



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

GEF ID:	5393		
Country/Region:	Regional (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam)		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the West Pacific and East Asian Seas		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4753 (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:	\$60,000	Project Grant:	\$2,233,578
Co-financing:	\$19,859,525	Total Project Cost:	\$22,213,103
PIF Approval:	May 02, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 20, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	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 ?	12 April (SHansen): Yes, the participating countries are eligible.	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12 April (SHansen): Yes, all three operational focal points (Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam) have endorsed the project.	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the requested funds \$2,293 mio plus fee is available under the IW focal area.	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of		

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): The proposed activities have been aligned with the IW focal area results framework. The main focus of the proposal is implementation of policies and institutional reforms, which is central activities towards a more sustainable fishery of highly migratory species.	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
	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?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project and its activities have been aligned with the three participating countries national policies and plans.	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
Project Design	6. 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?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): The project will be based on strong outcomes of activities that among others led to increased capacity and understanding of highly migratory species in West Pacific and East Asia.	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes; however, see note in #7 regarding the need to clarify and quantify baselines in the Frameworks.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the components and their outcomes and outputs is clear enough at this stage, but are to become much more quantifiable at the time of CEO Endorsement. Further, please do include wording that explains how the activities under	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Most of the outcomes have clear and quantified targets; however there are several that are quite vague and, therefore, need to be clarified. For example, in Outcome 1.1, "Countries routinely share information" - "routinely" needs to be quantified; for

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>component 1 are to be sustained after project closure.</p>	<p>Indonesia "coverage of artisanal fleet landings significantly improved" - "significantly improved" needs to be quantified. Please review all the targets to ensure clear and quantified.</p> <p>Relatedly, the baselines need to be clear and quantified as well so that progress can be measured. In the above case for Indonesia, the baseline for coverage of artisanal fleet landings needs to be quantified (even if "none"). In Philippines the target is "improved by 30%" but the baseline level is not noted. Please review all baselines and edit to clarify and quantify.</p> <p>A few of the indicators do not have relevant targets. In particular:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Outcome 1.1 Indicator is "Improved... and IUU..."; however targets related to IUU are not provided for the nations nor are baselines provided except for Vietnam. 2) Outcome 1.2 Indicator is "Prediction of climate change impacts on oceanic fisheries and development of adaptive management strategies"; however these are not explained for Philippines and Vietnam targets. Since Outcome 1.3 discusses climate change policies, perhaps could move the indicator to Outcome 1.3 where there are relevant targets. 3) Outcome 1.3 Target for Philippines of 4 experts is already noted under Outcome 1.2 (and more relevant to Outcome 1.2; perhaps delete in Outcome

