practices and lessons learned in a range of social, economic and cultural conditions. These best practices and lessons will be disseminated regionally through the Nairobi Convention Clearing House mechanism and globally

under the framework of the IW:LEARN and GEF IW Conferences. These will contribute towards the current global effort to develop well-tested methodologies and approaches for effective conservation of the coastal and marine ecosystems in other regional seas of the world.

The project will build the capacity of project partners at both local, national and regional levels for the enhanced conservation and protection of the critical coastal and marine ecosystems from land-based sources and activities. This includes capacity to manage wastewaters and effluents, spatial planning, vulnerability assessment and monitoring, enhancement of the capacity of local communities to engage in ICZM processes, development of alternative livelihood systems, economic valuation of ecosystems and provision of support for the implementation of environmental flow assessment.

Although most of the coastal and marine ecosystems in the WIO Region are in relatively good health as compared to other parts of the world, there is a broad scientific consensus that these critical ecosystems would be degraded to the level where they would no longer be able to provide essential global environmental benefits if there are no significant interventions. The threats to the coastal and marine ecosystems from land-based sources and activities existing in the region and other parts of the world are unmitigated and funds for their protection are limited. The governments of participating countries have expressed their willingness to implement measures for the continued protection of the coastal and marine ecosystems through joint effort in view of the transboundary nature of the root-causes and barriers. This commitment will be reciprocated through GEF funding of incremental activities. The GEF project will provide for more effective protection and conservation measures in 8 countries in the WIO Region which contain some of the most highly diverse coastal and marine ecosystems in the world. Without GEF funding, national projects to conserve and manage these critical coastal and marine ecosystems would not realize significant global environmental benefits.

Building on and supporting the national priorities for action and capacity building identified at PPG stage, the project will catalyse the conditions for more effective conservation measures in the WIO region. However, it will also benefit other globally associated marine ecosystems such as the coral triangle. Critical coastal and marine ecosystems provide nurseries, shelter, and food for a variety of commercially, recreationally, and ecologically important species (e.g. fin-fish, sharks and rays, marine turtles, inshore cetaceans, seahorses, crustaceans and molluscs). Also, mangroves and seagrasses filter estuarine and coastal waters of nutrients, contaminants, and sediments thus ensuring water quality conditions are ideal for sustainability of coral reef ecosystem. The critical coastal ecosystems also provide key ecosystem services such carbon sequestration, protection from storms, protection of shoreline from coastal erosion, support of ecotourism and fisheries, and filtration of water of sediments and pollutants.

The survival of coastal communities is closely related to the long-term sustainability of coastal and marine ecosystems, through provision of food, protection, employment opportunities and also through provision of opportunities for coastal developments. However, the value of critical ecosystems that are important for sustainability of livelihood systems and coastal economies needs to be more widely recognized, particularly among the policy makers.

While data on the vulnerability of coastal and marine ecosystems will be collected during the implementation of the project, it is expected that changes over such a short period of five years will not immediately be reflected in the state of the ecosystem. The most tangible benefits will be realised over the long term period when participating countries have fully implemented the required reforms and undertaken necessary investments. However, indicators to track the impact of the project and subsequent contributions to achieving global environmental benefits will be developed during the Inception period.

The global significance of the WIO region is also highlighted by the potential impacts of climate change. Numerous studies have identified countries in the region, especially the Small Island Developing States to be amongst the most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. These countries have a high possibility of experiencing significant environmental, ecological and socio-economic disruptions due to climate change as compared to countries in other parts of the world. The design of the WIOSAP Project activities has deliberately taken into consideration the potential impacts of climate change.

The contribution of the project in the identification of good practices, approaches and methodologies for the effective management of the coastal and marine ecosystems will also be of benefit to other IW projects that would

be implemented in other parts of the world, particularly in relation to restoration of coastal ecosystems, wastewater management, economic valuation of coastal ecosystems, marine spatial planning, and integration of environmental flow assessment in the management of river basins. This will also lead to an improvement in the effectiveness of other conservation projects in the WIO Region since their activities will be designed bearing in mind the lessons and experiences learnt in the WIOSAP Project.

Thus, in summary, it can be noted that the global environmental benefits will accrue on various levels. It is expected that through improvements in coastal and marine habitats, water quality, inclusion of environmental flow assessment in river basin management, improved capacity, and implementation of appropriate legislation, direct local economic, social and environmental benefits will be generated and these will maintain the integrity of the ecosystems so that they can continue to yield global environmental benefits. The other global benefits include mitigation of climate change through conservation of wetlands, seagrass beds and mangroves and to a limited extent the conservation of coral reefs and RAMSAR sites. The awareness and capacity building activities that will be undertaken by the project in participating countries are also expected to influence the integration of coastal and marine issues in regional economic communities (RECs) such as the IOC/COI, EAC, COMESA, and SADC including the African Union (AU). Similar integration is also expected among global environmental organisations/conventions.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: The WIOSAP project implementation would involve participation of ten (10) countries in the WIO Region including numerous other partners. This arrangement presents its own risks to the project. The detailed analysis was carried out on the possible risks to implementation of each of the components of the project including also the impacts or likelihood of each of the risks. The corresponding mitigation measures for each of the identified risk for each of the component of the project is presented in Table 7 in the project document. In general, the main risks are divided into the following broad categories:

1. Inadequate cooperation and coordination: Coastal and marine environmental considerations may not be adequately incorporated into projects, programmes, policies and activities of governments of participating countries and their partners, in the manner envisaged in the project in order to realise a comprehensive vision of sustainable marine and coastal ecosystems management in the WIO Region.
2. Inadequate political will: The governments of the participating countries may not accord sufficient importance to the implementation of the WIOSAP project or may not mandate key national institutions and other key partners of the project to comprehensively participate in region-wide programmes embracing the entire WIO Region as envisaged in the project.
3. Inadequate capacity: Mechanisms and regulations essential for integrated management of the WIO region coastal and marine natural resources may not be developed, reformed, adopted or adequately implemented due to limited capacity in the participating countries.
4. Inadequate financial resources: Due to economic conditions, governments of participating countries and national and regional institutions/organizations may not be able to allocate adequate human and financial resources to the implementation of the WIOSAP project.
5. Inadequate awareness and stakeholder participation: There may be a lack of effective stakeholder participation in the implementation of strategies and activities defined in the project. Also, some key players in the WIO region may not be fully informed about the project objectives, activities and expected outcomes, and their participation in the implementation of the project may be limited and ineffective.
6. Negative impacts of climate change: The participating countries may face severe environmental, ecological and socio-economic disruptions owing to impacts of climate variability and change and this may affect the ability of governments and project partners to implement priority activities envisaged in the project.

The SAP has built in measures to mitigate the above-mentioned risks, including specific targets and actions aimed at mobilizing the required political support, building capacity, enhancing cooperation and coordination and creating sustainable financial mechanisms. Specific targets and activities in this regard have been included as part of various components of the WIOSAP project.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The WIOSAP Project will compliment other GEF financed projects that will be focussed on WIO LME. This include a follow-up project known as Western Indian Ocean Strategic Action Programme Policy Harmonisation and Institutional Reforms project (WIO-SAPPHIRE) for the implementation of the aspects of the joint ASCLME-SWIOFP LME SAP that are specifically relevant to the ASCLME Project.

The UNEP WIOSAP project is expected to address largely land-based activities while the UNDP GEF SAPPHERE project is expected to focus on policy harmonisation and institutional reforms with a particular emphasis on the offshore waters. There would also be collaboration with the SAPPHERE project in the implementation of a number of activities focused on the development of regional standards for marine water quality parameters and contaminants/pollutants, marine spatial planning, ecosystem valuation, selection and monitoring of critical coastal ecosystem indicators and stress reduction related to critical habitats in the LMEs, implementation of pilot level community-based management approaches to stress reduction. These are mainly activities that cuts across components A and B of the WIOSAP project. Additionally, the SAPPHERE project includes activities on policy, legislative and institutional reforms emphasising on strengthening and supporting existing processes and mechanisms and strengthening of a regional and national science-to-governance. These outputs will be closely coordinated with Component D of WIO-SAP Project, which relates to strengthening transboundary governance arrangements, so as to ensure that both projects' activities in this area are working towards the same goals and outcomes, consistent with the wishes of the Contracting Parties of the Nairobi Convention.

The conclusion of a Coordination and collaboration agreement between UNEP and UNDP detailing the cooperative arrangements and synergies between the WIOSAP Project and the anticipated ASCLME-SWIOFP LME SAP implementation project, i.e. SAPPHERE has been developed and agreed during the PPG phase. An on-going dialogue during the respective project preparation exercises has ensured complementarity between the projects and political ownership through the Nairobi Convention and the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission.

The other important GEF International Waters projects active in the Western Indian Ocean and in which linkages with the WIOSAP project would be important include the following:

- GEF/WB/IOC: Western Indian Ocean Marine Highway Development and Marine and Coastal Contamination Prevention (WIO Marine Highway) project,
- GEF/WB/FAO/WWF:Strategic Partnership for a Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund in Sub-Saharan Africa.
- GEF/UNEP/UNDP: Implementing Integrated Water Resources and Wastewater Management in Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS (Atlantic/Indian Ocean SIDS) project.
- GEF UNEP: Dugong and Seagrass project (Enhancing the Conservation Effectiveness of Seagrass Ecosystems Supporting Globally Significant Populations of Dugong Across the Indian and Pacific Ocean Basins), which includes Mozambique and Madagascar as target countries project.
- GEF-UNDP: Mainstreaming biodiversity into the production sector activities in Seychelles which has an interesting component on community managed reef fisheries.
- Global Deep Sea fishery and biodiversity project (GEF/UNEP/FAO), which targets WIO as one of the pilot regions.

