



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

GEF ID:	4343		
Country/Region:	Regional (China)		
Project Title:	EAS: Implementation of the Yellow Sea LME Strategic Action Programme for Adaptive Ecosystem-Based Management		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4552 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$7,562,430
Co-financing:	\$225,481,766	Total Project Cost:	\$233,044,196
PIF Approval:	February 14, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Erez Padilla

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, both countries China and DRPK are eligible under Instrument. March 16, 2011 (IZavadsky): In the revised PIF the only eligible country is China. Republic of Korea is cooperating country and will not receive any GEF grant. 8th of February 2013 (cseverin): PMIS altered so that the project now only features the one country that will receive funds, namely China.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) No change in status.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	The DRPK GEF OFP endorsed the project on Aug 6, 2010. The agency is	

*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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>asked to submit also the China GEF OFP endorsement letter, which is missing.</p> <p>March 16, 2011 (IZavadsky): The DRPK has withdrawn from the project, the the China GEF OFP endorsed the project on March 04,2011.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	<p>The agency justified its comparative advantage by UNDP's experience with a broad range of international transboundary water interventions, based on high-level adoption of 11 SAPS, seven of which are currently being implemented and several of which directly address sustainable fisheries management (W/C Pacific, Caspian Sea, Benguela Current LME, Guinea Current LME). UNDP is also presently supporting preparation of several SAPs for which management of shared fisheries has been identified as a priority transboundary issue (Caribbean Sea LME, Humboldt Current LME, Timor-Arafura Sea, Sulu-Celebes Sea LME, Agulhas/Somalia Current LMEs). In addition to support for the establishment of the world's first post UN Fish Stocks conservation and management organization for highly migratory fish stocks, the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), UNDP has strengthened or established 13 multi-country marine/coastal, river and lake basin management agencies or commissions including the Benguela Current and Guinea Current LME Commission in 2006. The baseline</p>	<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) UNDP has the comparative advantage to implement this project due to its extensive experience with transboundary initiatives and work in fisheries as noted above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project, namely in China, provides the agency with necessary framework to foster national reforms and budgeted plans to implement the elements of the project, proposed to be co-financed by the national government. However, the commitment of the Agency to these IW issues is not clear since the UNDP Strategic Plan, 2008-2011, does not address international waters, transboundary cooperation and LMEs management.</p> <p>March 16, 2011 (IZavadsky): The agency, in the revised PIF, provided additional information and clarification towards its commitment towards international waters, transboundary cooperation and LMEs management. The agency made specific reference to Goal 4 of the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan approved by the UNDP Executive Board and commitments therein towards achievement the MDG and other international goals through cooperation with regional and national partners. This document states the agency's support to countries in water governance and resource management, biodiversity and ecosystem services for development, which are in the center of the project intervention. The comparative advantage of the agency also lies in its holistic cross-sectoral approach to human development. Furthermore, the agency avoidance to single sector (e.g fisheries or agriculture) focus in its key policy document is actually considered</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		as a positive characteristic of this document towards inclusive, multi-stakeholder, cross-sectoral, ecosystem-based approach to sustainable managing marine ecosystems. The earlier comment was addressed in a satisfactory manner.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N.A.	N.A. (LKarrer)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, this regional project will establish an YSLME SAP Implementation Facility, which would broadly utilise the experiences and good implementation practices from the previous GEF funded TDA/SAP project, which brought forward the high level of countries commitment and co-financing to this SAP implementation project. In addition the agency regional GEF coordinating office and country offices would bring added value to the capacity of the YSLME SAP Implementation Facility to deliver the project results.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) The project fits within the UNDP program and staff capacity in China as explained above.
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.	N.A.
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) The funds are consistent with the amount allocated in the PFD for GEF ID 4936.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N.A.	N.A.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N.A.	N.A.