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>1.3 as still have regulations as target for Phillipines)</p> <p>4) Outcome 2.1 Outcome is "Enhanced compliance of existing legal instruments..."; however, the regional target is participation in meetings. This regional target needs to relate to legal instruments. In the text, there is discussion regarding developing governance among these three nations as a subset within WCPFC, which might be appropriate to create a target. The regional target noted under Outcome 1.1 (all three countries fully compliant with WCPFC requirements, and all relevant CMMs) might be appropriate here as ties to legal instruments.</p> <p>Note that minimum of 1% of funds need to be clearly allocated for IWLearn related activities and noted in the Frameworks.</p> <p>Please ensure the B. Project Framework information matches the Annex A. Project Results Framework. For example, the Project Results Framework does not include in Outcome 1.1 "Improved monitoring of oceanic tuna fisheries in the EAS: coverage increased by 40%", which is noted in the Project Framework. Please cross-check throughout for consistency.</p> <p>With regard to sustainability, further explanation is needed regarding financial and institutional sustainability. In particular, it is noted that the WCPFC</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>will continue to support to the full participation of the three countries in the Commission. How can that be continued in the future - where will the funding come from to replace GEF funding?</p> <p>Finally, private setor engagement is an important aspect of this project (see comment in #17 below. While certification of a fishery is useful, please include at least one more indicator / target to reflect private sector engagement (e.g. # of suppliers that have invested in fishing communities to move them toward sustainability).</p> <p>May 1, 2014 (lkarrer): Thank you for the revisions. All fine.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, however, please do provide, at time of endorsement, a more explicit description of the incremental reasoning</p>	<p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Following up on the PIF request to explicitly describe the incremental benefits (as well as the note by the STAP regarding explaining ties to the FAO project), a much more thorough explanation needs to be provided regarding how this project will build upon existing initiatives and how it will ensure complementarity (and not duplication). This is a major concern as there are several quite similar projects in the region and the Project Document does not adequately explain how this project contributes to regional needs beyond what is provided by existing projects; instead in only mentions that they will work together. At this stage there should be a very clear understanding of how this project contributes to this wealth of projects on</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>fisheries in the region. In addition to the projects noted in the Pro Doc, the following projects also need to be addressed: UNDP Marine Commodities (which has sites in Indonesia and Philippines); WCPFC Tuna Project and the FIP Project. In addition, please note it is important to commit to working with upcoming projects, for example, a fisheries related project is under discussion for Indonesia Seas.</p> <p>May 1, 2014 (lkarrer): Thank you for the revisions, which clarified the links for several projects. Of particularly importance are the ABNJ Tuna project, Sulu-Celebes LME and PIOFM projects. Note that it is also important to connect with the World Bank Ocean Partnership for Sustainable Fisheries project, which is not listed. The interlinkages with other projects is an important component of this project. GEF SEC will review the annual reports in order to see the progress made on cooperation arrangements with other related GEF projects.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified</p>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, a number of partner organisations have been identified, however, please do</p>	<p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and explicit means for their engagement explained?	include at time of endorsement a much more detailed analysis of the public stakeholder groups as well as other global, regional and national stakeholders.	
	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)	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project description includes a risk matrix including mitigation measures. the Changing climate has been included, as it has a direct effect on the project and the migratory fish species that the project focuses on.	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, a number of projects and ongoing activities in the region will be coordinated with, among others PEMSEA, FFA etc.	<p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): While general information was provided in the PIF, at this stage a more thorough explanation is warranted for the Pro Doc (see comment in #8).</p> <p>May 1, 2014 (lkarrer): Thank you for the additoinal information. As noted above, The interlinkages with other projects is an important component of this project. GEF SEC will review the annual reports in order to see the progress made on cooperation arrangements with other related GEF projects.</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 	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): This project is innovative as will be working towards improving the management of highly migratory species, i.e. Tuna, through strengthen the regional management capacity in combination with mainstreaming climate change impacts into the institutions and their policies of the three participating nations.	<p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Once comments above and below are addressed will have a stronger sense of how the project will be sustainable and scalable.</p> <p>May 1, 2014 (lkarrer): The project provides a unique opportunity to begin to address large scale migratory species in addition to climate change issues in the three countries.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.</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>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes, the project ensures cost-effectiveness.</p>
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the amounts listed seems to be adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.</p>	<p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the cofinancing listed seems to be adequate. However, please do work during project preparation towards attracting more financial support from the private sector, as the buy in of the supply and processing chain of Tuna, seems to central to sustainable long term management changes will take place.</p>	<p>March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): The Project Document indicates there are plans to work with the private sector. As indicated at the PIF review, we expected there to already have been extensive discussions during the PPG phase with the private sector to the point of seeking financial support. While it seems the private sector has not committed to financial support, what have been the nature of your discussions with the various regional and national businesses and organizations listed in the Pro Doc? What is the nature of your relationship with these institutions? What activities will they be engaged in, which institutions will be engaged and what is their commitment to engagement?</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Along with the point regarding how this project fits with existing initiatives, this is a critical point to address.</p> <p>May 1, 2014 (lkarrer): The areas of existing and planned collaboration are adequately addressed in the revision. Private sector engagement will be an important component during implementation and GEFSEC looks forward to learning of progress during annual reports.</p>
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the PM budget is in accordance with the GEF norm.	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
	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?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PPG is being requested and within the norm. PPG is being recommended for CEO approval.	March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF is technically cleared and can be considered for inclusion in a future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		March 5th 2014 (lkarrer): No. The points above need to be addressed, including related an explanation of how this project contributes to the existing suite of projects in the region, the planned activities of the private sector and quantification of targets and baselines. May 1, 2014 (lkarrer): Yes. The points above have been addressed. As noted, coordination with other relevant GEF projects and with the private sector will be an important component of this project.
	First review*		May 01, 2014
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.**