The project will also complement emerging GEF-funded regional projects including the proposed WB/GEF SWIOFish project which includes the same participating countries linked through the SWIOFC and the proposed SAPPHERE project which addresses ocean and offshore challenges in the same countries. There are also strong linkages to the regional GEF-funded ABNJ activities operationalized through FAO and IOTC. There are also linkages with GEF supported interventions focused on the SIDS and marine and coastal biodiversity. UNEP's Division for Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI) offers a strong foundation for the project, with its Freshwater Programme, Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA), and the Regional Seas Programme. In particular, UNEP supports the secretariat of the Nairobi Convention, the implementation of the GPA, a range of green growth, ecosystem management and environmental best practice initiatives.

The WIO Marine Highway project deals specifically with pollution originating from shipping activities (e.g. oil spills) and safety of navigation issues. It is highly complementary with the WIO-SAP Partnerships project in that the former addresses sea-based sources of marine pollution while the latter will address land-based sources of pollution. There would also be a strong synergy between WIO-SAP Project and the outcomes of the Collaborative Actions for Sustainable Tourism (COAST) project financed by GEF/UNEP/UNIDO, in that coastal tourism in the WIO region is highly dependent on environmental quality, including healthy coastal ecosystems and good water quality – both freshwater and marine. Lessons learnt by Kenya and Tanzania in the COAST Project on issues related to waste, including waste water management as well as alternative livelihood opportunities for coastal communities (mostly through nature-based tourism) will be useful to this project.

GEF Interventions in the WIO Region would be expected to jointly work at regional level in an informal arrangement that will be created within the framework of the Nairobi Convention. This arrangement is considered important for it will assist in minimising duplication of effort and wastage of resources and also help in minimising conflicts between projects. At country level, it is expected that the GEF Projects would use the same Inter-Ministerial Committees (IMCs). Other equally important projects include Biodiversity and CC adaptation projects some of which have large coastal components (e.g in Tanzania).

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

The stakeholders engagement in the WIOSAP project is at various levels and in this respect, it important to consider how stakeholders will be involved in the management of the project (oversight functions) and also how they will be involved in the implementation of various project activities. These details are presented below:

B.1.1 Engagement in Institutional Framework of the Project

The Nairobi Convention Secretariat with the UNEP DEPI functioning as the Implementing Agency will execute the project. The Nairobi Convention Secretariat will establish the Project Management Unit (PMU) to cater for the day-to-day running of the project. The WIOSAP Project Steering Committee whose members will include National Focal Points, representatives of UNEP/DEPI GEF IW, Nairobi Convention and donor organizations, will be established to provide strategic guidance on the implementation of the project. The Steering Committee will meet regularly to review annual work plans and facilitate coordination between the various implementing partners and stakeholders. Representatives of the private sector and civil society will participate in the WIOSAP Project Steering Committee as observers. The work of the project will be carried out by national and international consultants, national and international organizations, including educational, research, governmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations, among others.

This network will work closely through the National Focal Points to ensure that the governments of participating countries will endorse their work products, but the Nairobi Convention Secretariat and the PMU will retain some independence in naming these institutions to assure a broad representation across the stakeholders. International consultants will be involved in specific activities where capacity in the region is lacking.

The development of the WIOSAP was a participatory process demonstrating the broad commitment of the governments in the WIO region. During the implementation, governments will be directly involved in the regionally co-ordinated activities through the participation of national institutions and experts in activities planned under this project.

The private sector will also be actively involved in the project where necessary.

The Project through the Nairobi Convention Secretariat will work with the participating countries and key private sector actors to identify and engage the private sector in the appropriate project activities.

B. 1.2 Executing Agency Arrangements

The Project will be executed by the Nairobi Convention Secretariat. The overall financial responsibility for the GEF funds will remain under the supervision of UNEP/DEPI Office for the entire project. The Nairobi Convention Secretariat would build the capacity to execute the project and also provide technical support in the implementation of the project. The project financial and administrative support will be provided by UNEP and UNON. In addition to budget management and expenditures control, UNEP's responsibilities will include hiring and administration of international and local personnel, procurement of goods and services, travel arrangements and other miscellaneous support as required by the PMU.

B.1.3 Management and Administrative Structure

The management and administrative structure for the project shall consist of the following elements: Executing Agency, Project Steering Committee (PSC), and Project Management Unit based at the Nairobi Convention Secretariat in Nairobi, Kenya. The Project Manager shall be responsible for presenting reports on project implementation to the Steering Committee as well as to the Nairobi Convention Secretariat. The progress reports including annual work plan and budget shall be approved by the Project Steering Committee during its formal sittings and the approval granted shall be minuted in the reports of meetings of the committee. The reports shall be circulated to participating countries and also posted in the Nairobi Convention CHM.

B.1.4 Stakeholders Participation Plan:

The WIOSAP PMU will update the Stakeholder's Participation Plan that was developed during the implementation of the WIO-LaB Project by bringing onboard other key stakeholders that are important in the realization of the goals of the project. The updated plan will be presented to the Project Steering Committee for approval. The potential partners of the project in each of the participating countries shown in Table 11 in the project document. Appendix 24 shows the main stakeholders to be involved in the implementation of specific activities of the project. During the implementation of the WIOSAP project, the Nairobi Convention Secretariat will take the lead in ensuring linkages with key partners in the WIO Region such as the various organisations that are members of the Consortium for Conservation of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO-C), namely BirdLife International, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the Western Indian Ocean Marine Sciences Association (WIOMSA), and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), among others. Other partners will be brought onboard on the basis of their core competencies and comparative advantages. These partners include the Indian Ocean Commission, UNESCO-IOC, FAO EAF, the Natural Resources Programme under UNEP's Regional Office for Africa; the joint UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative for Africa; the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA), and the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development in Small Island Developing States. During the implementation of the project, the aim will be to ensure full participation by a diverse range of stakeholders in order to consolidate various partnerships for the implementation of the WIO-SAP through targeted on the ground activities and governance processes. The project will engage with partners in the WIO Region that are already addressing issues that are relevant to the attainment of the main objective of this project.

Local communities and authorities, NGOs, private sector and technical services from various other ministries besides those responsible for environment and water resources, will be involved in the development and

implementation of on the ground interventions and the implementation of specific WIO-SAP activities such as the restoration of degraded critical ecosystems/habitats in key hotspot areas in the WIO region. To ensure ownership, local communities and CSOs/CBOs will be involved in the design, implementation and monitoring of the relevant on the ground interventions. Output A.2.4 will specifically link communities and CSOs to on the ground interventions. The project has adopted the 'bottom-up approach' so that the experiences gained at the local level during the implementation of on the ground interventions, can inform to national and regional management and policy. Coastal and marine resource managers in participating countries are expected to play an important role in the coordination of project activities at the national level including also facilitation of data-sharing within the project. They would support national and regional decision making processes and monitor project progress at national and regional levels. The project will provide support to resource managers so that they can most effectively ensure linkages with the national implementation committees and national interministerial committees, respectively. The development of tools and implementation of on the ground interventions will not only benefit the resource managers and resource users, but also other partners who are concerned with management of the region's coastal and marine resources.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF):

The implementation of the WIOSAP Project will result in significant socio-economic benefits at national and local levels and these are expected to lead to the realisation of regional and global environmental benefits. The expected benefits of the project are as follows:

- The project will contribute towards the conservation of globally significant species and habitats. The WIO region is characterized by a high diversity of species and communities exists . Over 11,200 marine species have been recorded from the western Indian Ocean region. By addressing the degradation of mangroves, seagrass beds and coral reef habitat by focusing on the protection of these critical ecosystems from land based sources of pollution and activities, the project will contribute in the attainment of global targets on biodiversity conservation and sustain the livelihood of millions of coastal communities.
- The WIO Regions marine and coastal ecosystems such as mangrove forests, seagrass beds including estuaries holds a huge quantity of carbon stock. Thus, the conservation of these ecosystems through a concerted effort is important in that it will contribute towards the mitigation of global climate change by ensuring that huge stock of carbon held in these ecosystems is not released.
- The project will also contribute towards the sustainability of fisheries resources that are essentially for sustaining economies of participating countries. The WIO Region contributes about 4% to the global fish landing and this contribution could greatly increase with better and sustained management of the critical coastal and marine ecosystems. The conservation of the critical coastal ecosystems is considered important in the sustainability of marine fisheries in view of linkages that exists between the coastal and marine ecosystems.
- Good practices and lessons that can be used at national, regional and also in other regions of the world for the conservation and or protection of the critical coastal and marine ecosystems particularly mangroves, seagrass beds and coral reefs. The implementation of the project in the WIO countries will enable the project to draw on and promote exchange of best practices and lessons learned in a range of social, economic and cultural conditions. These best practices and lessons will be disseminated regionally through the Nairobi Convention Clearing House mechanism and globally under the framework of the IW:LEARN and GEF IW Conferences. These will contribute towards the current global effort to develop well-tested methodologies and approaches for effective conservation of the coastal and marine ecosystems in other regional seas of the world.

The project will build the capacity of project partners at both local, national and regional levels for the enhanced conservation and protection of the critical coastal and marine ecosystems from land-based sources and activities. This includes capacity to manage wastewaters and effluents, spatial planning, vulnerability assessment and

monitoring, enhancement of the capacity of local communities to engage in ICZM processes, development of alternative livelihood systems, economic valuation of ecosystems and provision of support for the implementation of environmental flow assessment.

