



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT*

GEF Program ID:	4936		
Country/Region:	Regional (China, Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Timor Leste, Vietnam)		
Program Title:	Reducing Pollution and Rebuilding Degraded Marine Resources in the East Asian Seas through Implementation of Intergovernmental Agreements and Catalyzed Investments (PROGRAM)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5007 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; IW-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$20,000,000
Co-financing:	\$343,905,766	Total Project Cost:	\$363,905,766
PFD Approval:	October 03, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2012
		Expected Program Start Dt:	
Program Manager:	Ivan Zavadsky	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the countries are all eligible.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	<p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): the endorsement letters from Cambodia, Philippines and Timor Leste have been submitted along with the PIF. This means that endorsement letters from China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Vietnam is still missing. Please provide these when resubmitting.</p> <p>17th of April 2012 (cseverin): Endorsement letters now included for China, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Phillipines and Timor Leste, so still endorsement letters for Thailand and Vietnam is missing. Please provide.</p> <p>23rd of April 2012 (cseverin): endorsement letters still missing from Vietnam and Thailand.</p> <p>17th of August 2012 (cseverin): Endorsement letters from China, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Phillipines, Timor Leste and Vietnam have been included. Thailand have still not endorsed the programme, but this may happen during the preparation of the sub projects.</p>
Agency's Comparative	3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly	4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the agency's comparative advantage has been clearly described.

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	4th of April 2012 (cseverin): No.
	5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?	4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed activities will be in line with the agency's capacity in the region.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	
	• the focal area allocation?	4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, 20 Mio excluding fee is available within the IW focal area for this PFD.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	
	• focal area set-aside?	
Program Consistency	7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the PFD framework have been aligned with the IW focal area results framework.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the PFD identifies objective 2 and 3, which is suitable for the suggested investments.
	9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes the proposed PFD and its sub projects are consistent with the National and regional priorities, through strategies such as the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of EAST Asia.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the capacities that will be developed through active participation in the project activities will be central to the sustainability of the project activities. One way that this is ensured is to have all level of stakeholders active in reaching the project outcomes and outputs, ranging from ministerial level to local governments, NGOs and local communities.
	11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): The baseline investments have sufficiently been described, including estimated baseline investments. But please do forward the detailed descriptions of each of the proposed project investments under the PFD.

Program Design	and assumptions?	17th of April 2012 (cseverin): the descriptions have been attached.
	12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) will not materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?	
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes the activities proposed has been based on incremental reasoning. Further, the suggested investments will built on top of a number of investments in the East Asian region, that are working towards reaching the SDS SEA targets that have been adopted by the 14 countries in the region.
	14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>5th of April 2012 (cseverin): The programme framework mentions some measurable indicators, but primarily includes wording that would effect, updating, increase, strengthened etc) please include indicators that are a bit more directed towards becoming quantifiable during the Project Preparation stages of the single projects.</p> <p>17th of April 2012 (cseverin): the indicators asked for above, have to a certain degree been addressed in the detailed descriptions of the sub projects. however, please expand much more on these at time of CEO Endorsement.</p>
	15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the PFD includes the gender dimension and the socio economic benefits and the gender dimension will be central to support the long term sustainable outcomes and outputs of the proposed projects under this PFD.
	16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): yes, CSO, NGO, private sector and local communities will be taken into consideration and have an active role.

	17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, a matrix outlining potential risks and associated mitigation strategies have been included, including Climatic Variability and change.
	18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed PFD will address the SDS-SEA targets while also being coordinated with investments such as "scaling up Partnership Investments for Sustainable Development of the Large marine Ecosystems of the EaSt ASia and their Coasts", as well as Coral Triangle Initiative.
	19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed PFD will be implemented with the help of an extensive network of field offices in the East Asian Region, while also being supported from head quarters.
Program Financing	20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the PM budget included for this PFD is ~ 5%, which is in accordance with the GEFSEC budgetary guidance.
	21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the funding/co-financing ratio seems to be appropriate to be able to achieve the proposed outputs and outcomes. But this will become more clear when the detailed descriptions of the projects under this PFD have been submitted along with a resubmitted PFD.
	22. Comment on the indicated co-financing.	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): The indicated co-financing is consisting of a large variety of sources, of both Grant and in-kind types.
	23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the UNDP co-financing in a size of roughly 12 mio in a mix of grant and in kind sources, which is along the lines of the agency's role.
Program Monitoring and Evaluation	24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	
	25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
Agency Responses	26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? • Convention Secretariat? 	5th of April 2012 (cseverin): No STAP review provided at this stage.

	• Other GEF Agencies?	
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?	<p>5th of April 2012 (cseverin): No, please review the above comments and resubmit soonest.</p> <p>23rd of April 2012 (cseverin): All above comments addressed, however, since two endorsement letters (Thailand and Vietnam) are still missing, the PDF can not be recommended for clearance into WP.</p> <p>17th of August 2012 (cseverin): The Vietnamese endorsement letter have now been obtained, hence the PDF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>
	28. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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 program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.**

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program	1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PCB/PPG for Program 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.