



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

GEF ID:	5513		
Country/Region:	Regional		
Project Title:	Western Indian Ocean LMEs Strategic Action Programme Policy Harmonization and Institutional Reforms SAPPHIRE Project		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5262 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$10,976,891
Co-financing:	\$68,802,000	Total Project Cost:	\$80,078,891
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Akiko Yamamoto

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 ?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the nine participating countries are eligible for GEF funding	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes all nine OPFs have endorsed the proposed project.	
Resource Availability	3. 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? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project amount of 10,976,891 is available under the IW focal area. Please do make sure that the amount listed in Table A is not different from the actual	

		excluded). Please do correct. 29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed	
	<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"> • 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>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the project is fully aligned with the IW results framework. However, Please do consider to rewrite the objective of the project to something along the lines of " To Achieve effective long-term ecosystem management in the Western Indian Ocean LMEs in line with the endorsed Strategic Action Programme. "</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed, with a revised, alternative, Objective.</p>	
	<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>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project is fully aligned with the national mairne ecosystem diagnostic analyses and will translate these to national actions during project implementation. Please do make sure during preparation that coordination with countries will be undertaken, to maximise country ownership.</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Agency response outlines that coordination will be a central part of the PPG phase and continously throughtout the project implementation.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s),</p>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the</p>	

<p>Project Design</p>	<p>baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>described. The project will be investing to support and coordinate the NAPs to facilitate regional actions and results.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the components, outcomes and outputs in Table B is clear. Please do include wording to support the fact that 1% of the GEF grant will be allocated to support IWLEARN activities. Please do at time of CEO Endorsement include quantifiable outcome and output indicators into the project framework.</p> <p>Please do make sure that during project preparation coordination will be taking place on the use of tools developed and MPAs defined by other GEF funded activities in the region.</p> <p>UNder the Component on Stress Reduction, please do make sure to coordinate with other activities in the region, so that there will be no overlap.</p> <p>On a general note some of the outputs may be a bit ambitious, e.g. please consider to insert a / into following project output, just after REVISED, before UPDATED: Regional and national marine ecosystem cost-benefit analysis and goods-and services asserssments revised/updated and delivered at community level.</p>	

		29th of August 2013 (cseverin):Addressed	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin):Yes, the GEBs have been identified and the incrementality has been described.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin):Yes the PIF includes description of the relevant stakeholder groups.	
	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)	16th of August 2013 (cseverin):Yes a risk matrix including potential mitigation measurs have been included.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project include thorough description of the foreseen coordination with a number of key initiatives in the region, with whom coordination will be essential for successful implementation and sustainable outcomes and outputs. The PIF is in detail describing the coordination between UNEP, WB and UNDP activities in the region. Coordination between these three institutions and ongoing/planned	

		<p>achieving long term sustainable results in the region.</p> <p>Further, please do ensure coordination between the WB/GEF Electronic Highway project, in order to ensure proper linking to relevant project outcomes. Hence making sure that no overlap in efforts will be taking place.</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): This project is primarily focused on solidifying and delivering on the national and regional policy frameworks that has been established during the TDA/SAP project. A number of innovative approaches, to the region, will be used in order to accelerate the successful implementation.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>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?</p>		
	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B</p>	<p>19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the indicated GEF financing and associated</p>	

Project Financing	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	adequate. Please do make sure that there is consistency between the amount stated in Table A, B and D. 29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed	
	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?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Composition is fine. However, please do make sure that the cofinancing sources are not mixed. So please do split out in-kind and cash cofinancing. Further, please make sure that there is consistency between amounts listed in Table A, B and C. 29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the listed PM budget is following the GEF guidance.	
	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?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes PPG has been requested is within the norm and is understood to be essential for proper planning of the ProDoc, especially considering the multiple countries involved in this project.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin):NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results		

Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): No, please do address above comments and resubmit. 29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes PIF clearance is being recommended	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	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.**