



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

GEF ID:	5405		
Country/Region:	Regional (China, Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam)		
Project Title:	EAS: Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4752 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$10,643,992
Co-financing:	\$157,265,467	Total Project Cost:	\$167,909,459
PIF Approval:	April 29, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 20, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Erez Padilla

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the participating countries are eligible	SHansen (11.7): Yes, all participating countries are eligible.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Endorsement letters have been recieved from Cmabodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines and Timor Leste. Please submit Thailand and Vietnam soonest.</p> <p>If the Endorsement letters for Thailand and Vietnam have not been forwarded, prior to posting of the June WP, this project will not be part of the June 2013 WP.</p> <p>15th of April 2013 (cseverin): YES, The</p>	SHansen (11.7): Thailand OFP endorsement letter has been recieved and suggested activities in Thailand keep in the project.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Vietnam endorsement letter have been submitted and a caveat have been included on the Thailand Endorsement letter and that if not received before CEO Endorsement, all suggested activities in Thailand will be removed from the project.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin):Funds are available under the Parent PFD "Reducing Pollution and rebuilding degraded marine resources in the East Asian Seas through implementation of the Intergovernmental agreements and catalyzed Investments" So it will draw no funds from the subsequent WP that it may be presented along with.	SHansen (11.7): Funds available under the GEF id 4936 parent program.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART</i>	12th of April 2013 (cseverin):Yes the project is aligned with the IW Results framework.	SHansen (11.7): Overall the project is aligned with the IW results framework. However, for GEF to evaluate the overall effect of the investment please add to table B more quantifiable indicators (see box 7 "component, outcomes and outputs" for further clarification).

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><i>indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>		<p>19th of December 2013 (cseverin): Please do address the above point.</p> <p>13th of February 2014 (Ikarrer): Point addressed. Thank you.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested project activities have been aligned with the vision of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA).</p>	<p>SHansen (11.7): Yes, the project will contribute towards national and local governments adopting and initiating ocean policy, legal instruments, institutional improvements and programs, and mainstreaming SDS-SEA targets into their medium-term development and investment plans.</p>
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the baseline for this project is provided by the highly accepted and successful regional development strategy SDS-SEA, which among others have been supported through PEMSEA activities. Both SDS SEA and PEMSEA will be central in the successful implementation of this proposed project activities.</p>	<p>SHansen (11.7): Yes, the baseline is thoroughly described in the PIF document and further elaborated in the project document. However, please do correct data indicating the total stretch of coastline under ICM. According to the PEMSEA Anniversary Publication the correct number is 11.98 % (approx. 12 %).</p> <p>19th of December (cseverin): Addressed.</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the outputs and outcomes listed in tabel B are considered to be sufficiently clear at this stage.</p>	<p>SHansen (11.7): Please see the below comments.</p> <p>1. Please do revise the pro.doc so that BOTH stress reduction and qualitative activities have strong quantifiable indicators. As an example of missing/weak quantifiable stress reduction indicators the project document states that at least 25% of ICM/IRBCAM sites in priority river basins/coastal areas (Table 16) should demonstrate measurable reductions in</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>priority pollutants (e.g., N, P, BOD), along with improved water use and conservation management (compared to baseline conditions). In this specific case tangible targets needs to be added, e.g. stating overall expected % reductions of N, P, BOD. It is not enough to state that there will be measurable improvements, the pro doc needs to include target values or target changes in values for these indicators to demonstrate significant improvements. Following the logic of the above stated example please add quantifiable indicators to not only stress reduction outputs (e.g. output 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2 and 6.1) but also qualitative activities. Also, please note that in the case of missing baseline data indicative quantifiable indicators are acceptable.</p> <p>2. Please do revise output 6.2 so that it reflects the following text: "Innovative technologies and good practices in nutrient management and water use conservation demonstrated in priority coastal areas and river basins considering socio economic and financial implications".</p> <p>3. Under project component 3 please do consider incorporating Economic Valuation (of direct and indirect-use values of ecosystems) as a Tool to Bridge the Science-Policy Gap.</p> <p>4. Under project component 3 output 9.4 please do specify where activities will</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>take place?</p> <p>19th of December 2013 (cseverin): Please do make sure include quantifiable indicators (as comment 1 above describes) into Table B as well as Annex A - Strategic Results Framework of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Comment 2 addressed.</p> <p>Comment 3 Addressed.</p> <p>Comment 4 Addressed.</p> <p>13th of February 2014 (lkarrer): Final comment addressed. Thank you.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the IW GEBs have been identified and incorporated. Yes, the incremental reasoning is considered to be sound.</p>	<p>Shansen (11.7): Yes GEBs have been identified and incorporated. Also, the incremental reasoning is clear: sustainable development of coastal and marine areas will be undertaken through a regional coordinating mechanism that enables implementation of a regional strategy featuring commonly defined goals, objectives and targets. Further, GEF investments will contribute towards a transformative set of actions which will serve as a model for other regions, national and sub-national governments at the global level.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional</p>		<p>SHansen (11.7): Socio-economic benefits are described, while gender is covered through a focus on alternative / sustainable livelihood development in selected priority sites which will allow women to engage directly in upstream economic activities as well as be</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits?		empowered to participate in policy and decision-making processes.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, a long list of organisations, institutions, CSO, private sector partners etc, have been identified. However, at time of CEO End. it would be needed to see more details under each of these "headings".	Shansen (11.7): Yes, project document table 10 gives details on involvement of CSOs etc.  19th of December 2013 (cseverin): Sorry about this late proposal, but please do consider if it makes sense to investigate if synergies can be created between the proposed project and its activities and national SGP activities.  13th of February 2014 (Ikarrer): Point addressed. Thank you.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the project proposal includes a matrix including potential mitigation measures.	Shansen (11.7): Yes, the submission includes a comprehensive risk assesment.
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project will be coordinating with EAS Partnership Council as well as multiple ongoing GEF IW projects in the region.	SHansen (11.7): The project takes into account a long list of related initiatives in the region. However, please do add to the list:  - UNEP project (GEF id 5401) titled: Establishment and Operation of a Regional System of Fisheries Refugia in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand.  19th of December 2013 (cseverin): Addressed