Although most of the coastal and marine ecosystems in the WIO Region are in relatively good health as compared to other parts of the world, there is a broad scientific consensus that these critical ecosystems would be degraded to the level where they would no longer be able to provide essential global environmental benefits if there are no significant interventions. The threats to the coastal and marine ecosystems from land-based sources and activities existing in the region and other parts of the world are unmitigated and funds for their protection are limited. The governments of participating countries have expressed their willingness to implement measures for the continued protection of the coastal and marine ecosystems through joint effort in view of the transboundary nature of the root-causes and barriers. This commitment will be reciprocated through GEF funding of incremental activities. The GEF project will provide for more effective protection and conservation measures in 8 countries in the WIO Region which contain some of the most highly diverse coastal and marine ecosystems in the world. Without GEF funding, national projects to conserve and manage these critical coastal and marine ecosystems would not realize significant global environmental benefits.

Building on and supporting the national priorities for action and capacity building identified at PPG stage, the project will catalyse the conditions for more effective conservation measures in the WIO region. However, it will also benefit other globally associated marine ecosystems such as the coral triangle. Critical coastal and marine ecosystems provide nurseries, shelter, and food for a variety of commercially, recreationally, and ecologically important species (e.g. fin-fish, sharks and rays, marine turtles, inshore cetaceans, seahorses, crustaceans and molluscs). Also, mangroves and seagrasses filter estuarine and coastal waters of nutrients, contaminants, and sediments thus ensuring water quality conditions are ideal for sustainability of coral reef ecosystem. The critical coastal ecosystems also provide key ecosystem services such carbon sequestration, protection from storms, protection of shoreline from coastal erosion, support of ecotourism and fisheries, and filtration of water of sediments and pollutants.

The survival of coastal communities is closely related to the long-term sustainability of coastal and marine ecosystems, through provision of food, protection, employment opportunities and also through provision of opportunities for coastal developments. However, the value of critical ecosystems that are important for sustainability of livelihood systems and coastal economies needs to be more widely recognized, particularly among the policy makers.

While data on the vulnerability of coastal and marine ecosystems will be collected during the implementation of the project, it is expected that changes over such a short period of five years will not immediately be reflected in the state of the ecosystem. The most tangible benefits will be realised over the long term period when participating countries have fully implemented the required reforms and undertaken necessary investments. However, indicators to track the impact of the project and subsequent contributions to achieving global environmental benefits will be developed during the Inception period.

The global significance of the WIO region is also highlighted by the potential impacts of climate change. Numerous studies have identified countries in the region, especially the Small Island Developing States to be amongst the most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. These countries have a high possibility of experiencing significant environmental, ecological and socio-economic disruptions due to climate change as compared to countries in other parts of the world. The design of the WIOSAP Project activities has deliberately taken into consideration the potential impacts of climate change.

The contribution of the project in the identification of good practices, approaches and methodologies for the effective management of the coastal and marine ecosystems will also be of benefit to other IW projects that would be implemented in other parts of the world, particularly in relation to restoration of coastal ecosystems, wastewater management, economic valuation of coastal ecosystems, marine spatial planning, and integration of environmental flow assessment in the management of river basins. This will also lead to an improvement in the effectiveness of other conservation projects in the WIO Region since their activities will be designed bearing in mind the lessons and experiences learnt in the WIOSAP Project.

Thus, in summary, it can be noted that the global environmental benefits will accrue on various levels. It is expected that through improvements in coastal and marine habitats, water quality, inclusion of environmental flow assessment in river basin management, improved capacity, and implementation of appropriate legislation, direct local economic, social and environmental benefits will be generated and these will maintain the integrity of the ecosystems so that they can continue to yield global environmental benefits. The other global benefits include mitigation of climate change through conservation of wetlands, seagrass beds and mangroves and to a limited extent the conservation of coral reefs and RAMSAR sites. The awareness and capacity building activities that will be undertaken by the project in participating countries are also expected to influence the integration of coastal and marine issues in regional economic communities (RECs) such as the IOC/COI, EAC, COMESA, and SADC including the African Union (AU). Similar integration is also expected among global environmental organisations/conventions.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The WIOSAP Project considered three alternative approaches for addressing the various challenges threatening the sustainable management and conservation of the coastal and marine environment in the WIO Region. The first approach considered is the business-as-usual approach in which there is no intervention and current trends are left to continue without additional support. This approach was considered to be inappropriate because the current situation in the WIO region is such that the existing problems and challenges facing the coastal and marine environment are not being adequately addressed across the entire region. Also, the degradation of the coastal and marine critical ecosystems is on an upward trend and in the absence of any significant intervention, the situation is likely to continue to deteriorate, with a possibility of reaching an irreversible stage.

The second approach that was considered was to adopt a purely thematic approach in which interventions and catalytic actions will be focused on specific thematic area such as coastal water pollution. This approach would entail provision of support to projects that are being implemented in the region and which are focused on a specific thematic area. This approach was also found to be unsuitable in that it has low possibility of achieving the desired goal of the WIOSAP project in view of the nature, magnitude and complexity of the numerous high priority issues that need to be dealt with in the WIO region. It was noted that addressing only one thematic issue in participating countries would not allow for the required multi-sectoral linkages including sharing of knowledge, experiences and lessons among various stakeholders in the WIO Region. Thus, the thematic approach would be an ineffective and inefficient way of achieving sustained progress in the management and conservation of the coastal and marine ecosystems in the WIO Region.

The third approach that was considered is the integrated multi-thematic approach that is based on the experience gained by various stakeholders through implementation of projects focussed on the management and conservation of the coastal and marine environment in the WIO Region. This approach was considered to be more appropriate for the WIO region considering the multitude of problems that need to be addressed. There is consensus among the governments of the participating countries and partners that a region-wide multi-sectoral approach is a much more cost-effective approach than undertaking actions based on a specific thematic area. This is considered especially important when dealing with transboundary issues such as the alteration of river flows, degradation of coastal and marine critical ecosystems and water pollution in the WIO region. Dealing with transboundary river-basins and coastal and marine ecosystems in an integrated manner at the regional level has a potential of yielding tangible results in terms of cost effectiveness. There is also a high chance of optimizing both human and financial resources by: (1) considering the transboundary dimensions of the priority issues to be addressed, and (2) by tackling transboundary problems with the goal of yielding regional benefits.

To achieve the project objective and obtain the tangible results, the project's five-year implementation period focuses on activities that will provide significant and sustainable impacts. The project would build on the experiences of existing institutions including best practices, knowledge and networks in the WIO region. The project would also focus on addressing constraints that have been identified within the existing national and regional frameworks. The activities described in this project document are therefore designed to provide tailor-made technical assistance and building of the capacity of relevant national and regional institutions and other stakeholders, including the strengthening of institutional and regulatory frameworks for sustainable conservation of coastal and marine ecosystems. The project will also adapt existing best practices, guidelines,

methodologies and technologies for sustainable management and conservation for the coastal and marine ecosystems and improve mechanisms of disseminating them widely to various stakeholders in the region.

It should be noted that the WIOSAP Project builds upon the willingness of the governments of participating countries in the WIO Region to work jointly to promote rational use of the transboundary river-basins, coastal and marine ecosystems and their resources, taking into account the role of these resources in the economic development and environmental health of the region. The integrated management approach as demonstrated by the TDA/SAP formulation model, including the regional and national cross-sectoral institutional and implementation arrangements such as the Regional Task Forces and inter-ministerial coordination committees, can help overcome the limitations of the traditional sectoral approach in the management of coastal and marine natural resources. The multi-sectoral/multi-thematic approach has the advantage of facilitating simultaneous consideration of economic and ecological outcomes in the sustainable management of the whole coastal and marine environmental system.

Project cost-effectiveness is also strongly enhanced by the partnership approach that will be adopted by the project in the implementation of various key activities as outlined in this document. Partnership is an important pillar of the project at both the national and regional levels, and this allows greater coordination between different stakeholder's interventions including pooling of resources together to create greater impact on the ground. It also allows participating countries and their partners to establish synergies and multiplier effects with a far much greater potential of yielding cost-effectiveness as compared to the ineffective efforts by various individual players focused on a specific thematic area.

The project cost-effectiveness is also enhanced by building on the existing national and regional capacity and also working through established institutional and implementation structures that were developed under the auspices of the Nairobi Convention and the WIO-LaB project, rather than inventing and developing new structures. Also, by integrating into the project, mechanisms of promoting learning from the previous lessons, mistakes and successes of the WIO-LaB Project including other GEF-IW projects, the project's cost effectiveness will be enhanced.

In conclusion, it can be noted that cost-effectiveness of the WIOSAP project would be achieved through the following: (i) design and implementation of customized-pilot activities that can yield concrete results and that can be up-scaled in the region, (ii) supporting the existing national and regional institutional frameworks and processes that have potential for delivering results (e.g., those established under the Nairobi Convention, etc) and (iii) promoting an integrated participatory approach involving the key stakeholders so that coordination of activities and sustainability of results are optimized. Previous experience in the WIO Region shows that a 'bottom-up' participatory approach involving key stakeholders in all stages of the project cycle is more beneficial as compared to the traditional 'top-down' approach. Also, adaptive management which is embedded within an ecosystem-based management approach is now recognized as the best-practice for coastal and marine ecosystem management. The project design has taken into consideration all these approaches.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

Monitoring and evaluation includes a series of linked activities, including a complete WIOSAP project document, annual project reports, mid-term evaluation and terminal evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation begun with preparation of this project document, complete with logical framework matrix (Logframe) developed according to standard M&E procedures. This Project Document includes the required Logframe Matrix with progress indicators and means of verification. Baseline data gaps for M&E will be addressed during the first year of project implementation. A plan for collecting the necessary baseline data will be developed by the WIOSAP Project Manager. In parallel, at the national level, the ecosystem vulnerability assessments, environmental flow assessments, and monitoring of the water quality will create a baseline with expanding coverage.

