



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:	EAS 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:	\$16,156,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,449,578
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval			
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	

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 ?	12 April (SHansen): Yes, the participating countries are eligible.	
	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.	
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.	
	• 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>	<p>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.</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>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project and its activities have been aligned with the three participating countries national policies and plans.</p>	
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>	<p>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.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>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.</p>	

		Further, please do include wording that explains how the activities under component 1 are to be sustained after project closure.	
	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, however, please do provide, at time of endorsement, a more explicit description of the incremental reasoning	
	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, a number of partner organisations have been identified, however, please do 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.	
	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.	
	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 	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	

	<p>and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	with mainstreaming climate change impacts into the institutions and their policies of the three participating nations.	
	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 amounts listed seems to be adequate to achieve the expected 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 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.	
	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.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PPG is being requested and within the norm.	

	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?	approval.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	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.**