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		N.A.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	N.A.	N.A.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>Yes, the project fully corresponds with the GEF 5 IW Objective 2 and would directly contribute to Obj. 2 outcomes and outputs, as stated in the GEF 5 IW results framework. The project focuses on the implementation of the YSLME SAP, endorsed by the YS countries, and which is anchored on ecosystem-based approaches to the management of the YSLME. The proposed creation of the YSLME Commission will address the need for multi-lateral institutions and programmes of action to enhance fish stocks, encourage the implementation of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, engage the fishing and mariculture industries in sustainable management solutions. Innovative measures to reduce nutrient loads will be undertaken, the project will utilize ecosystem-based approaches and adaptive management schemes to manage transboundary water problems. The potential impacts of, and adaptation to climate change will be embedded in the management actions directed towards ecosystem carrying capacity as the central theme of the project. The project will also deliver additional outcomes such as enhanced public awareness, strengthened stakeholder capacity to carry out actions, and institutional sustainability that ensures the SAP and the Commission will be self-sufficient in the long-term.</p>	<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) The project fully corresponds with the GEF 5 IW Objective 2 (Catalyze multi-state cooperation). Outcome 2.1 (Implementation of SAP) is a priority for this project, which builds on the development and approval of the SAP during the first GEF funded YSLME project. The project is based on an ecosystem and adaptive management approach with LME and ICM frameworks (Outcome 2.2), stresses innovative solutions to reduce stresses (Outcome 2.3) and incorporate climate variability (Outcome 2.4). The establishment of the YSLME will be particularly critical to the long-term sustainability of this regional collaboration.</p> <p>Dec 16 (LKarrer): Comments addressed.</p> <p>Nov 14 (LKarrer): An important component of IW is the IW Learn program, which ensures knowledge sharing across projects. Consequently, integration with IW Learn is an important aspect of the knowledge sharing of this work as noted in the PIF (section II.B.6, p15). Please revise to incorporate IWLearn into plans and include required 1% of the budget toward IWLearn.</p> <p>Dec 16 (LKarrer): UNDP noted they</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Involvement of all coastal countries in the YS, will contribute to regional environment management, as well as regional peace and stability.	addressed these points and noted the new text; however, these changes are not in the document. Please edit to include the text. Jan 21 (LKarrer): Points addressed and incorporated into document.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, the project is fully aligned with the GEF 5 IW Objective 2 "Catalyze multi-state cooperation to rebuild marine fisheries and reduce pollution of coasts and Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) while considering climatic variability and change" as noted in #7 above.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) The project is aligned with the GEF 5 IW Objective 2 as explained in #7 above.
	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?	Yes, the SAP approval by the countries and development of National SAPs demonstrates their commitment to improve the management of the YS ecosystem. Targets listed in the SAP are and will be included in the nationally-approved plans that apply to the entire country (e.g. a 30% reduction in fishing boats over the next 20 years). The Chinese National SAP is expected to be included in the next 5 year national development plan and the ROK National SAP will be implemented within the national framework.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Yes, the nations' approvals of the SAP and development of national SAPs demonstrates their commitment. Furthermore, the NSAPs are consistent with National Biodiversity Strategic Action Programs of both China and ROK.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, the establishment of the YSLME Commission will improve the governance of the YSLME and will support the technical management actions enhancing the environmental status of the Yellow Sea. The countries will continue to operate the Inter-Ministry Co-ordinating Committees in order to better harmonise policies and	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) At the regional level, the YSMLE Commission is highlighted as important to long-term sustainability of the project. The Commission will be non-legally binding due to the complex geopolitical situation in the Yellow Sea. However, an MOU may be sought to demonstrate political will among participating governments.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>communication between the various government agencies for effective SAP implementation. The YSLME SAP Implementation Facility will co-ordinate the interactions and linkages among scientific research, ecosystem-based management, legislation and policy-making in all participating countries to ensure that the YS continues to provide ecosystem services to the countries and the region.</p>	<p>The importance of sustainable financing for the YSMLE Commission is noted as part of Output 1.5.2, which will be critical to long term sustainability. This need is recognized as a priority to address during this project. This sustainability concern was also raised by the STAP in their PIF comments.