



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

GEF ID:	5513		
Country/Region:	Regional (Kenya, Comoros, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Somalia, Tanzania, South Africa)		
Project Title:	Western Indian Ocean Large Marine Ecosystems Strategic Action Programme Policy Harmonization and Institutional Reforms (SAPPHIRE)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5262 (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:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$10,976,891
Co-financing:	\$333,428,294	Total Project Cost:	\$345,005,185
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 07, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Akiko Yamamoto

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 ?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the nine participating countries are eligible for GEF funding	July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes all nine OPFs have endorsed the proposed project.	July 23, 2015 (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?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project amount of 10,976,891 is	July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): 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.

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)
		<p>available under the IW focal area. Please do make sure that the amount listed in Table A is not different from the actual proposed project amount (fees and PPG excluded). Please do correct.</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or 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>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the project is fully aligned with the IW results framework. However, Please do consider to rewrite the objective of the project to something along the lines of " To Achieve effective long-term ecosystem management in the Western Indian Ocean LMEs in line with the endorsed Strategic Action Programme. "</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Adressed, with a revised, alternative, Objective.</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>
	<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>	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project is fully aligned with the national mairne ecosystem diagnostic analyses and will translate these to national actions during project implementation. Please do make sure during preparation that coordination with countries will be undertaken, to maximise country ownership.</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. See points under #7 related to lack of coordination.</p> <p>June 21, 2016 (Ikarrer): Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Agency response outlines that coordination will be a central part of the PPG phase and continuously throughout the project implementation.	
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?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the baseline for this project is sufficiently described. The project will be investing to support and coordinate the NAPs to facilitate regional actions and results.	July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): Yes.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the components, outcomes and outputs in Table B is clear. Please do include wording to support the fact that 1% of the GEF grant will be allocated to support IWLEARN activities. Please do at time of CEO Endorsement include quantifiable outcome and output indicators into the project framework.</p> <p>Please do make sure that during project preparation coordination will be taking place on the use of tools developed and MPAs defined by other GEF funded activities in the region.</p> <p>UNder the Component on Stress Reduction, please do make sure to coordinate with other activities in the region, so that there will be no overlap.</p> <p>On a general note some of the outputs may be a bit ambitious, e.g. please consider to insert a / into following project output, just after REVISED, before UPDATED: Regional and national marine ecosystem cost-benefit analysis</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (lkarrer):</p> <p>Overall The Executing Agency is unclear. It is noted as "N/A" in the Request for CEO Endorsement, but then noted as "UNDP Seychelles" in the Pro Doc. Within the Management Arrangements section is noted, "PCU hosted by Government of Seychelles and housed in the UNDP-Government of Seychelles Programme Coordination Office," and that the "project will be implemented directly by UNDP". Is UNDP proposing self-execution? Please note this is only allowed under exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>There needs to be an explanation of plans for creating a long-term governance strategy that will continue regional efforts following the closure of the project. This may be the plan for the SAP Implementation Policy Steering Committee and STAP, which needs to be noted. Plans for a long-term structure need to be part of the discussion</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and goods-and services assessments revised/updated and delivered at community level.</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin):Addressed</p>	<p>regarding links to the other project structures. It also needs to be clear how these new entities relate to existing regional bodies (e.g. SADC, EAC) and there needs to be clear justification for creating these new bodies instead of using existing entities (a major concern raised by STAP at PIF).</p> <p>The project is focused around addressing stresses; yet there is very little mention as to what stresses will be addressed. There are plans for working on legislation, policies, engaging the private sector, but not what about. There is reference to the WIO SAP, which identified water quality degradation, habitat and community modification, declines in living marine resources and environmental variability and extreme events. However, these stresses are not discussed in the explanations of outcomes, outputs, deliverables and activities. These needs to be discussed throughout the text. This is especially important since there are many similarities with WIOSAP and SWIOFish activities.