A project inception workshop will be held at the beginning of project implementation, preferably within the first 3 months. The participants in the inception workshop will include partners and agencies that are assigned roles in the project organisational structure including also the representatives of the participating countries, UNEP/DEPI GEF IW and Nairobi Convention Secretariat. The inception workshop will consolidate the regional ownership of the project and approve of the first year annual work plan, the draft of which will be prepared by the WIOSAP PMU. The inception workshop report is a key reference document which will be prepared and shared with participants within two weeks of the workshop to formalize various agreements and plans agreed during the meeting.

The first Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting will be held back-to-back with the Inception Workshop. Among the important actions of the PSC is to discuss and approve the roles and responsibilities of all project organisational structures and the first Annual Work Plan and Budget. The PSC will receive periodic reports on progress made by the project and will make recommendations to UNEP concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Results Framework or the M&E plan.

Project oversight to ensure that the project meets UNEP and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility to the Task Manager in UNEP/DEPI GEF IW. The Task Manager will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of scientific and technical outputs. Project supervision will take an adaptive management approach. The Task Manager will develop a project supervision plan at the inception of the project which will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop. The project supervision plan will focus on the outcome monitoring including also project financial management. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and UNEP/DEPI GEF IW, since risk assessment will be an integral part of the Project Implementation Review (PIR). The quality of project monitoring and evaluation will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost-effective use of financial resources.

1. Half-Yearly Progress Reports: These will be prepared by the PMU and will be assessed based on the projects Results Based Framework. The detailed half-yearly reports will be prepared by the Project Manager and submitted to the PSC and to UNEP/ GEF Coordination Office covering the periods 30th June and 31st December of each year of implementation. The reports will include a summary of progress made since the previous biannual report and provide details of any unforeseen impediments to project implementation. The report will also include up-to-date financial information on the expenditure of project funds. These reports will be reviewed, amended as required and approved by the PSC as part of the record of their meetings.

2. Project Implementation Review (PIR): The PIR will be prepared by the Project Manager to monitor progress made since the commencement of the project implementation and in particular for the previous reporting period (30th June to 1st July). The PIR will combine both UNEP and GEF reporting requirements. The PIR report will include details on the progress made toward realisation of project objectives and project outcomes, project outputs delivered per project outcome, lessons learned in the implementation of the project, financial expenditure report, risk and adaptive management, among others.

3. Annual Project Report (APR): This report will be prepared by the Project Manager in consultation with the relevant Stakeholders and will be submitted to UNEP/ GEF Coordination Office and Nairobi Convention Secretariat. The report will enable the partners of the project to obtain information on the performance of the project with regard to the implementation of agreed activities. The APR will also provide details on the project achievements, initial evidence of success, including constraints in the implementation of agreed activities and how those constraints/shortcomings will be addressed in subsequent years. The report will also include a compilation of lessons learned and financial expenditure statement. The review of APR will be based the logical framework matrix and the agreed performance indicators.

4. Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE): The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation, preferably by June 2018. The mid-term evaluation will take place as indicated in the project milestones. The mid-term project evaluation will focus on relevance, performance (effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness), issues requiring decisions and actions and initial lessons learned on the project design, implementation and management. The evaluation will also include all parameters recommended by the GEF Evaluation Office for mid-term evaluations and will verify information gathered through the GEF tracking tools, as relevant. The evaluation will be carried out using a participatory approach - parties that benefit or are affected by the project will be consulted. Such parties were identified during the stakeholder analysis. The project Steering Committee through the Nairobi Convention National Focal Points and other stakeholders will participate in the mid-term evaluation of the project. The Project Manager will prepare a management response to the mid-term evaluation recommendations along with a plan for effecting the required changes in project implementation. The UNEP/ GEF Coordination Office Task Manager will have the responsibility of monitoring the implementation of agreed recommendations. The Terms of Reference for the Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNEP/DEPI GEF IW Task Manager in consultation with the Nairobi Convention Secretariat and the Project Management. The recruitment of a consultant to carry out mid-term evaluation will be undertaken by UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU).

5. Terminal Evaluation (TE): An independent final evaluation will take place at least six (6) months prior to the final Project Steering Committee meeting. This terminal evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with UNEP and GEF procedures and will focus on the same issues as the mid-term evaluation but in addition it will also examine the early evidence of project impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity building and the achievement of global environmental benefits. GEF Tracking Tools will also be compiled before the Terminal Evaluation and entries verified by the consultant. The terminal evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's outputs and outcomes detailed in the project document and as amended following the mid-term evaluation. The final evaluation will assess the impact and sustainability of results, including contribution to capacity building in the WIO region including also the achievement of global environmental benefits. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNEP/ GEF Coordination Office based on guidance from the Project Management Unit and Nairobi Convention Secretariat. The Terminal Evaluation will also provide recommendations for follow-up activities. The management response to issues raised in the terminal evaluation will be prepared by the Project Manager in consultation with the Nairobi Convention Secretariat and National Focal Points. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) of UNEP will manage the terminal evaluation process. The review of the quality of the evaluation report will be done by UNEP's EOU who will subsequently submit the report to the GEF Evaluation Office not later than 6 months after the completion of the terminal evaluation. The standard terms of reference for the terminal evaluation are included in Appendix 10.

6. Project Terminal Report (PTR): This report will be prepared by the project management unit during the last three months of the project. This report will provide details on the achieved results (outcomes and outputs), lessons learnt, problems/constraints experienced and specific areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also provide recommendations on measures that should be put in place to ensure sustainability and replication of the project's results. The follow-up will be the responsibility of the Nairobi Convention Secretariat to ensure long-term sustainability of project results.

7. Project Implementation Review (PIR): The WIOSAP project will need to participate in the GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR) process. The PIR is mandatory for all GEF projects that have been under implementation for at least a year at the time that the exercise is conducted. The PIR will be carried out between June and September of each year of implementation. It will contain sections on basic project data, financial status, procurement data, impact achievement and progress in project implementation. The basic outline will follow the structure of the Logframe with indicators assigned to objectives, means of verification, and assumptions. The PIR questionnaire is sent to the Project Manager, usually around the beginning of June of each year. Project Manager will have on average 1.5- 2 months to collect the necessary information, and submit PIR to UNEP/ GEF Coordination Office.

8. Periodic Site Visits (PSV): UNEP/DEPI GEF IW, Nairobi Convention Secretariat and WIOSAP PMU staff will conduct periodic visits to project sites in participating countries based on the schedule that will be agreed during the project's inception workshop and subsequent Project Steering Committee meetings. These periods will be factored in the annual Work Plans of the project. The purpose of site visits will be to assess the progress in the implementation of specific project activities in the field, such as those on the on the ground interventions. Other members of the Project Steering Committee may be invited to join these visits as may be appropriate. A field visit report will be prepared by the Project Manager within a period of one month after the visit to the field. The Audit Service may also undertake ad hoc site visits.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
		MINISTERE DE LA PRODUCTION, DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT, DE L'ENERGIE, DE L'INDUSTRIE ET DE L'ARTISANAT	08/15/2014
Ayub Macharia	Director General	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY	03/12/2012
Marcelin Rabeantoandro	Secetaire Generale	DIRECTION GENERALE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT	08/20/2014
D.D Manraj	Financial Secretary	MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	11/21/2014
Marilia Telma Antonio Manjate	Head of Cooperation Directorate	MINISTRY FOR THE COORDINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS	08/22/2014
Etienne Didier Cesar Dogley	Special Advisor	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY	09/22/2014
Mohamud A. Hashi	Director	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT OFFICE	11/28/2014
Julius K. Ningu	Director	DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT	12/05/2014
Zaheer Fakir	Head	International Governance and Relations, Department of Environmental Affairs	26/02/2015

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan Van Dyke Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP		April 4, 2016	Christine Haffner-Sifakis UNEP Task Manager		Christine.Haffner- Sifakis@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Outcomes/ Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Project objective: <i>To reduce impacts from land-based sources and activities and sustainably manage critical coastal-riverine ecosystems through the implementation of the WIO-SAP priorities with the support of partnerships at national and regional levels</i>					
Outcomes/ Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		

