



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

GEF ID:	4940		
Country/Region:	Regional (Kenya, Comoros, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Tanzania, South Africa)		
Project Title:	Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Protection of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; IW-1; IW-2; IW-2; IW-2; IW-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$10,867,000
Co-financing:	\$66,710,185	Total Project Cost:	\$77,577,185
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Kelly West

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	(4/5/2012 ah): Yes, all participating countries are GEF eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	(4/5/2012 ah): The operational focal points for the Seychelles, Mozambique, Madagascar and Kenya have endorsed the project. Letters of endorsement for Comoros, Mauritius, South Africa and Tanzania are still missing. Please provide these when resubmitting. (4/16/2012 ah): Letters for all countries, except South Africa, are now attached. Please submit the South Africa LOE prior to entry into workprogram.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	(4/5/2012 ah): Yes, UNEP's comparative advantages in relevant areas related to the project is outlined in the PIF.	

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	(4/5/2012 ah): yes, the activities are aligned with UNEP's capacity and engagement in the region.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>(4/5/2012 ah): The project should remain within an envelope of USD 12 million (including agency fees).</p> <p>(4/16/2012): This has been addressed.</p> <p>One editorial item:</p> <p>The \$ figures for baseline in the text (pg 10, 2nd para in B.1) for the Nairobi convention and UNEP add to close to, but not quite the same amount as the co-finance figures in table C. Unless I overlooked something, you may want to make these match.</p> <p>(9/4/2012 ah): The above comment has been addressed and figures match.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		

Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	(4/5/2012 ah): Yes, the project is aligned with the GEF 5 IW focal area results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	(4/5/2012 ah): yes. The project addresses SAP implementation and is identifying IW objective 1 and 2 which is in lign with the land-coastal area interactions addressed by the project.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	(4/5/2012 ah): yes, the project is consistent with national and regional priorities. WIOSAP priorities have been taken up under the work program of the Nairobi convention and are in line with national priorities, incl. those of SIDS.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	(4/5/2012 ah): This is only partially addressed in the current PIF. 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 - 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.	

		<p>better in the current PIF by linking the tools to implementation and especially focussing and clarifying the component on flow assessments.</p> <p>Two points recommended for resubmission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The PIF still contains a large number of outputs that do not clearly result in action on the ground, which is not a good reflection of SAP implementation. Please reorganize outcomes and outputs so that the project framework has a greater emphasis on implementation than on the tools perse - see also #14 below.</li> <li>- Please include the 'pilot actions on empowering communities in relation to demonstration sites in components A2,B2, C2' as budgeted activities WITHIN these components. We believe this will also make for a more logical structure of the components during project design.</li> </ul> <p>(9/4/2012 ah): The points above have been addressed by clearly articulating the link between proposed tools as essential to specific and tangible project activities and outputs. Furthermore, the pilot actions now are an integral part of each component design to assure a close link to the expected component outcomes.</p>	
	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>(4/5/2012 ah): yes, the baseline actions are described in sufficient details including specific funds invested by each development partner. There are substantial national baseline investments, some of which are mentioned in LOEs. It would strengthen</p>	

Project Design

described here as well (in table format if that would be easier).

(4/16/2012): Some additional information as well as a reference to the respective Annex in the WIOSAP has been added, which is helpful.

At CEO endorsement stage it will be important to show close linkage to the respective river basin organisations 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 co-financing (see also comment #25).

(9/4/2012 ah): Comment addressed, Additional information requested re. baseline and co-financing has been added to the agency response matrix and is expected to be included to the project documentation at CEO endorsement.

	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	(4/5/2012 ah): yes, it is based on incremental reasoning and GEF investments in context of their additionality over and above the baseline investments. Yet, see also comment 15.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>(4/5/2012 ah): The PF would benefit from being more concrete/specific in terms of what component interventions. In addition, the PO does not seem to address the entirety of the project. For example:</p> <p>A 1.3 - which ecosystem based approaches are being considered and roughly where.</p> <p>A 2.2 and A 2.3 - the WIOSAP provides detail in terms of critical habitats and hotspots (as mentioned in the PIF text). It would be important to reflect this here by indicating which areas these management plans may target (at least give a long list in the text and set a target in the project FW of 'at least X number of mmgt plans developed and adopted')</p> <p>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</p>	

strengthening (e.g. training and other capacity building) or also aims at providing funds to upgrade specific laboratories for WW analysis; comp.