</p> <p>The national Inter-Ministry Coordinating Committees (IMCC) are also important for national-level actions and will be supported as part of Output 1.2.1. However, it is unclear the level of authority these committees will have. In particular to what extent will the IMCCs have decision-making authority regarding establishing regulations, enforcement of management strategies, and data collection / analysis / access? Relatedly, what is the plan for the IMCCs after this project funding ends to ensure continuity?</p> <p>Dec 16 (LKarrer): Addressed sufficiently. Thank you.</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>Yes, particularly in China, the baseline UNDP WRM project, which supports the UNDAF for China (2011-20015), will strengthen policy and implementation mechanisms to manage natural resources, and will enhance China's response to regional issues. In addition, in all three participating countries (RoK as cooperating one not receiving GEF funds) the baseline activities address the key activities,</p>	<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Yes, the UNDP WRM project and UNDP Ocean Governance will play strategic roles as will the participating countries to address the key activities, stresses and processes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>processes and stress reduction measures ant national scale laying fundamentals for YSLME SAP implementation anf for meeting regionally adopted targets to reduce 10% fishing efforts and to reduce 10% nutrient pollution from the YS coastal countries every 5 years. March 16, 2011 (IZavadsky): The revised PIF added the agency contribution to the baseline project via UNDP's Ocean Governance Programme.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Yes, cost-effectiveness has been demonstrated.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Yes, since the Yellow Sea represents a marine environmental resource under at least 3 national jurisdictions GEF involvement is critical in overcoming the geopolitical complexities and potential conflict among resource users in the Yellow Sea, through the YSLME SAP Implementation Facility, that is the only body capable of coordinating the implementation of the SAP. The full participation of DPRK in this project ensures the engagement of all the Yellow Sea coastal states in the management of their shared transboundary issues and problems and these costs are therefore considered to be almost entirely incremental. Benefits will result from the inclusion of a new partner will accrue in terms of expanded</p>	<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Yes, as explained in detail above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>regional and international marine conservation and management efforts in the Yellow Sea. GEF assistance in the institutional, policy and management reforms will move the process from the business-as-usual approach to integrated management across sectors and national boundaries. The adoption of internally-accepted procedures and practice in inter-governmental negotiations is a major contribution of the GEF in building regional cooperation particularly among the three countries. GEF funding will be catalytic in generating the substantial co-financing from the riparian countries as in the case of the vessel-buy-back actions in China and ROK which require regional cooperation and would not proceed from unilateral action. Managing to improve ecosystem carrying capacity will be a novel process for the region to engage in, and there is an urgent need to move the region's perception of marine environmental management in this direction. The use of GEF resources together with national financial commitments will also support the sharing of experiences and lessons-learned on national and regional scales, ultimately aimed at increasing the replication potential of the project impacts.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, the project interventions are organised around four logical components with clearly defined expected outcomes and outputs	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) No, there are concerns with regard to the targets in the Results Framework. The targets for the project outcomes (noted in Annex A:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>accompanied by measurable targets of improving policy frameworks, reducing key stresses to the YSLME ecosystem and to put regional cooperation and management of the LME resources on sound, evidence based sustainable management platform, including regional inter-governmental institution.</p>	<p>Results Framework) need to be more quantifiable. Some of the outcomes have quantifiable targets and others are vague (e.g. Outcome 2.2 "Measurable improvement in standing stock and CPUE" - what is 'measurable'? Please provide a numerical target).</p> <p>There also needs to be consistency. Within B. Project Framework it notes as Outcome 2.1.1 Reduction of fishing by around 10%, but the Project Results Framework notes 15% reduction. In the ProDoc (p11, para 30) notes the need for "decreased eutrophication through reduction in nutrient discharges by 10% every 5 years"; yet, the Results Framework Component 3 notes only a 5% reduction. Please edit for consistency.</p> <p>Dec 17 (LKarrer): Thank you for adding targets and ensuring consistency; however, these are quite low at 5%. The reduction in fishing boats by 5% is much lower than the noted 2020 target of 30%. Please consider increasing these.</p> <p>Jan 21 (LKarrer): Targets raised to 10% with explanation. Thank you.