</p> <p>Relatedly, the role of SAPPHIRE with respect to WIOSAP and SWIOFish is not clear. Note that while only the first SWIOFish project has been approved (SWIOFish1 for Comoros, Mozambique and Tanzania) others are in the pipeline and, therefore, it is important to clarify coordination plans. (Throughout the following comments, "SWIOFish" will</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>refer to SWIOFish1 and the anticipated rest of the SWIOFish country projects). There is mention of these projects and that there were coordination discussions, but not a clear articulation of the respective roles with regard to mutual interests in fisheries and LBS pollution. As written there is significant concern that there is overlap between project efforts.</p> <p>Following are several examples of these two concerns (articulation of which stresses and ties to WIOSAP & SWIOFish). These concern needs to be addressed throughout the text not just with respect to these examples.</p> <p>Outcome 1.1 policy, legislative and institutional reformsâ€</p> <p>The Output Descriptions for this outcome discusses "changes in legislation policy and associated institutional and administrative arrangements in line with the SAP requirements," as well as "reviews of national legislation." (further described in Deliverable 1.1.5). However it does not state what stresses these policies, legislation and institutions will address. Instead it notes it will be "in line with the intentions of the SAP". The SAP highlights four areas of concern (listed above). In considering how these will be addressed in SAPPHERE, there seems to be overlap with WIOSAP and SWIOFish. Water quality legislation is addressed in WIOSAP under Outcome</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>B.2. Habitat and community modification is addressed through WIOSAP under Outcome A.1. Fisheries is addressed through SWIOFish1 Component 2. There needs to be clarification of how these efforts are different and explanation of coordination plans.</p> <p>In addition, the deliverables for this Outcome 1.1 includes a SAP Implementation Policy Steering Committee, STAP and national intersectoral committees. The relationship between these bodies with regard to similar institutions planned for WIOSAP (Output D.1.3 ‘SAP implementation through interministerial committees and regional task forces) and SWIOFish (Component 4 ‘Regional and National Steering Committees and Implementation Units) needs to be justified and explained. The SAPPHIRE description only notes for the Steering Committee that it will "complement and interact directly with the UNEP-GEF WIOLAB SAP implementation policy and steering mechanisms" without explaining how. And SWIOFish is not mentioned. Given the related interests, it would seem these should be combined as much as possible. Otherwise there needs to be a very clear explanation of why they are split, what each will do and how they will coordinate.</p> <p>Outcome 1.2 technical and institutional</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>capacity</p> <p>This outcome focuses on capacity strengthening and development of effective science-to-governance processes, including monitoring methods and strategies and marine spatial planning techniques. This description seems duplicative with WIOSAP Output D.2.2, which plans to create a science-policy exchange platform related to LBSA and ICZM. Please consider combining efforts to one platform; otherwise justify having two, clarify how these platforms are different and how they will be coordinated.</p> <p>Outcome 2.1: Stress reduction through EBM into Local Economic Development Plans</p> <p>This outcome focuses on community-level LEDs to incorporate coastal/ocean EBM approaches. Similar to Component 1, the description does not discuss what stresses will be addressed. While termed differently, this seems duplicative of WIOSAP Outcome A.2 "support coastal planning and management", A.1.2 "management plans developed" and outcome A.1.1 "national institutions undertake participatory spatial planning of selected key coastal ecosystems" and "pilot actions to build capacity in ICM". Please clarify what stresses this outcome will focus on, how the efforts are different and how this project will coordinate with WIOSAP selection process to choose different local</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>communities.</p> <p>Outcome 2.2 ‘ Stress reduction through EBM practices among artisanal and subsistence fisheries</p> <p>This section is the first time fisheries is explicitly noted. Therefore there is the impression that these community level efforts lack comprehensive national and regional connections. Once the stresses are better incorporated into the previous sections, this concern may be addressed. However, currently there needs to be a more comprehensive view of how these site efforts fit with broader activities on fisheries at larger scales.</p> <p>There is also no connection to SWIOFish. For SWIOFish1 (Comoros, Mozambique, Tanzania) all three countries havenational levels plans that provide a framework for working at the community level. For the Comoros, there are plans for developing community co-management system and plans; for Mozambique strengthening community program design and management plans, including for artisanal fishers; and for Tanzania plans for targeted coastal communities. The link to these efforts is not explained, including how sites will be selected taking into consideration SWIOFish plans.</p> <p>Component 3: stress reduction through private sector</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Similar to the previous two components, this component does not clarify what stresses will be the focus. While 'maritime industries' are noted, it is not stated what that means ' fisheries related organizations? Coastal developers? Shippers? Port developers? Do they mean organizations related to LBS, such as farmers? The only specificity is brief mention "such as WOC and International Seafood Sustainability Forum" within Deliverable 3.1.1. and then oil and gas in Deliverable 3.1.5.