

## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS

**Country/Region:** India  
**Project Title:** India: IND-BD Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the Malvan Coast, Maharashtra State  
**GEFSEC Project ID:** 3941  
**GEF Agency Project ID:** 4242 (UNDP) **GEF Agency:** UNDP  
**GEF Focal Area (s):** Biodiversity  
**GEF-4 Strategic Program (s):**  
**Anticipated Project Financing (\$):** PPG:\$0 **GEF Project Allocation:** \$3,438,294 **Co-financing:** \$12,000,000 **Total Project Cost:** \$15,438,294  
**PIF Approval Date:** July 13, 2009 **Anticipated Work Program Inclusion:** November 12, 2009  
**Program Manager:** Ivan Zavadsky **GEF Agency Contact Person:** Doley Tshering

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	India has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD funding.	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	An endorsement letter dated 19 March 2009 is attached that indicates allocation of BD RAF of 3.85 million.	
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	The project conform well with GEF BD SP4 on strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity.	GEF 4 BD SO-2, SP-4
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	UNDP's comparative advantage is recognized. UNDP is the lead agency for the overall programmatic approach on India GEF Coastal and Marine Program which is the parent program of this PIF.	
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RAF allocation?</li> </ul>	The remaining BD RAF allocation to India, after council approval of ABS and Godavari	

		Marine and Coastal PIFs would be 4.353 million. The grant amount requested for this PIF is 3.85 million and it is within the allocation.	
	• The focal areas?	Refer above.	
	• Strategic objectives?	n/a	
	• Strategic program?	This PIF is one of the two sub-projects of the programmatic approach on India GEF Coastal and Marine Program.	
Project Design	6. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	<p>The project will have GEB in more than 18000 ha of coastal landscape and seascape area in Malvan by mainstreaming biodiversity in key sector development plans and policies, including fisheries sector policies. The area also includes the Malvan marine Sanctuary which is recognized with its global significant biodiversity resources. While replicating the initiatives in other areas in western India, there could be larger impact on the GEB.</p> <p>Further details, including measurable indicators for GEB needs to be developed by CEO endorsement.</p>	
	7. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		<p>May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky):  Yes, The development and implementation of the Landscape-level Strategic Plan and biodiversity-friendly Fisheries and Sustainable Tourism Plans will focus on reducing these pressures over an approximate area of 6,327 sq km of landscape/seascape. This, in turn, will improve the conservation prospects of several globally significant flora and fauna species notably, Olive Ridley Turtle and Indo-Pacific Hunchback Dolphin, and population size of birds (including migratory species), as well as the coral reefs in the area. The project results framework/log frame matrix comprises measurable indicators with quantified</p>

	<p>8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent &amp; sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?</p>	<p>The project is consistent with the overall program design. Although understanding that the overall program coordination costs would be covered by the another PIF on Godavari River Basin/Marine Coastal project, it is unclear how this project will ensure linkage to the overall program. In order to ensure wider impact of this project in Western India as well as at the national level, it would be important to incorporate appropriate products, activities and mechanisms within the project framework. Please provide additional information and include appropriate outcomes within the PIF project framework.</p> <p>In addition, the approx 0.45 million allocated from the Godavari project may not be sufficient to ensure development of effective tools and capacities to ensure biodiversity mainstreaming in coastal and marine initiatives beyond the two sites, and it may be necessary to consider allocating funding also from this PIF, if appropriate.</p> <p>Similar set of comments made for the Godavari project applies to this PIF as well:  1) The project covers major barriers for coastal and marine conservation in the region, however, it is rather ambitious by covering multiple issues. Although it is important to remain a holistic approach, further focus and targetted approach may be explored to ensure concrete project impact.</p> <p>2) The project framework should be further developed with measurable indicators and targets at the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>3) Component 1 Sectoral Mainstreaming:</p>	<p>baseline and target values.</p> <p>May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky):  In principle yes, however some target values for outcomes 2 and 3 in the project results framework in Annex 1 seem not to be substantiated. In particular, what's the reasoning for targeting at 50% of trawlers follow the mesh size norms? Or an increase of amount of resources to local communities annulay from community based ecoturism activities from \$2.5 to \$5.0 mill? Would not be more appropriate to say that "the target to be defined after desighn of the micro-plans", as in other indicators in the outcome 3?</p> <p>June 09, 2011 (IZavadsky):  Sufficient explanation was provided by the agency and the project results framework was amended accordingly.</p>
--	---	---	--