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, according to the TDA's findings and SAP's targets and measures adopted thereof, the global environmental benefits, expected to be achieved by the project are justified by sound science behind them.</p>	<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Yes, the plans are based on the TDA findings, which are reflected in the Results Framework, including the specific targets (e.g. 15% fishing boat fleet reduction in line with 30% target by 2020).</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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>	<p>Yes, Socioeconomic benefits for the target communities in the three riparian countries will be realized through improvement of the incomes of fishermen in the medium to the long-term as overfishing is effectively addressed through the vessel buy-back schemes. Alternative livelihoods will be provided primarily to displaced fishermen to soften the impacts of the buy-back scheme. The integrated multi-trophic aquaculture (IMTA) will improve production and incomes. Substantive economic valuation activities are planned to assess the economic benefits of the management actions identified in the YSLME SAP. Gender will be mainstreamed in this project through the active engagement of women to optimize the impacts of the interventions, e.g. in component 2 the contribution of women in household income will guide the provision of alternative livelihoods and the development and implementation of IMTA. Also the role of women will be harnessed in formulating procedures to control and remove marine litter at demonstration sites, in recognition of the role of women in managing household waste that could find its way in coastal waters. The project will seek and engage women experts in constituting the local, national and regional scientific committees and in the project management team.</p>	<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) "Sustainable development" is noted as a priority for this project, particularly compared to the previously funded stage. In the Additional Info Not Addressed at PIF Stage section on Socioeconomic Benefits highlights the relevance of the marine and coastal ecosystems to socioeconomics. However, in considering the results framework there are no indicators or measures to assess if socioeconomic conditions improve. Easy measures would be contribution to GDP, number of marine related businesses and number of jobs and incomes. More complicated, but very important to measure, indicators relate to the ecosystem services provided by the marine resources - e.g. local seafood availability, shoreline storm protection, recreation/tourism opportunities.</p> <p>An important mechanism for helping to ensure socioeconomics is incorporated into the project is to include social scientists, including economists, anthropologists and governance experts, on the Marine Science and Technical Panel.</p> <p>This concern regarding the lack of integration of socioeconomic analysis into the project was also noted by the STAP in their comments on the PIF.</p> <p>Dec 17 (LKarrer): Sufficiently addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Yes, socioeconomic benefits for the target communities in the three riparian countries will be realized through improvement of the incomes of fishermen in the medium to the long-term as overfishing is effectively addressed through the vessel buy-back schemes. Alternative livelihoods will be provided primarily to displaced fishermen to soften the impacts of the buy-back scheme. The integrated multi-trophic aquaculture (IMTA) will improve production and incomes. Substantive economic valuation activities are planned to assess the economic benefits of the management actions identified in the YSLME SAP. Gender will be mainstreamed in this project through the active engagement of women to optimize the impacts of the interventions, e.g. in component 2 the contribution of women in household income will guide the provision of alternative livelihoods and the development and implementation of IMTA. In component 3, the role of women will be harnessed in formulating procedures to control and remove marine litter at demonstration sites, in recognition of the role of women in managing household waste that could find its way in coastal waters. The project will seek and engage women experts in constituting the local, national and regional scientific committees and in the project management team</p>	<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Several stakeholder groups are noted in the Stakeholder Analysis (Section 1.4.1, p13) as important benefactors from coastal ecosystems, including tourist businesses, mariculture operations and fisheries operations engaged in the past projects. The discussion in the Stakeholder Analysis also notes a few local private sector organizations (e.g. Rongcheng Fisheries Association, mariculture companies, academic communities) and NGO organizations (e.g. Birds Korea, Shihwa Lake Saver, Global Village of Beijing) that were engaged in the first YSLME project. However, there is very little explanation of how these or other groups will be engaged in this second project. Instead paragraph 44 notes "Securing the participation of ... stakeholders ... while necessary will be an enormous task." There is no further explanation of how these important groups will be engaged. More information needs to be provided regarding stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Dec 17 (LKarrer): Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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, the potential risks were identified, including CC and mitigation measures were proposed.