



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

GEF ID:	5278		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Strengthening Global Governance of Large Marine Ecosystems and their Coasts through Enhanced Sharing and Application of LME/ICM/MPA Knowledge and Information Tools.		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	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-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,500,000
Co-financing:	\$14,816,675	Total Project Cost:	\$17,316,675
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Vladimir Mamaev

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 ?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): NA, this is a global project	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): NA, this is a global project	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, funds are available under the IW focal area allocation.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project is in alignment with IW - 3	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): This is a global project, but it is addressing a global identified need.	
Project Design	<p>6. 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>	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes	

	8. Are global environmental benefits adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, this MSP project will support the formulation of a LME/ICM Governance network, reaching out globally, not only servicing the UNDP, NOAA, IUCN, IOC, ICES but also GEF IW and GEF BD funded MPAs.	
	9. 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?		7th of February 2013 (cseverin): This project will not directly address the gender issues, but will create socio economic benefits due to the nature of the suggested interventions, while also promoting gender mainstreaming into LME and ICM projects.
	10. Is public participation , including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin):Yes, Since this project is building upon a large number of successful regional interventions that includes CSOand local communities, the project wil include linkages to these.	
	11. 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)	7th of February 2013 (cseverin):the project includes a matric outlining potential riska and mitigation measures. Climate Change or its consequences are not directly addressed, due to the nature fo the proposed project, but will be an integral part when addressing governance of LMEs, MPAs and assessing tools for ICM.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, this global project properly coordinates with relevant initiatives.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. - Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not. whv not.	7th of February 2013 (cseverin):This project will be important in creating a global governance structure for LMEs, MPAs and towards harnessing public and private partners. The approach that this project is taking is highly innovative as it will be able create a governance structure	

	<p>sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project? - Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up. 	to happen not only with in GEF IW funded projects, but also similar investments within BD in MPA areas, UNDP, IOC, NOAA, ICES, CI and many other partners.	
	14. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. 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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes,	
	17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any comment on the indicated amount and composition of cofinancing ? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, it is following the GEF guidance	
	19. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): NA	

Project Monitoring and Evaluation	20. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is being recommended for Clearance	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	25. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested and approved? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	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.