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): This project will among others be demonstrating innovative financial and economic instruments and other incentives designed to drive positive changes in behavior at ICM sites (e.g., revolving funds, Public Private Partnerships (PPPs), Payment for Environmental Services (PES), markets for carbon credits, Corporate Social responsibility (CSR) and certification programs (e.g. Port Safety, Health and Environmental Management Code; ICM Code).</p> <p>This project will be working towards a sustainable coastal and ocean based economy in the East Asian Region, through making sure that PEMSEA becomes a self sustaining country owned regional mechanism for managing the 7 regional LMEs, while also scaling up interventions to reach the regional goal of 20% of coast line under ICM.</p>	<p>SHansen (7.11): The project displays strong innovative aspects. As stated earlier capatilization on strong links to GEF investments in the region is vital and will further enhance the positive outcomes when working towards impact through innovative marked instruments.</p> <p>Project sustainability is not sufficiently described, please in greater detail elaborate on output 1.1: how will PEMSEA become a self-sustaining, country-owned, regional mechanism?</p> <p>19th of December 2013 (cseverin): Partly addressed in PRO DOC with activity 1.1.3, however, please include some narrative description on how the sub activities will be essential steps towards long term sustainability and how these steps will also be informed by other activities under other listed outcomes.</p> <p>13th of February 2014 (lkarrer): Point addressed. Thank you.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>Shansen (7.11): Yes, however, please note that total Project Budget has increased from USD10,143,992 in the PIF to USD10,643,992 in the Project Document, an increase of USD500,000. The increase is due to the incorporation of additional activities following STAP recommendations and is within the limit of an acceptable 5 % increase between PIF and endorsement stage.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		SHansen (7.11): Yes, the project will build on the operational and core set of partnership arrangements, capacities and capabilities that have been established to date, at the regional, national and local levels.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the funding suggested per component seems to be adequate.	SHansen (7.11): Yes, GEF funding and co-finance suggested per component is adequate.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, table C outlines a diverse list of cofinanciers.  Please consider during PPG phase to strengthen the Private Sector engagement in the project and its activities, as private Sector is understood to be an important driver in the region.	SHansen (7.11): Both the amount which UNDP brings to the table and the composition of co-finance is adequate.  It is noted that output 3.1, 5.2, 6.2, 7.2, 8.1 and 8.2 displays links to the private sector. However, to enhance sustainability of the project results and insure implementation of cost effective solutions please do incorporate text into the project document stating that the projects private sector strategy will be executed in the early stages of the project. This includes the creation of forums, venues and opportunities to encourage private sector participation in technical working groups, coordinating committees, among others, at national and local levels, particularly priority sites where ICM implementation is taking place.  19th of December 2013 (cseverin): Please do address comment and have it also reflected in the Request for CEO Endorsement. This is such an important