</p> <p>These plans need to be linked to SWIOFish and WIOSAP. If interest is in working with fishing industry, then would be relevant to SWIOFish. If pollution related then relevant to WIOSAP. There needs to be very close coordination, which is not noted other than very briefly in Deliverable 3.1.4 . For example, if developing public-private sector partnerships around shoreline development or with upland agriculture, then need to be working with WIOSAP, which is also working on government on water quality standards. If developing PPPs between fisheries agencies and fishers, then need to coordinate with SWIOFish as they are working on government policies and working with communities.</p> <p>The private and public stakeholders need to be noted in the Stakeholders section.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Component 4: best practices and innovative ocean governance demonstration For this component also it is unclear what stresses would be addressed. Assuming fisheries would be a focus, there is considerable overlap with the ABNJ Deep Sea project activities, which has WIO as one of the two focus areas, including related to marine spatial planning and VMEs. The Pro Doc for ABNJ Deep Sea project needs to be closely reviewed and discussions held with the PM (Chris O'Brien) to determine if and how SAPPHERE can contribute to the work they are conducting. If there is still a need for this component given ABNJ plans, then this needs to be clearly articulated and how the two projects will be coordinated.</p> <p>Component 5: Capacity development Similar to previous comments on the above components, there needs to be clarification of how these capacity building efforts relate to knowledge sharing efforts in SWIOFish (Component 1 includes regional knowledge management and exchange) and WIOSAP (Component D includes learning and exchange).</p> <p>Having two PADs for one GEF project is unprecedented. That said, as long as there is one PIF, one CEO endorsement request, one PIR and one TE report, is</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>fine. In addition the Trustee will only want cash transfer requests associated with on project.</p> <p>With regard to the Joint Mgt Support to Mascarene Plateau Region Project Document,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - please confirm and clarify in Pro Doc that Seychelles and Mauritius will still actively engage in the main SAPPHIRE project i.e. the activities in this Pro Doc only apply to the area that is jointly managed; - as above, the stresses to be addressed need to be clarified in the Pro Doc; -similar to above, the ties to the ABNJ Deep Sea project, which includes a component in WIO with heavy emphasis on marine spatial planning, needs to be clarified; - while presumably LBS pollution do not impact the plateau (please confirm), fisheries does. Please clarify anticipated links to future SWIOFish projects in the two countries; - the final component is where change will occur (the prior components will provide capacity and data to inform this change). given the importance of this component, a larger allocation of the funding seems warranted. please consider. - the EA needs to be reconsidered as noted above. <p>Finally, please note the indicators in the Project Results Framework will be reviewed once the following concerns</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>are addressed.</p> <p>Nov 17 2015 (Ikarrer): Points above are addressed except one significant and one minor concern:</p> <p>First, with regard to the executing agency - Alternative options need to be pursued to having UNDP serve dual roles of implementing agency and executing agency. Agencies only serve dual roles in exceptional cases in which there are no viable alternative arrangements. Further, having the PCU hosted in the UNDP country office in SAP implementation raises serious concern regarding the sustainability of regional processes, which are best served by a long-standing regional organization with the relevant mandate. The SAP clearly asks for placing the SAP implementation coordination function in an existing (not new) regional institution. The SAP notes the organization "should ideally be 'anchored' or linked to some existing regional body with the appropriate mandate and responsibilities." It should be possible to narrow down among reasonable options, including those noted in the SAP, to find a host institution for the regional PCU in a place that has some relevant regional mandate. This structure would enhance synergies with such regional set-ups, enhance country ownership and enhance capacities realizing that this may be an interim arrangement until a more</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>permanent design is agreed by the countries. Several organizations have been noted as possibilities and these need to be explored.</p> <p>Second, the Nairobi Convention (which is EA for WIOSAP) and SWIOF-C (EA for SWIOFish1) are listed as potential members/observers to the PSC, which presumably means they will be on the RSC. However, FAO, which is lead on ABNJ Deep Sea, is not listed. This needs to be addressed.</p> <p>June 21, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes. These final two points are addressed. Nairobi Convention will serve as EA and host the PCU and FAO ABNJ Deep Sea Project is included for the RSC.</p>
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the GEBs have been identified and the incrementality has been described.	July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): Yes.
	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?		July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): Yes.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the PIF includes description of the relevant stakeholder groups.	July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): No. The private sector stakeholders need to be noted in the Stakeholders section. While the table of "General Public" Stakeholders notes some of the groups, it is not comprehensive (e.g. oil and gas are

