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

GEF ID:	**5768**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Indonesia, Timor Leste)**		
Project Title:	**Enabling Transboundary Cooperation for Sustainable Management of the Indonesian Seas**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	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-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$4,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$15,500,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$19,650,000**
PIF Approval:	**April 01, 2014**	Council Approval/Expected:	**May 01, 2014**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Christian Severin**	Agency Contact Person:	**Simon Funge Smith**

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**?	15th of March 2014 (IW): Yes Indonesia and Timor-Leste are GEF eligible countries. Note that the submission did not note the Executive Agency. Please add. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Please include the national ministeries that will be the executing partners. If it is indeed the case that FAO will not work with national executing partners towards this regional TDA/SAP, the main rational for funding is lost. 25th of March 2014 (cseverin):	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Addressed	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	15th of March 2014 (IW): Yes, both OFPs 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?	15th of March 2014 (IW): Yes, the funds are available within the GEF IW focal area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of 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**? *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).*	15th of March 2014 (IW): This project falls within GEF 5 objective 3, please adjust table A. Please align better with the Output indicators of Objective 3, key output indicators are missing from the results framework such as Inter ministerial committees. Further, please add an indicator on ministerial adoption fo the TDA and ministerial Endorsement of the SAP as part of the results framework (as already done in the component descriptions.) The description of component 2.1 and its associated outputs are more quantifiable than was has been listed in the results framework.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Generally, please do work towards making the output indicators in the results framework more quanitifiable. (See also question 7 comments) 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Please make sure to include an output indicator for establishment of Intern-Ministerial Committees in both countries.	
	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?	15th of March 2014 (IW): Yes the proposed project is fully aligned with the national strategies of Indonesia and will assist Timor Leste in developing a national policy and management plan for its marine fisheries. However, there are at least two relevant regional projects (OFMP II and REBYC II CTI) that are both addressing fisheries issues. It is not clearl how this project relates to those, seemingly duplicative, projects. Please explain or shift focus to non-fisheries aspects. Please expand to also reflect upon how the other activitiets suggested by the project related to limiting the stress on marine and ecosystem resources. The section seems to focus on the fisheries and this TDA SAP project will also be dealing with other issues. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed	
	6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to	15th of March 2014 (IW): A large number of GEF funded activities have been included as the baseline for the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	project. Please investigate if there are any national activities that wil be able to support the project as baseline. Without those national baseline activities, there is a possibility that the projects activities will not be sustainable. Also, relevant sub-national projects are not mentioned, which are important given the large geographic area. For example, both CI and WWF have projects in Bird's Head/Papua that address the issues discussed in this project. The various relevant projects need to be identified to demonstrate knowledge of existing efforts. Relatedly, the stakeholder list needs to reflect these organizations in these roles. Also, please see note in #5 regarding the existing REBYC II and the OFMP II projects and how they relate to this project. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed, however, please do make sure to keep exploring the potential synergies throughout the project prep phase.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	15th of March 2014 (IW): Please do revise the Objective. presently it is not formulated as an objective, more as a descriptor of what elements the project will consist of. Please work on the output indicators to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		make them easier quantifiable. e.g. how will the potential PM know when output indicator 1.1.4 is met?? Component 1: Please remove Marine Debris from output indicator 1.1.5, unless this will be fully funded by national cofinancing, as Marine Debris is not eligible to receive IW funding. The text for Outcome 1.1 reads very well, but is not reflected in Table B. The following points are for Table B, which basically needs editing in line with the text: 1.1.1 â€“ 1.1.5 seem to be the main components of the TDA (which is noted as 1.1.6). While the ecological aspects are addressed and the socioeconomic (values, benefits), there is no mention of analyses the other aspects, particularly governance and stakeholder analysis. All 3 aspects â€“ ecological, socioeconoimcs and governance â€“ require resources and expertise, not just ecological. 