<p><i>Outcome A.1: Appropriate tools and methodologies are used to manage critical coastal and marine habitats in order to enhance their resilience and long-term sustainability</i></p>	<p>Adoption, integration and use of tools and methodologies for improved and sustainable coastal and marine habitats management and restoration</p> <p>Adoption of spatial plans and establishment of planning capacity to support and guide the management process</p> <p>Adoption of the ICZM Protocol and ratification of LBSA Protocol by all countries by the year 2020.</p> <p>Close collaboration with ongoing related initiatives such as the UNDP implemented SAPPHIRE project among others to strengthen synergies</p>	<p>Baseline to be established on current status of existing tools</p> <p>Elements of spatial planning are being developed in a few partner countries, comprehensive baseline of completed spatial plans to be established</p> <p>No regional ICZM protocol adopted. One country ratified the LBSA protocol</p> <p>Establishment of coordination arrangements between WIO SAP and SAPPHIRE projects</p>	<p>The LBSA Protocol ratified in at least 8 countries and the ICZM Protocol signed by at least 8 countries by the year 2020.</p> <p>Creation of synergies between activities of WIOSAP and SAPPHIRE and integration of results into the regional governance framework of the Nairobi Convention</p>	<p>Reports of the Conference of Parties to Nairobi Convention.</p> <p>Reports of Steering Committee reports.</p> <p>Signed copies of LBSA and ICZM Protocols.</p> <p>Evidence of national level of adoption of the standards included in the CHM.</p> <p>Minutes of regular coordination meetings</p> <p>Presentation of implementation progress and results to the COP of the Nairobi Convention</p>	<p>Management plans are implementable based on the capacity challenges of the countries involved.</p> <p>Technologies introduced are socially accepted and demonstrating the results.</p> <p>There is a political will to develop a new protocol.</p> <p>National and regional institutions will participate to the extent required</p> <p>Continued interest in seeking synergies between activities to efficiently deliver outputs to partner countries</p>
<p>Output A.1.1: National institutions undertake participatory spatial planning to increase the resilience of selected key coastal ecosystems to anthropogenic impacts including the impacts of climate change and variability.</p>	<p>Spatial plans adopted by competent authorities and stakeholders building on extensive stakeholder analysis. All relevant sectors and a wide group of stakeholders (including civil society, private sector and women's groups) are involved from the onset and partnerships are established with agencies that have capacity in gender training and analysis.</p>	<p>Marine spatial planning is not currently a standard methodology or management tool. Few marine spatial plans exist in the region and baseline to be established.</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u> New spatial plans prepared for at least five [5] key marine and coastal zones in at least 5 countries by 2020.</p>	<p>Reports of participatory dialogue processes (including gender specific considerations and the involvement of civil society).</p> <p>Publication of spatial plans for target sites.</p> <p>Project Annual reports, indicating the adoption of the plans at an appropriate level</p>	<p>In-country capacity is available and sufficient to build to prepare spatial planning.</p> <p>Political will exists to prepare and implement plans.</p> <p>Countries willingness to share data or allow access to data</p>

Output A.1.2 Management plans developed and adopted for at least 5 key critical coastal and marine habitats, reinforcing the regional MPA network and mitigating habitat loss and climate change impacts;	5 critical coastal and marine habitats management plans in target countries adopted taking socio-economic dimension and in particular gender considerations into account in all stages of the process.	Few coastal management plans prepared and implemented (baseline to be established).	<u>End of project target:</u> Management plans adopted for at least [5] coastal zones in at least 5 countries by 2020.	Reports of participatory processes including gender specific considerations, targeted meetings with women's groups and the involvement of civil society. Publications on coastal management plans for target sites. Project Annual reports, indicating adoption	Capacity in-country is available and sufficient to develop management plans Political will exists to prepare and implement plans.
Output A.1.3 At least one key degraded critical coastal habitats restored and resilience increased;	Ha of priority habitats restored.	No area has been restored within the SAP implementation framework.	<u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, there will be at least a total of 5 ha each of coral reefs, seagrass beds, mangrove forest in degraded hotspot sites.	Reports of on the ground interventions and experience gained in initiating and sustaining restoration projects documented and shared on the project website and in reports and meetings of the Nairobi Convention. Mid-term and Terminal Evaluation Reports. State of the coast reports. Project Annual reports.	Communities and all stakeholders can be engaged in restoration works. Particular attention is paid to multistakeholder dialogue representing variety of groups including women and civil society. There is capacity and knowledge for restoration of ecosystems.

Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		

<p>Output A.1.4 Pilot actions build capacity in ICM, demonstrating how ICM can be strengthened at the local level through the empowerment of communities and other actors at on the ground interventions (under A.1.2 and A.1.3).</p>	<p>Number of ICZM plans in target coastal sites involving wide range of stakeholders. Number of multistakeholder meetings held with all involved stakeholders including civil society and women's groups</p>	<p>ICZM is not currently used as a standard tool for the empowerment of communities</p> <p>Community stakeholder awareness of ICZM is not widespread in the region yet</p> <p>Baseline to be established</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, at least 5 ICZM plans for target coastal zones will be developed, involving wide stakeholder dialogue including women and civil society.</p>	<p>Copies of ICZM plans for target sites.</p> <p>Minutes of meetings and considerations of stakeholder involvement taken up in the development of the plans</p> <p>Project Annual reports, including the adoption of the plans at appropriate levels</p>	<p>There is political will to develop ICZM plans in target sites. Particular attention is paid that the widest stakeholder dialogue is ensured including the voice of women and civil society.</p> <p>In-country capacity exists for development and implementation of ICZM Plans.</p>
<p>Outcome A.2 <i>Appropriate tools and methods</i> (which integrate economic, social and environmental considerations) support coastal planning and management</p>	<p>Tools such as regional guidelines for economic valuation and guidelines for vulnerability assessment and spatial planning and extractive use strategies are integrated into coastal planning and management.</p>	<p>Currently tools and methods for integrating economic valuation, guidelines for vulnerability assessment, spatial planning and extractive use strategies are not widely used in coastal planning and management.</p>	<p>By 2020, tools which integrate economic, social and environmental considerations will be integral part of the coastal planning and management process</p>	<p>Tools are adopted and used in the existing planning and management processes.</p>	<p>The in-country support and capacity is made available to develop and implement these tools</p> <p>Political willingness supports the development of these tools.</p>
<p>Output A.2.1 Economic valuation of at least three (3) key critical coastal and marine habitats including integration of economic valuation to coastal management and planning.</p>	<p>Regional guidelines for Economic Valuations of at least three (3) key coastal ecosystems adopted and used in actual valuation studies.</p> <p>Values of coastal and marine ecosystem services incorporated in management planning including particular attention to the involvement from the onset - and considerations of women and civil society.</p>	<p>Economic valuation guidelines have as yet not been established on a regional scale.</p> <p>Management plans do not as yet integrate information on values of ecosystem services</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, Economic valuation studies will be undertaken for at least 1 coastal ecosystem in at least 5 countries in the region using the guidelines.</p> <p><u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, information on the value of coastal and marine ecosystems is used in decisions of coastal planning.</p>	<p>Reports of Economic Valuation studies.</p> <p>ICZM Reports clearly showing the values are used in the planning.</p> <p>Project Annual reports.</p>	<p>Capacity in-country is available and informed to undertake economic valuation of coastal ecosystems.</p> <p>Experts with a broad knowledge base can be identified and appointed.</p> <p>Regional guidelines are developed before the valuation studies. Willingness to engage widely with stakeholders.</p>

Outcomes/ Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Output A.2.2 Tools and guidelines for vulnerability assessment and spatial planning supports monitoring and management actions.	Toolkits and guidelines for vulnerability assessments, spatial planning developed and applied including gender sensitive analysis.	There are as of yet no guidelines used for vulnerability assessment and spatial planning in the region.	<u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, guidelines and methodologies for vulnerability assessment and spatial planning will be used in at least 5 countries in the region.	Vulnerability assessment and spatial planning finalised using the guidelines and tools. Guidelines for ecosystem vulnerability assessment. Guidelines for spatial planning.	Planners and policy makers will make effective use of tools and guidelines. Guidelines are user friendly and meeting the needs of users.
Output A.2.3 Sustainable extractive use strategies developed and adopted for specific coastal and marine natural resources.	Number of sites with extractive use strategies for coastal natural resources adopted for implementation.	The countries have not developed extractive use strategies for specific coastal and marine resources as of yet	<u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, sustainable extractive use strategies will be developed and adopted for specific coastal and marine natural resources, in at least 5 countries in the region.	Reports on sustainable extractive strategies. Project Annual reports, showing the involvement of Stakeholders and adoption of the strategies.	Effective collaboration between ministries/ authorities (fisheries, forestry, commerce, local government).
Outcomes/ Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		

<p>Output A.2.4 Adoption of regional indicators and baseline assessment in support of critical habitat monitoring and management.</p>	<p>A set of regional indicators for ecosystem monitoring, assessment and management, developed and adopted (taking the SDG development into account) including socio economic and gender specific indicator</p>	<p>Currently regional indicators and guidelines are not commonly used for ecosystem assessment in the region.</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u> By 2017, regional indicators and guidelines for ecosystem assessment will be drafted. They will be tested in all habitat pilot sites and wider to set baseline for 2016.</p> <p><u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, indicators are monitored towards the end of the project to demonstrate the change in the ecosystem status in pilot sites and in the region in general. SDG process is integrated into the indicator framework.</p>	<p>Report on the adoption of regional indicators.</p> <p>Reports of PADH, WSQ and MWM Task Forces.</p> <p>Project reports showing the indicator monitoring results.</p> <p>Reports on the SDG development related to ecosystem monitoring.</p>	<p>Task Forces reach agreement on regional indicators and assessment methods.</p> <p>Capacity to carry out indicator monitoring exists in target countries.</p> <p>Data and information available in support of the regional set of indicators.</p>
<p><i>Outcome B.1 Quality of coastal receiving waters improved through pilot interventions</i></p>	<p>Overall reduction of the annual amount of nutrient input (t/a) to the coastal waters in pilot sites leads to improved quality of coastal and receiving waters</p>	<p>There is limited data available on effluent treatment in the pilot sites.</p> <p>ICM plans are currently not systematically incorporating water quality</p>	<p>Total of at least six innovative investments in improved wastewater management in six countries</p> <p>Improved quality of coastal receiving waters due to reduction of N & P pollution loads by at least 50% over baseline (kg/year)</p>	<p>Water quality/pollution standards and monitoring reports</p>	<p>Capacities in country and knowledge to promote and implement pilot interventions</p> <p>Political will to support pilot interventions.</p>