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>part of the long term sustainability of the project and PEMSEA as an organisation that it HAVE to be reflected upon in both the descriptive text of the Request as well as in the results framework and in the strategic Results Framework (Annex A).</p> <p>Further, the description of the Private sector engagement in setting out to fulfil Outcome 4, will need be changed to better reflect upon the role of the private sector not only as a partner, but probably also as a catalysor in the process of getting local and national governments to identify ICM areas and in getting legal policy and institutional frameworks identified and agreed upon.</p> <p>Thanks for including new activity 4.1.6, it partly addresses the issue.</p> <p>13th of February 2014 (lkarrer): Private sector linkages added and point addressed. Thank you.</p>
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PM budget is in accordance with the GEF norm.	SHansen (7.11): Yes, project management budget is in full accordance with the GEF standards.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): No PPG have been requested.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>SHansen (7.11): A tracking tool has been submitted. However, please do submit a revised TT addressing the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please include updated data reflecting the area currently under ICM (goal being 20 % of coastline under ICM)</li> <li>- Please to the extent possible revise the different stress reduction indicators so that they reflect more tangible stress reduction results e.g. measuring total N, P, BOD, water savings, protected MPA etc. As an example, monitoring of municipal waste water discharges at selected ICM priority sites should not only show % of population covered by adequate treatment facilities, but include reductions of N, P and BOD to water bodies (measured in kg/ton).</li> </ul> <p>19th of December 2013 (cseverin); Partly addressed. Thanks for the revised TT, much more to the point, however it appears that the Baseline information is partly missing at this stage, which makes some of the stress reduction indicators rather empty. We would need to see resubmission of the TT (as well as updated results frameworks) as soon as the baseline data (at inception) will be available.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			13th of February 2014 (lkarrer): Point addressed. Thank you.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Shansen (7.11): Yes, the proposal contains a detailed M&E plan.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		<p>SHansen (11.7): Yes, Annex B contains a comprehensive list of responses to both STAP and GEF comments.</p> <p>In mote detail the project document has incorporated STAP recommendations and articulated actions for strengthening coordination and information sharing between the project and ASEAN and APEC Working Groups in Output 1.2 (Partnerships in Coastal and Ocean Governance) as well as in Output 3.7 (Outreach Services).</p> <p>Because of additional outputs and the associated activities, the Total Project Budget has increased from USD10,143,992 in the PIF to USD10,643,992 in the Project Document, an increase of USD500,000.</p> <p>Please do note that the US has requested that the project be circulated for council for a four week period prior to CEO endorsement, to evaluate if the STAP comments have been taken into consideration.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		29th of April 2014 (cseverin): Council comments received from Germany and have been addressed (Communication

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		have been linked to the PMIS).
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): The PIF is ready to be technically cleared and to be considered for inclusion in a future work program as soon as the endorsement letters from Thailand and Vietnam be submitted to the GEFSEC.</p> <p>15th of April (cseverin): Vietnam have submitted the Endorsement letter and a caveat on the Thailand endorsement letter have been included. hence above comment addressed and hence the PIF is ready to be technically cleared and to be considered for inclusion in a future work program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>OFP letter from Thailand has been recieved. However, prior to the project being circulated before council please do address the below comments :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revise the results framework and project document (see comments in box 7)</li> <li>- Update Tracking tool</li> <li>- Correct baseline data indicating the total stretch of coastline under ICM</li> <li>- Add to list of projects which this project must coordinate with</li> <li>- Incorporate text on execution of private sector involvement</li> <li>- Elaborate on output 1.1: how will PEMSEA become a self-sustaining, country-owned, regional mechanism?</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>As indicated above please be aware that the revised package will be circulated for council comments for a 4 week period prior to CEO endorsement (due to a United States request).</p> <p>13th of February 2014 (Ikarrer): Points addressed and sending for 4 week Council review as requested.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>Not yet, please do address the above mentioned comments.</p> <p>19th of December 2013 (cseverin): No, Please do address above comments.</p> <p>13th of February 2014 (Ikarrer): Yes, recommend for CEO endorsement. Please note the US requested that the project be circulated to council for a four week period prior to CEO endorsement, to evaluate if the STAP comments have been taken into consideration.</p>
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.