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Please clarify the 2.5 table, which notes a rating for Probability and for Impact. Explain what rankings mean in the heading e.g. P=1, I=4 means low probability but high risk if it does occur? Dec 17 (LKarrer): Addressed.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project design envisaged coordination and collaboration with all key regional initiatives, programmes or inter-governmental procedures in order to ensure synergy with other GEF and non-GEF interventions in the region, including NGOs.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Several regional organizations are noted, including PEMSEA, the Regional Sea Programme, and IMO, but information on how they will work together is missing. The MOU with PEMSEA from the first phase is noted, but there is no further mention of a relationship for this second phase. Plans for coordinating with these initiatives need to be explained. Dec 17 (LKarrer): Addressed. However, we have a new request. We would like to ask that you consider approaching the UNDP Small Grants Programme about providing additional funding for the planned on-the-ground ground activities. If you are amenable to this talking with them, then please add a sentence or two that you plan to do so. Apologies this point was not raised earlier, but the idea came out of the recent IWC7 discussions. Jan 21 (LKarrer): Addressed and they are already discussing with UNDP SGP.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, the project would strongly benefit from the implementation/execution	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) UNOPS is the executing agency; however, the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>arrangements developed and successfully deployed in the previous GEF intervention on TDA/SAP formulation. The proposed YSLME SAP Implementation Facility would not only benefit from that good practice but is also foreseen as a model for other SAP implementation arrangements in other East Asia Seas LMEs.</p>	<p>reasoning behind UNOPS holding this role is not provided. Presumably UNOPS was selected because the YSLME Commission has not yet been established. The phase-out plan for UNOPS to turn over responsibility to another institution, such as the YSLME Commission, also needs to be explained.</p> <p>Dec 17 (LKarrer): The response addressed the role of UNOPS, but did not address the last comment. Please clarify the phase-out plan for UNOPS to turn over responsibility to another institution. If the plan is TBD, at least note that determining a replacement institution to take on regional efforts will be figured out.</p> <p>Jan 21(LKarrer): Addressed - the YSLME Commission will take over responsibility.</p>
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Yes, the information in the ProDoc provided useful insight and clarification.</p>
	<p>22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) No, there is no non grant element.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the project management costs are appropriate to the size and type of project intervention, the ratio of co-financing with GEF funded project management cost is 5:1.</p>	<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Yes. The PM budget is less 5.3% of the grant amount.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Yes. However, a small detail that will cause the project to be rejected by the system - please edit the request amount, which is noted on the first page of the Request for CEO Endorsement as \$7,184,431 to be consistent with the PIF – it is off by \$1. The correct amount (in the PIF, 1st page) is \$7,184,430. Please ensure all numbers match up or it will be rejected by the system. Dec 17 (LKarrer): Addressed.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	April 6, 2011(AD): The co-financing seems unbalanced. We understand new information exists on co-financing from China. The PIF should be revised with an annex to clearly outline (1) the Co-financing from both countries and UNDP and (2) what is intended to be funded that will improve the situation of the YSLME. Without this, the project is not recommended for work program inclusion. May 25, 2011 (IZ): The co-financing still needs more clarification and dialogue between the GEF SEC and the agency to distinct the co-financing from parallel financing in line with the GEF policy on co-financing (GEF/C.20/6/Rev.1). 8th of February 2013 (cseverin): Co-financing issues has been clarified.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) All co-financing letters match to the co-financing listed in the Request for CEO Enforsement.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in	Yes, although the co-financing bringing to the project by the Agency makes	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	line with its role?	only part of the baseline project cost, the impact of project activities at national scale and in other basins that are draining to Yellow Sea would foster the necessary national reforms and actions to reduce pollution release and overall improved water resources management. March 16, 2011 (IZavadsky): The revised PIF added the agency contribution to the baseline project via UNDP's Ocean Governance Programme.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) The tracking tool is great except section #15 is incomplete. This piece is important as it relates to the targets in the Project Results Framework in the main body of text in the Project Document. Please noted appropriate measurements in the tracking tool keeping in mind the targets you have noted in the Framework (e.g. reduced fishing pressure, protected areas, etc).