<p>Output B.1.1 Cost-effective technologies for municipal wastewater treatment demonstrated in at least 3 sites;</p>	<p>Removal rates of N and P in the sites</p> <p>Best practices of innovative pilot activities captured and disseminated to all key stakeholders including civil society and user groups (i.e. women's groups)</p>	<p>Limited baseline data available.</p> <p>Limited awareness of the reuse of treated wastewater</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u> Reduction of at least 50% of the baseline of N& P pollution loads in the three hotspots initiated</p>	<p>Site visits to demonstration projects.</p> <p>Reports on results of stakeholder dialogues including participation of women's groups.</p> <p>Reports of regional Task Forces (MWM, WSQ).</p> <p>Reports of on the ground interventions.</p> <p>Reports on municipal wastewater management.</p> <p>Project Annual reports, showing the monitoring results</p>	<p>There is capacity and knowledge to adopt cost-effective technologies for wastewater treatment.</p> <p>There is a will among policy makers to promote cost effective technologies for wastewater treatment.</p>
<p>Outcomes/ Outputs</p>	<p>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</p>			<p>Means of verification</p>	<p>Assumptions</p>
	<p>Indicator</p>	<p>Baseline</p>	<p>Target</p>		
<p>Output B.1.2 Effluents at a minimum of 3 demonstration sites are collected, treated, recycled and/or disposed of in accordance with international best practices.</p>	<p>Removal rates of COD and nutrients.</p> <p>Increased m3 of reuse of treated wastewater</p>	<p>There is currently no treatment of effluents in pilot sites.</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, At least 50% of the treated wastewater from hotspots reused and recycled three hotspots.</p>	<p>Site visits to demonstration projects.</p> <p>Reports on the ground interventions.</p> <p>Reports of regional task forces.</p> <p>Project Annual reports, showing the monitoring results.</p>	<p>Political willingness by local administrations; pro-active participation by local industries.</p> <p>Necessary targeted awareness raising of local community of the planned activities from the onset and throughout the project</p>

<p>Output B.1.3 Pilot actions undertaken to build capacity for water quality management and ICM promoted through empowerment of communities and other actors at the on the ground interventions.</p>	<p>ICM plans incorporate water quality management.</p> <p>Number of multistakeholder meetings held in preparation of the ICM plans with particular attention is given to the empowerment of women and the input of civil society</p>	<p>There are currently no ICM plans fully incorporating Water quality management.</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u></p> <p>By 2020, there will be ICM plans in at least 5 countries in the region, incorporating water quality management.</p>	<p>Minutes of stakeholder meetings including representation of the women and civil society.</p> <p>National reports/ MTR site visits.</p> <p>Project Annual reports showing the adoption of the ICM plans.</p>	<p>Communities are able to understand and effectively participate in the stakeholder dialogues.</p> <p>Community experts with a broad knowledge base and local expertise should be identified and appointed.</p> <p>Careful selection of communities and community 'champions'</p>
<p><i>Outcome B.2 Regulatory Framework for monitoring and management of pollutant loads, effluents and receiving water quality adopted at regional level</i></p>	<p>Policy, legislative and institutional arrangement to support monitoring frameworks for pollutant loads, effluents and receiving water quality set up supporting SAP implementation at national and regional level as appropriate.</p> <p>Monitoring and management frameworks are strengthened at both national and regional levels</p>	<p>There is currently no comprehensive regionally harmonised water quality and pollution monitoring framework set up for the region.</p>	<p>A regionally harmonised water quality and pollution monitoring framework set up for the region by 2020.</p>	<p>Adoption of regional (and national) water quality standards and a regional monitoring framework is in place at regional level</p>	<p>Support of all participating countries will need to be ensured</p> <p>Data availability, and access</p>

Output B.2.1 Regionally harmonized framework for monitoring pollution loads and water quality standards developed for receiving coastal waters.	Regional receiving marine water standards developed and agreed with elements of participative monitoring	There is currently no regionally harmonised water quality and pollution monitoring in the region. There are no regionally agreed receiving marine water standards.	<u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, regionally receiving marine water standards will be agreed upon in the region.	Decision of the Nairobi Convention COP on the adoption of the regional water quality standards Regional standards.	There is political will to develop a regional standards Capacity exist in the region to monitor the variables set in the standards.
---	--	---	--	---	---

Outcomes/ Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Output B.2. Regionally harmonized standards and monitoring framework for pollutant loads and effluent and marine water quality standards adopted by at least five (5) countries through participatory national and regional consultations.	Regionally harmonised total pollution load standards. Number of regional (2) and national (5) multistakeholder consultations taken place.	There is no regionally harmonised pollution load standards.	<u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, regionally harmonized total contaminant load standards will be adopted.	Reports on regionally harmonised pollution load standards. Reports of regional and national multistakeholder dialogues	There is political will to develop a regional pollution load standard. Capacity exists to develop the monitoring of the pollution loads.

Output B.2.3 Regulatory and human capacity of national and regional facilities/institutions strengthened to promote implementation of water quality monitoring using regional standards.	Number of competent institutions involved in the network of monitoring of water quality. Allowable difference between the quality of monitoring between the reference institution and other participating institutions	There is currently weak capacity to apply and enforce water quality standards. There is limited network of institutions in monitoring the quality of water Difference in water quality monitoring results and quality of data is not at an allowable level.	By 2020, At least five scientists from each participating country are involved in the network of water quality monitoring. By 2020, monitoring results show an improved quality of monitoring activities among all the participating institutions.	Reports on the pollution monitoring and quality of the results.	Improved capacity will contribute to improved water quality monitoring.
<i>Outcome C.1 Environmental Flow Assessments (EFAs) underpin the integrated management of river flows and coastal areas and implementation of assessment recommendations strengthens ecosystem resilience</i>	Strengthened resilience and improved and integrated management of river flows and coastal areas	Currently systematic environmental flow assessments are undertaken in the region There are still important data gaps reduced baseflows	<u>End of project target:</u> By 2020 improvement of flows in pilot rivers	The recommendations of the Environmental Flow Assessment studies are integrated into the management decisions of river authorities	Capacities in countries are available and sufficient to facilitate the integration of the EFA results into management and policy decision making.

Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		

Output C.1.1 Environmental flow assessments conducted in at least three (3) pilot river basins to determine the environmental, economic and social trade-offs in water allocation and the need for management of river flows with respect to coastal areas.	Number of studies of Environmental Flow Assessment.	Environmental flow assessments are as yet not carried out for the majority of rivers basins in the region.	<u>End of project target:</u> Environmental Flow Assessment studies conducted in at least 3 river basins draining into the Indian Ocean.	Reports of Environmental Flow Assessment studies. Project Annual reports.	The project would build the capacity for EFA studies. There is a political will to carry out EFA in target river basins. There is sufficient knowledge of using the EFA results in policy decisions.
Output C.1.2 Implementation of flow assessment recommendations and participatory river basin management approaches yield environmental, economic and/or social benefits as a result of improved river flows to the coast.	Number of integrated river basin management plans (including critical socio-economic elements and gender considerations) Number of assessment recommendations implemented	The baseflow has been reduced. The baseline for target rivers is currently not established.	<u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, implementation of EFA recommendation show initial improvement of flows in pilot rivers.	EFA reports. Annual reports, showing the baseflow in the target rivers.	Effective frameworks to resolve political economy issues and water use trade-offs can be developed as part of the EFAs
<i>Outcome C.2 Capacity to conjunctively manage river flows and coastal areas strengthened</i>	Strengthened and improved capacity for conjunctive management of rivers and coastal areas	Lack of institutional capacity and governance and use of regional guidelines.	Enhanced capacities using harmonized guidelines leading to effective conjunctive management	Integration of guidelines and methodologies for Environmental Flow Assessment into management processes of river basin authorities	Ownership and sustainability of the capacities and application of the guidelines developed.

Output C.2.1 Institutional capacity for implementation of climate sensitive environmental flow assessments enhanced and supported by appropriate guidelines, methodologies and networks at both national and regional level.	<p>Number of EFA guidelines and methodologies.</p> <p>Case study documentation for best practice including gender specific case studies</p> <p>Number of active networks involved</p> <p>Number of participating institutions</p>	<p>Currently no regional guidelines exist or are not used.</p> <p>Institutional capacity for implementation is still not sufficiently developed</p> <p>Lack of a clear appropriate governance framework</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u> EFA assessment exercises include strong capacity building component using the guidelines</p> <p>Institutional capacity is reinforced to ensure effective implementation through targeted training</p> <p>Harmonized policies and guidelines</p>	<p>Reports of regional Task Forces.</p> <p>EFA guidelines and methodologies.</p>	<p>Institutions are supported to dedicate time and resources</p> <p>Regional expertise will be enhanced through EFA assessments based on the guidelines.</p>
--	---	---	--	--	--

Outcomes/ Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
<i>Outcome D.1 Updated policies and strong institutions underpin WIO-SAP implementation</i>	Timely adoption and ratification of Protocols	Process of ICZM Protocol ratification is ongoing	Accelerated ratification of the ICZM and LBSA Protocols	Ratification of Protocols by countries	Political support and priority given to ratification of Protocols
	Successful implementation of outputs through coordination and guidance of existing interministerial committees and	Process of LBSA Protocol ratification is ongoing	National and regional institutional set up for WIO SAP implementation strengthened	Reports and relative decisions of the COP of the Nairobi Convention	Willingness of cooperation and synergies among existing institutions
Output D.1.1 ICZM protocol developed and adopted at the regional level.	Adoption of the ICZM Protocol.	The ongoing process for the development of ICZM protocol.	<u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, all Nairobi Convention parties will have signed the ICZM protocol and at least 2 countries will ratify it.	Reports of Conference of Plenipotentiaries. Ratification instruments submitted to depository.	ICZM Protocol will be given sufficient political priority by countries.
Output D.1.2 LBSA protocol ratified in at least 4 countries and supported in all countries through the development of policy briefs, model legislation and capacity building to practitioners;	Number of countries ratifying/acceding the LBSA Protocol.	LBSA Protocol signed by 8 countries. However, only Mozambique has ratified it.	<u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, LBSA protocol will be ratified by at least 6 countries.	Ratification instruments submitted to depository	LBSA Protocol will be given sufficient political priority

