



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9451		
Country/Region:	Regional (Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	Caribbean Regional Oceanscape Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	159653 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3 Program 7; IW-3 Program 6; BD-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$182,648	Project Grant:	\$6,300,000
Co-financing:	\$13,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$20,382,648
PIF Approval:	May 04, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	June 09, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	22nd of April 2016(cseverin): Yes the project and its results framework is fully aligned with the GEF6 IW results framework.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes, the project will help countries to address issues that will work towards implementing the Caribbean Strategic Action Programme, which all GEF Eligible Caribbean Countries have endorsed.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes,	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	while recognizing the substantial work undertaken by other entities towards addressing the drivers via other investments.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes, the concept lays out a sound incremental reasoning.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes, the components and their activities will be not only supporting the IW focal area identified GEBs, but also supporting regional agreements within OECS and some that have been identified in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Strategic Action Program, endorsed by 27 Caribbean Countries.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):The project concept includes a section on the range of World bank safeguards that the project will touch upon.	Please at time of CEO Endorsement make sure to include wording that the project will be delivering according to indicators identified in the GEF6 GENDER strategy. Further, please also expand on the impact the development the Marine Spatial Plans will have on the local level and how these will engage with the NGOs and CSOs.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	According to PMIS on the 26th of April, the Grenada STAR should be	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		untouched, hence the funding of \$300k BD funding should be available.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):The funding requested from the IW Focal area is available.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes the PIF is being recommended for CEO Clearance	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): No major changes.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>23rd of June 2017 (cseverin):Partly, please include wording in the PAD and the GEF datasheet, to the effect that the national Marine Spatial Plans will be endorsed at ministerial level, to most optimally inform political decisions.</p> <p>Further, please make it clearer in the submission that the MSPs will be including funding strategies, identifying funding sources (pension funds, private sector, government funding, etc) and potential funding organisations in each country will also be identified.</p> <p>30th of June 2017 (cbarnerias): the GEF Datasheet or para 18 of annex 1 don't precise the level of endorsement of the Marine Spatial Plans. The Project Development Objective Indicators mention endorsement by states and OECS.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): Yes. However, it is noted that the co-financing to this project has fallen dramatically since PIF stage. This issues has been raised with the agency multiple times.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): Yes	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): No Cofinancing letters have been attached. Please note that cofinancing letters needs to be provided by the time of WB board approval. 30th of June 2017 (cbarnerias): Cofinancing letters have been provided	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): Yes	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): Yes, in particular the CLME + project has been and will be coordinated with.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): The project follows World Bank standards and hence no budgeted ME table has been included, but does identify tangible outputs as part of the results framework.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): Yes, will be using IWLEARN as a mechanism for sharing best practices	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		and lessons learned.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	<p>23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): Yes, mostly, apart from the two points on ministerial endorsement of MSPs and long term funding strategies for these MSPs, as identified above, everything has been responded too.</p> <p>Please address these two missing points.</p> <p>30th of June 2017 (cbarnerias): Yes. Marine Spatial Plans will be endorsed by member countries at ministerial level.</p> <p>An effort will be made to provide long term financial sustainability to Marine Spatial Plans implementation.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): Yes	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>23rd of June 2017 (cseverin): Germany had following comment with suggestions for improvement of the project:</p> <p>1: Development of five national and one regional Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) as well as five national coastal blue growth master plans are envisaged in this project document.</p>	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>However, the involvement of the five countries and their resulting ownership is not laid out.</p> <p>2: The co-financing table shows a contribution from the regional Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) which will be responsible to develop the regional MSP. For national integrated Marine Spatial Plans involving diverse stakeholders at national level and in most cases several different ministries, a strong commitment is needed to steer the process.</p> <p>3: Regarding the implementation, the PIF refers to other WB projects in the region which are not transparent for external reviewers through the document at hand. This should be clarified during the drafting of the final project proposal.</p> <p>Please attach report/proof that these comments have been taken into consideration during the project development stage.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	23rd of June 2017 (cseverin):No, please address two points identified above and attach report that illustrates that Germany's comments have been addressed.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		30th of June 2017 (cbarnerias): GEF secretariat comments were addressed and a report attached to illustrate the way Germany's comments have been addressed.	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		