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) A sufficient M&E budget is provided; however, more quantifiable indicators and targets needs to be provided as noted above. Dec 17 (LKarrer): See comment above in #14 regarding increasing targets. Jan 21 (LKarrer): Addressed.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	N.A.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) The STAP provided the following comments to the PIF, which are relevant to this CEO

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Endorsement:</p> <p>1) The importance of ecosystem services needs to be better explained. - As noted in #31 below, the document does not discuss the relevant ecosystem services provided by the resources nor the ties to human wellbeing. Suggestions on points are noted below.</p> <p>2) The project needs to integrate socioeconomic analyses and guidance into the project plans. - As noted, plans for considering socioeconomic cost and benefit trade-offs of management decisions need to be incorporated into the project plans.</p> <p>3) YSLME considers a partnership through an MOU with PEMSEA for Phase 2 - An MOU between YSLME and PEMSEA is noted in the Stakeholder Analysis (1.4.1 section of Project Document) as existing in Phase 1, but is not mentioned for Phase 2.</p> <p>4) Address sustainability of the YSLME Commission and generate greater collaboration with DPRK. - More information needs to be provided on these components.</p> <p>Dec 17 (LKarrer): Addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	N.A.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	N.A.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>No. The PM would recommend to CEO the clearance of the PIF if the agency would submit the missing LoE from China GEF OFP and if the Agency would provide documentation in key UNDP policy/planning documents for mainstreaming of international waters agenda into its regular programmes.</p> <p>April 06, 2011 (AD): The project is not recommended for work program inclusion. Co-financing seems unbalanced. We understand new information exists on co-financing from China. The PIF should be revised with an annex to clearly outline (1) the Co-financing from both countries and UNDP and (2) what is intended to be funded that will improves the situation of the YSLME.</p> <p>May 25, 2011 (IZ): The PIF is not yet recommended for Work Programme inclusion. The co-financing still needs more clarification and dialogue between the GEF SEC and the agency to distinct the co-financing from parallel financing in line with the GEF policy on co-financing (GEF/C.20/6/Rev.1).</p> <p>8th of February 2013 (cseverin): The PIF is recommended for Work Programme inclusion, under the parent programme (Reducing Pollution and Rebuilding Degraded Marine Resources in the East Asian Seas through</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Implementation of Intergovernmental Agreements and Catalyzed Investments) that has already been approved by Council back in November 2012.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) The comments on the PIF asked to describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project. In the CEO Endorsement response, instead of describing the contributions expected by the project, a description of how people use the coastal/marine resources was provided. The closest relevant text is a brief mention at the second to last paragraph that the YSLME ha targets of reducing fishing, nutrient discharge and sustainable mariculture, which "will defintely assist in the...provision of health food and living environment to the lare population..." That is a huge leap of faith that has no sound basis. In fact often if there are restrictions placed on fishing (for long-term sustainability) there are short-term, adverse effects that need to be understood and addressed. The lack of mention or understanding of this issue is disconcerting. There need to be clear expectations as to socioeconomic costs and benefits and those need to be monitored as noted above. The sustainability of this project depends on showing socioeconomic net benefits to policy-makers and the public.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>Nov 14, 2013 (LKarrer) No. GEF IW does not recommend CEO endorsement until we receive a resubmitted project document package that addresses our above concerns.</p> <p>Dec 17 2013 (LKarrer) No. A few final requests noted above need to be addressed (#7 text on IW Learn, #14 target levels, #20 future regional leadership).</p> <p>Jan 21 (LKarrer): Yes. All issues have been addressed.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*		November 14, 2013
	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.