		<p>- As the project support the development of the sustainable development plan for the area, it would be important to ensure that the multisectoral platform develops the capacity and concrete action plan to implement the developed plan, and adequate activities to ensure such implementation, both institutional and financial capacity, needs to be incorporated in the project design.</p> <p>4) Component 2 Institutional Capacity development:</p> <p>- Capacity building initiatives maybe required for both state/site based and at the national level to incorporate biodiversity conservation in the national program.</p> <p>- A focused and cost effective training and capacity building initiatives need to be identified more clearly before CEO endorsement.</p> <p>5) Component 3 Community based initiatives:</p> <p>- This component needs to be further defined with active participation of the communities in project design. Lessons could also be learnt from SGPs and IW demonstration projects.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?</p>	<p>The project linkage with key environment and biodiversity strategies and plans in the country is recognized.</p>	<p>May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Yes.</p>
	<p>10. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Major initiatives have been listed. It is important that concrete coordination mechanisms are identified with these initiatives, particularly with the WB's project on ICZM. Lessons learned from these and other ongoing initiatives related to coastal and marine biodiversity management need to be compiled and used to develop further project</p>	<p>May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Yes.</p>

		design - by the time of CEO endorsement.  Further information is required at this stage on how this project will internally develop coordination mechanism with the overall program, including Godavari projects and other ongoing coastal and marine conservation projects, for wider impact and results.	
	11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	Cost effectiveness of working on mainstreaming rather than on protected areas etc are well articulated.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Yes, a qualitative approach to identify the most cost-effective strategy for achieving the project objective was adopted through the project design. According to this analysis the scenario based on laying down the foundation and on demonstration of possibilities for integrating biodiversity conservation into land use planning and decision making in production sectors in the coastal and marine environment was proposed. This was considered as the most cost-effective use of GEF resources in the marine sanctuary. Cross-sectoral approach, as proposed, will open a dialogue on historically competing interests, allowing to conserve the biodiversity values of the area.
	13. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Yes.
	14. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	Key risks are identified and their mitigation measures. During further development of the project design, these elements need to be further examined and integrated into the project design.	May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): In principle yes but the a question arises why no risk is associated with implementing the 1983 regulation on mesh size, which zero level implementation is indicated in the results framework. Otherwise other risks and mitigation strategies are clearly articulated.  June 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Sufficient explanation was provided and the

			risk table, as well as the text of the endorsement request on the mesh size regulation was amended accordingly.
Justification for GEF Grant	15. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?	The value added of the GEF involvement is recognized	May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Yes, the baseline scenario, including monetary estimations of investments under this scenario in sectoral planning, capacity development for implementation of sectoral plans and unsustainable community livelihoods and natural resources use, is described. Furthermore, the Incremental Cost Matrix comprises details on baseline expenditures, incremental costs (GEF ones and shared by co-financiers) for each project outcome.
	16. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?		
	17. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Without GEF investment the trajectory of production activities in the land/seascape surrounding the Malvan Marine Sanctuary and associated degradation trends will continue as there would remain persistent barriers to addressing the direct and indirect drivers of degradation. The existing planning and policy framework, as well as institutional arrangement in the SCME would remain inadequate for addressing biodiversity conservation issues from a landscape/ seascape perspective. In terms of making community resource use and livelihoods more sustainable, a lack of robust community-based resource governance systems and alternatives would continue. The Government of Maharashtra interventions and investment would not fully integrate biodiversity conservation considerations. Furthermore, these would not be coordinated at the landscape level to

			provide a cross-sectoral strategic vision for balancing conservation and production sector objectives that would then integrate sectoral support services to the stakeholders under the same vision.
	18. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	The project management cost is identified as about 10% of the overall project cost and considered adequate.	May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Yes, it makes 6.2 % of GEF grant.
	19. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): No, the rate for international consultant of \$3,500/week is not justified. GEF normally approves there rates below \$3,500/week. In addition, the table F does not distinct consultants inputs between international and national ones, please provide information according the template for this table.  June 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): The questioned rates and figures in the Table F were corrected, the national and international consultants rates are now within GEF acceptable range.
	20. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	The cofinancing ratio of the project is about 1 to 3 and considered adequate,	
	21. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Yes, but in Annex E totals for outcomes 1 and 2 are different from the values in Table A: project framework - \$346,199 v. \$386,200 and \$1,575,500 v \$1,535,500. Please provide explanation or correct. June 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): The Annex E was corrected according to the comments above.
	22. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators?		May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Yes.
	23. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Yes.

Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP	pls provide adequate response once comments are provided.	May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): All STAP comments were addressed satisfactorily and the project design reflects STAP recommendations/requests.
	Convention Secretariat	pls provide adequate response once comments are provided.	N.A.
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): The agency responde satisfactorily to the comments of the Council member of Germany.
<b>Secretariat Decisions</b>			
Recommendation at PIF	<b>24. Is PIF clearance being recommended?</b>	No, pls further clarify the project linkage with the overall program, and identify clear products, tools, and coordination mechanism within the PIF to ensure wider replication and uptake at the western india as well as at the national levels. Upon receipt of a revised PIF, the PM will recommend the PIF for next work program inclusion.  15 June 2009 A revised PIF has been received with adequate additional information on the coordination with the overall program. The PM will technically clear the PIF and recommend for next work program inclusion.	
	25. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	<b>26. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?</b>		May 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): Not yet, the agency is asked to respond to comments/questions and request for corrections as stated in items 9, 15, 20 and 22. June 09, 2011 (IZavadsky): The agency responded to all above



			comments satisfactorily and revised the endorsement request accordingly. The CEO endorsement of this project is now being recommended.
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review		May 09, 2011
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review		
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review		

### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	
Recommendation	<b>5. Is PPG being recommended?</b>	
Other comments		
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review	
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review	
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review	

wb21049  
C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf  
8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM