



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

GEF ID:	5401		
Country/Region:	Regional (Indonesia, Cambodia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam)		
Project Title:	Establishment and Operation of a Regional System of Fisheries Refugia in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; IW-2; IW-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,000,000
Co-financing:	\$12,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,100,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Isabelle VanderBeck

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the six participating countries are eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the six national operational Focal points have endorsed the project.	
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 funds are available under the IW focal area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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></p>	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the project and its suggested activities is aligned with the IW focal area results framework and strategic objectives.	
	<p>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?</p>	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposed Project and activities is aligned with the six participating countries national strategies on Fish Refugia	
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the baseline included is sound and based on sound assumptions. Fish Refugia policies have been mainstreamed into the national fisheries policies and plans.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the project framework outlines clear components, outputs and outcomes. Surely at time of CEO Endorsement, more quantifiable indicators needs to be	

	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project has identified the GEBs	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin):Yes, the role of public participation and the CSO have been touched upon, but please do make sure to expand at time of CEO Endorsement, especially since Fish Refugia requires strong local support and anchoring in order to be successful and sustainable.	
	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 risks have been identified and described. Please do at CEO Endorsement include a matrix including risks a quantification of the risk (low, medium or high) as well as associated mitigation measures.	
	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, the project will be coordinating with relevant investments in the region. Please do ensure that appropriate links is also created to PEMSEA.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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 	12th of April 2013 (cseverin):The project will be implementing the fish refugia concept, which by fisheries and habitat specialist within the South China Sea have been categorised as an innovative approach for building fishing community support for area-based approaches to fisheries and habitat management.	

	<p>for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the funds allocated seems to be appropriate to be able to achieve the outcomes and outputs.	
	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?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the co-financing and its composition is considered to be OK.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PM budget is following the GEF norm.	
	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?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PPG is requested and within the norm.	

	if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin):NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
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?		
	First review*		
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.