Output D.1.3 Implementation of the WIO-SAP succeeds at national level through the coordination and guidance of interministerial committees and regional task forces;	Establishment/building on existing structures.	There is no national WIOSAP project office. NC focal points and task forces act as national project focal points.	<u>End of project target:</u> By end of 2015, National task forces to support inter-ministerial committee and regional task forces established and operational in all participating countries.	Reports of National Focal Points. Reports of National Task Forces.	There is adequate budget to set up national coordination structures.
Output D.1.4 Establishment of a funding pipeline to support long-term implementation of the SAP through Nairobi Convention including coordination of stakeholders and facilitation of learning and exchange in support of WIOSAP project implementation.	An effective regional management structure for the implementation of the WIOSAP Project. WIOSAP PMU at the Nairobi Convention Secretariat.	The regional structure for the implementation of the WIOSAP project does not exist.	<u>End of project target:</u> By end 2015, the WIO-SAP Project Management Unit will have been established at the Nairobi Convention Secretariat and the first meeting of Steering Committee will be organised.	Reports of Project Steering Committee. Annual reports of the project. Reports of the Nairobi Convention COPs.	Effective regional collaboration such as with RECS and African Union commissions for project management and resource allocation.

Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
<i>Outcome D.2 Improved knowledge management systems and exchange mechanisms support WIO management, governance and awareness creation</i>	Integration of information on investments, climate variability and changed into improved knowledge management system (CHM) Science-policy forum actively promotes greater interaction on	Limited policy-science interchange Lack of access to information Lack of overview of ongoing initiatives	Improved and updated multisectoral information within CHM and access to it Improved Science-policy interface with increased awareness creation, knowledge sharing of lessons learnt and	Recognition and use of the CHM as an important source of access to reliable information for coastal and marine planning in the region	Willingness to create the necessary synergies between national and regional commitments Access to data-sharing Support and willingness to create sustainable financing mechanisms

<p>Output D.2.1 Existing Nairobi Convention Clearing House Mechanism expanded to incorporate information on national and regional investments and projects, climate variability and change, guidelines, methodologies and success stories, among others.</p>	<p>Number of documents in the updated Nairobi Convention Clearing House Mechanism.</p> <p>Number of access to the CHM websites.</p>	<p>The CHM exists but limited information in it and limited access by stakeholders (baseline to be established).</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, CHM will be updated to include, information and tools that will be generated by the WIOSAP Project.</p> <p>By 2020, there will be at least 25% increase in the number of access to NC CHM.</p>	<p>CHM website.</p> <p>Number of new documents on CHM website.</p> <p>Number of hits on CHM website.</p>	<p>Sustainable financing mechanism is created.</p>
<p>Output D.2.2 Established science-policy exchange platform, under the Nairobi Convention for policy and for consensus on key LBSA and ICZM issues in the WIO region.</p>	<p>Science-policy forum promoting greater interaction between marine scientists and policy makers.</p>	<p>There exists gaps between science and policy making processes.</p>	<p><u>End of project target:</u> By 2020, science-policy forum will be established under the Nairobi Convention.</p> <p>By 2020, the project will organise at least 2 science-policy workshops and facilitate preparation of at least 5 policy briefs.</p>	<p>Project Annual reports.</p> <p>Policy briefs.</p> <p>Reports of science-policy workshops.</p>	<p>Synergies between NC commitments and other regional programmes, including RECs.</p>

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

The United States does not object to this PIF. This position, however, does not indicate recognition of or any change in U.S. policy with respect to the de facto regime in Madagascar. –The comment by the US is duly noted.

B. 1 Response to STAP Review comments:

1. Comment: In general the activities proposed in Components A-D should stress the common governance, policy, regulatory and analytical tools identified as critical to achieve the outcomes defined in each heading of components. Thereby the proposed project could avoid potential overlaps with other investment programs focused on the ground activities. Potential linkages with regional cooperative frameworks such as ZAMCOM, SADC and the EAC could be explored to enhance long-term sustainability of project outcomes.

RESPONSE: The activities defined for each of the Components of the WIOSAP Project have being revised accordingly and more emphasis has been placed on the common governance, policy, regulatory and analytical tools that are important in the realisation of the specific outcomes of each of the components. The design of the project activities has taken into account activities that are being undertaken in the region and in which this project would be expected to add value or lead to incremental benefits through GEF financing . The Nairobi Convention Secretariat has also explored potential linkages with other regional frameworks in the WIO Region in order to ensure long-term sustainability of the activities that would be initiated under the auspices of the WIOSAP Project. The Project has also included science to policy forums through which linkages with policy makers will also be established. This will be critical in ensuring integration of project activities into national and regional processes related to the management of the coastal and marine environment in the WIO Region.

2. Comment: Activities proposed in Component A are not properly connected and their cumulative impact seems to be limited. WIO-SAP among short-term priority actions proposes development of marine spatial planning as part of national development plans and strategies. Marine spatial planning is emerging as the most progressive framework for sustainable management of the coastal and marine environment. STAP believes that re-focusing Component A activities so that they specifically support marine spatial planning frameworks at the national and regional levels in the WIO region, would make significant impact on the sustainable development of the coastal and marine environment.

RESPONSE : The Component A of the WIOSAP project has been refocused based on the comments received from STAP and also based on additional stakeholders consultation during the PPG phase of the project. The activity on marine spatial planning which is considered to be one of the key activities for Component A is now focused on supporting marine spatial planning frameworks at the national and regional levels in the WIO Region.

3. Comment: In general the mapping of the project components in the PIF Project Framework to their equivalents in the WIO-SAP is clear and STAP notes that some consolidation of the policy aspects has been done drawing together sub-actions in all WIO-SAP sections to be addressed in Component D of the PIF. There are, however, some examples of relevant priority actions within the SAP that do not seem to be addressed in the PIF. These include, in Component A, incentive schemes, public awareness raising, economic valuation; in Component B, establishment of pilot wastewater plants in each country (not just pilot sites), sensitization of stakeholders. These examples are cited to underline the need in the project brief to be more explicit about the mapping of WIO-SAP actions against project actions, to enable strategic gaps to be more clearly expressed and tested against proposed actions. This comment also applies to the relation between the LBSA Protocol implementation needs against the project brief which is discussed further below.

RESPONSE : The priority actions in the SAP have now being integrated into the WIOSAP Project document, albeit with some modifications based on the inputs received from the Stakeholders during the PPG phase of the project. The

specific SAP priorities that have brought onboard include activities related to the provision of incentive schemes, public awareness raising and economic valuation in Component A. In Component B, SAP priorities related to the establishment of pilot wastewater plants in each country and sensitization of stakeholders have been integrated into the WIOSAP Project document. The WIOSAP Project has also integrated activities that are intended to promote the implementation of the LBSA Protocol that was delivered under the auspices of the WIO-LaB Project.

4. Comment: The evaluation report on the WIO-LaB project recommended that the utility of the various task forces and expert committees formed for that project should be reviewed by the Nairobi Convention Secretariat. Scientific and technical guidance proposed for the present project appears to be available from a diverse range of partners, but the PIF is not very clear about the legacy role of the WIO-LaB expertise and it would be helpful if the project brief could map the consultative and advisory relationships of scientific and technical focal points to the project components. Furthermore, because of the multiple partners and initiatives addressing project related goals, it is advisable to establish a consultative group or mechanism aiming at coordinating and aligning donor activities for strategic impact. Under Component D, STAP recommends considering support for such coordination mechanism.

RESPONSE : The implementation of the various activities proposed in the WIOSAP would be undertaken by the National and Regional Task Forces that have been established within the framework of the Nairobi Convention. These task forces are the same that the WIO-LaB Project used in the implementation of project activities in each of the participating countries and also at regional levels. The WIOSAP Project would strengthen these task forces so that they can play more effective role in the implementation of the project and also in terms of information exchange and dissemination. The WIOSAP Focal Points are important members of the regional and national task forces, and at national level, the national focal points are instrumental in ensuring effective coordination of the task forces activities. There is thus an effective linkage between the various task forces and the focal points, and these are subsequently linked to the WIOSAP project management structures. The Regional Inter-Ministerial Committee of the WIOSAP project will play an important role in ensuring that multiple partners and other initiatives are linked to the project. The members of the Inter-Ministerial Committee will include senior government officials involved in policy/decision-making processes in each of the participating countries.

5. Comment: The WIO-LaB evaluation report also recommended that a follow-on project should focus on implementation of the WIO-SAP and mainstreaming of activities at the national level to support implementation of the Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities (LBSA Protocol), which emphasizes actions to address pollution by particular chemicals and sources. STAP notes that the present PIF addresses more broadly the targets of the WIO-SAP rather than focusing on the Protocol, except for mention in Component D.

