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

GEF ID:	**4658**		
Country/Region:	**Russian Federation**		
Project Title:	**Integrated adaptive management of the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem in a Changing Climate**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**4485 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**International Waters**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**IW-3; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$3,211,000**
Co-financing:	**$9,800,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$13,011,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ivan Zavadsky**	Agency Contact Person:	**Vladimir Mamaev**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Russian Federation is eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the OFP has endorsed this project on 09/02/2011	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, this project is in line with UNDP's ongoing Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) program and their experience and proven record on implementing TDA/SAP projects.	
	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?	Yes.	

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

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N.A.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, a total of $3,211,000 is being requested from GEF IW	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N.A.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N.A.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N.A.	
	• focal area set-aside?	N.A.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. The project is aligned with appropriate GEF 5 IW Objective 3 outputs and outcomes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes.	
	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?	Addressed.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. The results of the developed TDA of the adopted SAP will provide better framework for joint mangement of the shared water body and living marine resources. This will assist both countries to sustain the project outcomes on sustainable basis.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on	Yes. the activities of key project partners in the region provided basic understanding of the scope of problems to be addressed in the WBS LME. The	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sound data and assumptions?	baseline project activities and outputs will underpin the GEF project intervention in order vto achieve scientifically sond set of data and information needed for development of the TDA and SAP.	
	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?	Yes, the GEF increment will allow Russian Federation to to participate in international agreements and organisations, the WBS LME and its associated stakeholders are not benefitting from the concerted approach, know-how and technical and institutional capacity that is vital to an effective integrated, adaptive and ecosystem-based management mechanism. Without the proposed GEF project the existing pressures on the LME are likely to continue or exacerbate.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes. The proposed outcomes and outputs provide sound framework for achieving the project objective. In addition to use of GEFglobally demonstrated TDA/SAP approach to establish the basic pronciple of ecosystem-based management of particular LME, the focus on tools and mesures like inter-ministry coordinating mechanism, governance reforms, new policies and regulations would promote	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		better management of LME.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, since the overall situation in terms of resource management is fragmented, lacking coordination and transparency at national and transboundary levels. In combination with anticipated climate change and the lack of a bilateral cooperative framework the ongoing pressures are likely to lead to reduced ecosystem productivity and resilience with detrimental consequences for the indigenous and coastal communities of the region, including reduced food security and regional stability, as well as increased poverty levels.	
	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?	Yes. The proposed project will create socio-economic benefits at national and local levels through building the institutional capacity to stem the loss in ecosystem goods and services. The project will promote the mainstreaming of gender into WBS LME and ICM governance at national, regional and local levels. The project will analyse the specific needs of both women and men in the proposed project initiatives and incorporate targeted interventions to enable women and men to participate in and benefit equally from the project outcomes and outputs.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Not fully. Although the component 3 on targeted demonstration projects mentions indigenou population socioeconomic development, the information on including CSO is missing. Please clarify.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Sep23, 2011 (IZavadsky): Additional information provided.	
	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)	Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Information is missing. Please clarify.	
	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.
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Funding for PM represents 5.2% of grant and ist matching cofinancing has a ratio of 1:5 ($160,000 to $800,000). However, the agency iskaed to bring the PM cost below 5% of the GEF grant. Sep 23,2011 (IZavadsky): PM costs now below 5%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	yes. Co-financing per project component varies from 1:1.6 (Component 4:Learning and KM) to 1:3.9. The overall project co-financing is 1:3.1, which is sufficient for this type of foundational activity.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The overall project co-financing is 1:3.1, which is sufficient for this type of foundational activity.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	The co-financing by UNDP is $300,000 in cash and in kind.	
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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	Not yet. Please note that PIF submitted is an outdated template. The most current template (Jan 2011) can be found on the GEF website. Please complete and address issues above prior to resubmitting. Sep 23,2011 (IZavadsky): The revised submission was done in proper format and outstanding issues were corrected and/or clarified. The PM recommends the clearance of this project into next WP.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		This project was developed within the GEF-RF Partnership on Sustainable Environmental Management in the Arctic under a Rapidly Changing Climate (Arctic Agenda 2020) PA and its outcomes are integral part of the outcomes of that PA. The project addresses several key environmental challenges of the Western Bering Sea, also identified amongst priority environmental issues by the SAP-Arctic, which developed with GEF support. Project addresses three key transboundary environmental concerns: decline in commercial fish stock and unsustainable harvesting technique of living marine resources, (ii) degradation of quality of marine and coastal environment and (iii) pressures exacerbated by sea ice reduction (e.g. increased navigation, oil and gas exploration, tourism, etc.) The project will, through development of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and adoption of Strategic Action Programme for West Bering Sea provide tools for sustainable management of this water body and its marine living resources, reduce risk of accidental pollution through piloting marine electronic highway and bring cooperative management of shared resources and coastal zone, including indigenous people. It is fully in line with the GEF 5 IW Strategy objectives. This is the first project of its kind

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			addressing an Arctic LME from transboundary cooperation perspective and could trigger similar process on the eastern side of the Arctic Ocean in the Barents Sea.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 21, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	
	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.