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.

B2. Please link the demosites to the hotspots in the SAP. B1 mentions that municipal treatment pilots are aimed at "at least three countries" without indicating the number of pilots (at least X number of ...). The SAP indicates that 80 % of the nutrient and organic matter load originates from South Africa and Tanzania. It therefore appears to makes sense to take this into account in the selection of pilots.

Component C: Again, could one build on the SAP here and indicate which of the basins that are indicated as "severely" affected are likely to be targeted. As mentioned above (under #10) the link to opportunities for using the EFAs for actual stress reduction action is not all that clear (e.g. in form of modified operating rules of existing infrastructure or similar). Funds for component C are therefore comparatively high.

Component D - the large co-finance for

foundational activities are of greater importance than actual implementation/stress reduction, which seems somewhat odd in a SAP implementation project. Please consider putting more emphasis in funds allocated to implementation. Furthermore, please reformulate output indicators to be more directed towards impacts achieved and/or quantifiable (e.g. X and Y achieved)

(4/16/2012 ah): Most of the comments above have been addressed and the PIF much strengthened through these revisions.

Please address the following remaining items:

- 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.

(9/4/2012 ah): Comment addressed by revising the DO in the project framework (please update the text/by CEO endorsement in the project document).

- The PIF still contains a large number of outputs that do not clearly result in action on the ground, which is not in lign with a SAP implementation project. Please reorganize outcomes and outputs

framework on implementation of actions and impacts on the ground and fewer outputs on supporting tools/guidance.

(9/4/2012 ah): Comment addressed - see above response under 10. The project framework and text have been revised to clarify how tools and guidelines are linked/are essential to effective implementation of specific activities of the project.

- We appreciate the quantified indicators in component A. Given the active involvement and ongoing activities of the WIO C members there is lot of action on the ground already. Else, indicators for component A 2.2. and A 2.3 could sound rather ambitious, yet are very supportive in showing that the project delivers visible impacts (e.g. through the rehabilitation of a number of critical habitats).

(9/4/2012 ah): noted/addressed.

- B 1.2 would benefit from including some 'bottom target' on how many countries are expected to adopt the regional freshwater and/or marine water quality or pollutant load guidelines for use at national level (at least X countries) or at least take necessary precursor action to do so (please specify). We had discussed that at the phone conference. Please address.

(9/4/2012 ah): comment addressed. The project framework is now providing

		<p>- D 1.2 It is not clear what the LBSA domestication in all countries actually means, As stated in the project framework and text this is not clear and therefore risks to remain at the level of recommendations and legal guidance documents. It should be expected that a SAP implementation project of this size and duration will go further than this. Again, what are the actions in countries in terms of national adoption of the LBSA that the project will support and please provide appropriate indicators for actions on national level.</p> <p>(9/4/2012 ah): comment addressed. The project framework is now providing specific, quantifiable indicators such as min. number of countries that have ratified the LBSA protocol.</p> <p>Editorial items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A.1.1. "adaptive resilience' is a strange term.</li> <li>- Table B : in C 2.2.: should probably read " ... optimization of infrastructure operation, efficiency ..." also at the end of C 2.2. should probably say ' in two sub-basins" instead of " in 2 sites."</li> </ul> <p>(9/4/2012 ah): The comments above have been addressed in the revised PIF.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The incremental cost reasoning should be strengthened keeping in mind that this is a SAP implementation project (IW 1 and 2). Reference to the IW focal area results framework would be helpful in this. Please enhance at time of resubmission.</p>	