RESPONSE : This matter was clarified during the PIF process and it is worthwhile to clarify on it further in view of its significance. The WIOSAP Project has a broad objective of implementing the priority actions recommended in the WIO-LaB SAP including priority actions defined in the Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities (LBSA Protocol). The four components of the project have been revised accordingly and a lot of emphasis has now being placed on the implementation of some aspects of the LBSA Protocol including other priority actions defined in the WIO-LaB SAP. It must however be emphasized that the WIOSAP Project is intended to implement the foundational activities defined in the WIO-LaB SAP including those related to LBSA Protocol.

6. Comment: Component D of the project focuses on selected policy goals (e.g., adoption of the ICZM protocol, ratification of the LBSA protocol) and knowledge exchange and dissemination. Financial sustainability of the WIO-SAP is not addressed while it is recognized in the SAP document itself as a target. STAP recommends that the project proponents consider development of the regional resource mobilization strategy and financial mechanisms supporting SAP implementation.

RESPONSE : The WIO-SAP Project document has integrated various approaches for ensuring financial sustainability of the activities that would be initiated under the auspices of the project. The project has also integrated a strategy for

mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the SAP within the framework of the Nairobi Convention. These strategies are provided in Component D of the project as well as in the section on the sustainability of the project.

7. Comment: This project as it's written could be seen as a stand-alone and an "end in itself" initiative supporting WIO-SAP implementation while the actual SAP was developed envisioning short-term, medium-term and long-term outcomes. During project preparation, this first integrated project for SAP implementation is the most critical and foundational step for follow-up activities in the WIO region. STAP recommends that project proponents consider and explicitly acknowledge in the project document how proposed activities pave the way for follow-up projects and initiatives.

RESPONSE : The WIOSAP Project is basically a foundational project intended to implement short-term activities (within a 5-year period) as proposed in the WIO-LaB SAP. The WIOSAP project document takes cognizance of the need for setting a concrete foundation for the implementation of the medium and long-term priority actions defined in the WIO-LaB SAP. The activities defined in the WIOSAP Project document have thus been designed in such a way that a stage is set for future implementation of the medium and long-term actions defined in the WIO-LaB SAP. It is envisaged that successful implementation of the short term actions defined in this project document will catalyse future actions (i.e medium term and long-term actions) with or without GEF intervention.

B.2. Response to comments in the GEF review Sheet (1February 2013):

In this section, responses to comments that required to be addressed before submitting the WIOSAP Project document for GEF CEO Endorsement are presented. The comments that were specific to the PIF were adequately addressed in the revised PIF document and these are not repeated in this section.

Comment: Tools developed under component A (ecosystems evaluation and planning tools; B water quality standards and capacity on monitoring; and C environmental flows) are not sufficiently linked to clear implementation of actions/stress reduction on the ground. For example, the actions to increase monitoring capacity described in component B are not likely to by themselves to improve water quality. Furthermore, the EFAs should be focussed on specific areas/basins that have been identified as high priority in the WIOSAP and at the same time where there is an opportunity to reduce environmental stresses through e.g. modifying operating rules of existing infrastructure based on an EFA. When resubmitting, please clarify the link between tools and environmental stress reduction in components A to C.

Response: This has been addressed better in the current Project document by linking the tools that will be developed in components A to C to the implementation of concrete activities intended to reduce stress in target hotspot sites. The emphasis is therefore not just on the development of tools but also implementation of the same. For instance, the activity on the development of water quality/effluent standards is followed by the demonstration of their applicability in target hotspot sites in the WIO Region. Also, the development of Environmental Flow Assessment guidelines is followed by the implementation of the same in target river basins. The specific river basins have already been identified through a consultative TDA process undertaken under the auspices of the WIO-LaB Project. These were subsequently confirmed during the PPG process of the development of the WIOSAP Project document. It is thus expected that the implementation of tools will lead to reduction in key stresses affecting the coastal and marine environment in the WIO Region. But the development of tools is considered essential to the successful implementation of actions on the ground.

Comment: At CEO endorsement stage it will be important to show close linkage to the respective river basin organizations and/or other initiatives especially with regard to sub-basins addressed by the EFA component (comp. C). Your comment in the response matrix notes that "it is not feasible to describe national baseline and co-finance in much detail at this point." We do understand that at PIF stage not all information is available. Yet given the UNEP presence in the region, capacities of the Nairobi convention secretariat, and given the fact that this is this is not a foundational activity and countries and development partners have been actively participating in the WIOSAP formulation, it should be relatively straightforward to compile a more comprehensive overview of national baseline actions and indicative cofinancing (see also comment #25).

Response: During the PPG phase of the WIOSAP Project document formulation, additional information was obtained on the key river basins in the WIO Region that should be targeted with regard to the activities related to Environmental Flow Assessment. The detailed analysis of the key river basins were also presented as part of the WIO-LaB TDA formulation process. The project has also benefitted from lessons of the UNEP freshwater programme focused on some of the river basins in Africa including those in the WIO Region. Thus, information on river basins generated under the auspices of the WIO-LaB TDA including additional information obtained during PPG stage have now been integrated into the project document, focusing more on the salient features of river basins in terms of hydrological alterations and coastal impacts. The project thus has included an overview of the national baseline actions related to the activities on the river basins.

Comment: Component B: we realize that a lot of these activities come straight from the SAP. Yet, from a project design and finance point it is essential to e.g. in comp B 1.3. indicate if the capacity enhancement will mainly address regulatory and human capacity strengthening (e.g. training and other capacity building) or also aims at providing funds to upgrade specific laboratories for WW analysis; On a technical level, we still want to make sure that while harmonization of regulations on effluent concentrations are important, that the impact in the coastal zone, hence sensible river and coastal zone interaction can only be captured if pollutant loads are also assessed.

Response: In Component B, there are various activities that are intended to build the capacity of not only the state actors (national and local institutions) but also the local communities and NGOs to participate more effectively in matters related to water quality/pollution management in their countries. The emphasis is also placed on the building the regulatory and human capacity of national institutions so that they can implement concrete actions on the ground. The activity on the implementation of the water quality monitoring programme in hotspot sites (assess pollutant loads) will also involve provision of financial support to national institutions with appropriate mandate. Therefore, the current project document has included activities that will build both human, regulatory and financial capacity of key actors in participating countries.

Comment: The development objective still does not quite capture the project content. e.g it is good that it addresses SAP implementation on national level, but the regional aspects has been dropped entirely. Also, we still are not convinced that you capture e.g. most of component 1. Please address.

Response: The development objective has been revised accordingly and now mentions 'regional level'. Component I activities are now integrated in the development objective.

Comment: The project design phase should also be conscious of evaluating on how far gender differential access and rights to natural resources exist and how this influences project outcome if not addressed in the project design.

Response: The WIOSAP Project has integrated gender issues in the design of various project activities. There will be a deliberate effort to involve women and youth in the implementation of various activities of the project. The project has taken into consideration the appropriate guidelines and or requirements on the integration of gender into project implementation process.

Comment: Please provide more information on the contribution of the co-financing sources to the implementation of the project, i.e. delivery of the specific project objective and outcomes. Please show what part of the indicative co-finance meets the criteria above and what part is parallel finance, which is still important, but cannot be counted as project co-finance.

Response: Additional information on the co-financing will be provided in the WIOSAP Project document once all the participating countries submits their letters. The WIOSAP Project document has therefore not fully provided information on the cofinancing contributions of participating countries and their partners in different components of the project. These details including the parallel financing will be submitted later once the project receives CEO endorsement..

Comment: As discussed with UNEP, the following items should be addressed in more detail at CEO endorsement:

- Integration of relevant activities esp. in components B (water quality) and C (environmental flows) with the Work program of respective river basin organizations.

Response: This has been achieved through identification of the key river basin organizations in the WIO Region including their main activities. It is however important to note that most of the river basin organizations in the region are yet to adopt some of the approaches presented in Components B and C of the project. Thus, the project would be introducing new integrative approaches that would be expected to build the capacity of river basin organizations in the WIO Region to most effectively deal with issues related to water pollution and hydrologic alterations at river basin level and associated impacts at the coast. Thus, the activities for the mentioned component will contribute to the work programmes of river basin organizations. Necessary linkages with various river basin organizations will be undertaken through the national focal points.

- Gender dimension and consideration in project design (see review sheet qu. 16).

Response: This has been addressed by integrating gender in the design of the activities of the project.

- Clarify the process (to be carried out in project implementation) to establish the functional relationship between river hydrology and environmental flow constraints and how this will be made stakeholders.

Response: The component C of the WIOSAP provides concrete steps that integrates the river basin hydrology and the environmental flows and the coastal impacts. It is understood that the alteration of the hydrology of key river systems that are linked to the coast through sediment and nutrient outflows, among others, will impact on the sustainability of the productivity of the critical coastal and marine ecosystems. The activity on EFA entails the examination of the activities at the river basin level and how the same impacts on the hydrology of river systems and subsequently how the later impacts on the coastal ecosystems. The implementation of EFA will thus involve the participation of both the EFA experts, river basin and coastal zone managers and stakeholders through a consultative process. There will be a number of awareness creation activities intended to educate river basin stakeholders on how activities in river basins impacts on coastal and marine environment and how the negative impacts can be addressed through EFA implementation.

- Additional information and details on project baseline.

Response: The WIOSAP Project document now includes an analysis of the baseline activities in participating countries and these have been integrated in all the components of the project. The project document provides details on what the governments of the participating countries and their partners are doing with regard to the protection and or management of the coastal and marine environment. Table 10 in the WIOSAP Project provides more detailed analysis of baseline in each of the components of the project and what the GEF funding will contribute to.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$US 185,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
\$US 185,000			\$US 185,000
Total	0	0	\$US 185,000

5 If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A