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			missing). Once the stresses are better articulated, these can be added. June 21, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes. Addressed.
	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)	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes a risk matrix including potential mitigation measures have been included.	July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): Yes.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project include thorough description of the foreseen coordination with a number of key initiatives in the region, with whom coordination will be essential for successful implementation and sustainable outcomes and outputs. The PIF is in detail describing the coordination between UNEP, WB and UNDP activities in the region. Coordination between these three institutions and ongoing/planned activities is understood to be essential for achieving long term sustainable results in the region. Further, please do ensure coordination between the WB/GEF Electronic Highway project, in order to ensure proper linking to relevant project outcomes. Hence making sure that no overlap in efforts will be taking place. 29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed	July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): No. See points in #7 above. June 21, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes. Addressed.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects,	16th of August 2013 (cseverin): This project is primarily focused on	June 21 2016 (lkarrer): This project is taking the critical next step in

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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 experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>solidifying and delivering on the national and regional policy frameworks that has been established during the TDA/SAP project. A number of innovative approaches, to the region, will be used in order to accelerate the successful implementation.</p>	<p>implementing the regionally agreed plans through actions at national and regional scales, which are scalable activities for other LMEs. The project is innovative in engaging communities in the LME management process; adopting national Community Advisory Committees; creating pilot public-private partnerships with the maritime industry in the entire management process; and, initiating the adoption of a pan-African partnership for ocean governance based in the WIO region but with global networking.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>July 23, 2015 (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>July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): yes.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<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>19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the indicated GEF financing and associated Co-financing is considered to be adequate. Please do make sure that there is consistency between the amount stated in Table A, B and D.</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): While the government co-financing has increased significantly since PIF, which is great, the private sector and other organizations' support has decreased. Please explain.</p> <p>June 21 2016 (lkarrer): Yes. Addressed.</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</p>	<p>19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Composition is fine. However, please do make sure that the cofinancing sources are not mixed. So please do split out in-</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>kind and cash cofinancing. Further, please make sure that there is consistency between amounts listed in Table A, B and C.</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the listed PM budget is following the GEF guidance.</p>	<p>July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): The split between the main SAPPHIRE project (\$8.77M GEF) and the Joint Management project (\$2.21M GEF) seems unjustifiably weighted toward the joint project. The Joint project is working in a discrete area with 2 countries; whereas the main SAPPHIRE project is working in a much larger area with more activities. Please reconsider and justify the split.</p> <p>June 21 2016 (lkarrer): Yes. Addressed.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>19th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes PPG has been requested is within the norm and is understood to be essential for proper planning of the ProDoc, especially considering the multiple countries involved in this project.</p>	<p>June 21 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.</p>
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>19th of August 2013 (cseverin):NA</p>	<p>24th of July 2015 (lkarrer): NA</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): Yes except the indicators noted focus on MPAs and fisheries. LBS pollution, including from irrigation and wastewater, is a major</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>concern. Please reconsider the indicators to include ones related to wastewater, irrigation and water use efficiency.</p> <p>June 21 2016 (lkarrer): Yes. Addressed.</p>
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): Yes</p>
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>July 23, 2015 (lkarrer): No. Given that the STAP PIF review indicated major revisions required, the agency needs to send the Pro Doc for STAP review.</p> <p>The STAP in its review of the PIF expressed strong concern regarding the need to focus activities more strategically and to select more focused areas within the region with a clear explanation of how those were selected. The Pro Doc does not indicate the activities have been narrowed in scope or selected geographies prioritized.</p> <p>In addition STAP notes the need to identify a clear long-term governance strategy for these activities within existing institutions (i.e. not create new institutions), such as SADC and EAC; yet, a new SAP Implementation Steering Committee and STAP are recommended. As discussed in #7, how these new entities fit within the existing governance in the region needs to be explained or, preferably, the existing</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			governance mechanisms need to be used instead of creating new institutions. June 27, 2016 (Ikarrer): Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? 		July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. At PIF stage France indicated the need to link the (then) new FFEM project, entitled "Conservation and sustainable exploitation of seamounts and hydrothermal vent ecosystems of the South West Indian Ocean outside of national legislative borders" on the same issue, which was just beginning. In conclusion they noted, "Opinion: we support the initiative and suggest that the program works strongly with UICN/FFEM project especially to ensure a reinforcement of the regional and local capabilities with regards to governance of the ZONL." Please address this comment. June 21 2016 (Ikarrer): Yes. Addressed as there is coordination with the noted FFEM project.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
	Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	19th of August 2013 (cseverin): No, please do address above comments and resubmit. 29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes PIF clearance is being recommended	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>July 23, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. Please address points noted.</p> <p>Nov 17, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. Please address final two points in #7.</p> <p>June 21, 2016 (Ikarrer): No. As noted (#23) STAP PIF review indicated major revisions required. The agency needs to send the Pro Doc for STAP review. This is the only remaining item prior to CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>June 27, 2016 (Ikarrer): Yes. Response to final STAP comments received.</p>
	First review*		July 24, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		June 21, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		June 27, 2016

* **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.**