		(4/16/2012 ah): This has been addressed.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	<p>(4/5/2012 ah): Yes, the PIF is detailed in describing the socio-economic benefits of the project. It also highlights the key role of women on local as well as governance/decision making level for project implementation. 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.</p> <p>(4/16/2012 ah): The gender issues has been commented on by the team in the response matrix and it is noted that this will be addressed in project design/at CEO endorsement stage.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>(4/5/2012 ah): the role of civil society in project design and as beneficiaries could be better articulated. Overall section B 5 of the PIF has an overarching emphasis on various levels of resource managers as the target group, which is somewhat odd to see in a SAP implementation project and based on the desription of the socio-economic benefits.</p> <p>(4/16/2012 ah): The revised PIF has been strengthend in this regard. Referring back to comments under # 10 the project component description and project design would appear much clearer with regard to community participation if these activities are properly folded into the respective</p>	

		<p>bundled into one sub-component under comp. A.</p> <p>(9/4/2012 ah): comment addressed. As noted under # 10; the component specific pilot actions have been integrated in the respective components, which is expected to result in increased co-herence and integration into component activities and contribution to the component outcomes.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	(4/5/2012 ah): yes. The PIF specifically addresses threats and assessment and incorporation of climate risk adaptation measures.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	(4/5/2012 ah): The project is well aligned with other initiatives in the coastal area. The link to RBOs should be clearly articulated in project design to assure that the project succeeds to create the intended link and conjunctive management of river basins and related coastal zones.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	(4/5/2012 ah): Yes, the project execution partners mentioned have strong engagement and capacity in the area.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	(4/5/2012 ah): Yes, the project management cost is below 5 % which is in accordance with GEF guidance.	

Project Financing			
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>(4/5/2012 ah): As commented earlier, the co-finance for component D - which mostly addresses foundational activities - appears high for WIOSAP implementation.</p> <p>(4/16/2012): The overall amount of co-financing is in line with GEF guidance and appropriate in terms of component outcomes and outputs.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>(4/5/2012 ah): The overall level of co-financing is adequate with above 1:5 ration.</p> <p>Based on the description of baseline activities it appears that the contribution of WIO-C Partners entails both in-kind and grant and if so, this should be reflected in the PIF resubmission. Currently this part of co-finance is entirely labeled as in-kind.</p> <p>(4/16/2012): While the overall amount of co-financing is in line with GEF guidance and appropriate in terms of component outcomes and outputs, it is not clear that the activities by partners listed as co-finance are actually part of (= directly contributing to) project delivery.</p> <p>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</p>	

		(9/4/2012 ah): comment addressed. Additional information on the sources of co-financing have been provided and will be further specified at CEO endorsement. The PIF includes a conservative (lower) \$ figure compared to the listed indicative co-finance attached to the agency response matrix.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	(4/5/2012 ah): The UNEP co-financing of 2.5 million in grant resources is in line with the agency's role.  (4/16/2012) - Yet, please see comment # 25.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	(4/5/2012 ah): No STAP review provided at this stage.	
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	(4/5/2012 ah): No. Please review the comments provided and resubmit along with missing endorsement letters soonest.  (4/16/2012); No. please address the items listed under # 10, # 11, # 14, and #25 and submit the endorsement letter	

		<p>(9/4/2012 ah): Previous comments have been addressed in the revised PIF.</p> <p>The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p> <p>(1/30/2013 AH): The PIF has been previously cleared from technical point for inclusion in a future workprogram; the current resubmission is addressing the new GEF agency fee structure (in force as off Jan. 1, 2013).</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>As discussed with UNEP, the following items should be addressed in more detail at CEO endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integration of relevant activities esp. in components B (water quality) and C (environmental flows) with the workprogram of respective river basin organizations.</li> <li>- Gender dimension and consideration in project design (see review sheet qu. 16).</li> <li>- 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 transparent and accessible to stakeholders.</li> <li>- Additional information and details on project baseline.</li> </ul>	
<p>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</p>	<p>32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?</p>		
	<p><b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b></p>		
<p>Review Date (s)</p>	<p>First review*</p>		

	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

**REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.