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 and 1.1.5 are subsets of 1.1.1 Separating them out suggests ecological aspects will get more emphasis than the other, equally important aspects of the TDA. The text for Outcome 1.2 notes the SAP will be harmonized with A-T and S-C SAP, which is important, but it needs to be harmonized with other relevant initiatives as well, not just those (as discussed later). Following point is for	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Table B: 1.2.3 specifically identifies a plan for regional pollution monitoring. Why is this specifically pulled out separate from the monitoring noted in 1.2.1. Why isn't there monitoring specific to other issues (e.g. fisheries, etc)? Please edit 1.2.5 to be either "agreed" or "endorsed" or both. Component 2: The title seems to be covering marine and coastal resources management, however, the outcomes and the activities are all focused on fisheries. Please make sure to also include outcomes talking to the other parts of coastal and marine resources. There are several outputs that are neither planning (Component 1) nor capacity building (Component 2), but implementation as pilot projects. These include 2.1.3, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4. Suggest you either broaden Component 2 Outcome to be capacity building and pilot projects or create another component that is pilot projects. The basis for these pilot projetcs, which are mostly focused on aquaculture, needs to be justified, especially given there is no SAP that has identified these as priorities. On what basis did you decide to pursue these aquaculture projects instead of all the other sectors? For Table B; What does "2.2.3) support to the implementation of the regional	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		plan of actionâ€¦" mean? What are you actually going to do? Similarly, what does "2.2.2) institutional support to meet conservation and management measures of regional RFMOS" mean? Consider using wording from the text, which is clearer than in the Table B. What does "2.3.1) Capacity developedâ€¦" mean? Are you going to do trainings or are you going to actually implement blue growth concepts. If the latter, how? And if latter, need to include under pilot projects. Component 3: Component 3 should include wording on the coordination efforts this project will undertake with the Timor Arafura Seas project and ecosystem management unit. In addition, the focus of the proposed research needs to be clarified beyond "oceanographic and remote sensing" which implies research on broad biophysical aspects (e.g. currents, deep sea) with limited coastal areas. The research needs to be clearly relevant to the project, which highlights the major threats as coastal and watershed activities (fisheries, aquaculture, shoreline development, etc). In fact the Background section notes the lack of fisheries data (particularly for Timor-Leste), which would, therefore, seem a priority. Further, the project is committed in the TDA process to not only understand ecological aspects, but also socioeconomic and governance context, which are not part of oceanographic and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		remote sensing analyses. The priority research activities need to be reconsidered to reflect the regional needs and with respect to the project focus. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin):Addressed adequately at this point, however, please focus during ppg phase to strengthen the focus in component 3 on the lack of fishery data from Timor-Leste as pointed out above, as well as adding an indicator to this effect too.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	15th of March 2014 (IW X): Yes, this region is recognized as the center of marine biodiversity for the world; yet a region under great pressure from various threats. Consequently, this project that addresses marine sustainability for the region has tremendous global benefits.	
	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?	March 18, 2014 (IW): The various stakeholders are discussed; however, the stakeholders relevant to the sub-regional projects need to be included. The discussion of non-government stakeholders representing communities, CSOs, academia, and the private sector is brief. These stakeholders, particularly the private sector, warrant much greater consideration and active engagement	24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Please expand considerable during the PPG,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		during the PPG phase to ensure they are sufficinetly incorporated during project implementation.	
	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)	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes, the PIF includes a review of risks, their rating and sufficient mitigation measures for these low to medium risks.	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	March 18, 2014 (IW): No, please see points above in # 5 and #6 related to how the project will complement existing initiatives. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed adequately at this stage.	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • 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.	March 18, 2014 (IW): The project will address marine resource sustainability in a critical region, the Indonesian Seas. While there are disparate activities underway, this project will build a comprehensive, planned way forward between the two nations.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes.	
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes; however, please split out in-kind and cash allocations. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin):Please split out the Indonesian co-financing. cofinancing can not be listed as both cash and in-kind cofinancing. 25th of March 2014 (cseverin); Addressed.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes.	
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	March 18, 2014 (IW): Yes, PPG is requested at a reasonable level.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
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?**	March 18 (IW): No, the aforementioned issues need to be addressed. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): No please address above points and revert soonest. 25th of March 2014 (cseverin): Proposal is technical cleared and recommended for CEO Clearance to be part of an upcoming WP.	
	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)		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)

* **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.**