



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

GEF ID:	5405		
Country/Region:	Regional (China, Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Timor Leste, Vietnam)		
Project Title:	EAS Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4752 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$10,143,992
Co-financing:	\$144,981,000	Total Project Cost:	\$155,124,992
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 ?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the participating countries are eligible	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Endorsement letters have been recieved from Cmabodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines and Timor Leste. Please submit Thailand and Vietnam soonest.</p> <p>If the Endorsement letters for Thailand and Vietnam have not been forwarded, prior to posting of the June WP, this project will not be part of the June 2013 WP.</p> <p>15th of April 2013 (cseverin): YES, The Vietnam endorsmeent letter have been submitted and a caveat have been included on the Thialand Endorsement letter and that if not recieved before CEO</p>	

		Thailand will be removed from 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):Funds are available under the Parent PFD "Reducing Pollution and rebuilding degraded marine resources in the East Asian Seas through implementation of the Intergovernmental agreements and catalyzed Investments" So it will draw no funds from the subsequent WP that it may be presented along with.	
	• 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 ? <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):Yes the project is aligned with the IW Results framework.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national	12th of April 2013 (cseverin):Yes, the suggested project activities have been	

	and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA).	
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): Yes, the baseline for this project is provided by the highly accepted and succesful regional development strategy SDS-SEA, which among others have been supported through PEMSEA activities. Both SDS SEA and PEMSEA will be central in teh successful implementation of this proposed project activities.	
	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 outputs and outcomes listed in tabel B are considered to be sufficiently clear at this stage.	
	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 IW GEBs have been identified and incorporated. Yes, the incremental reasoning is considered to be sound.	
	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 long list of organisations, insittutions, CSO, private sector partners etc, have been identified. However, at time of CEO End. it would be needed to see more details under each of these "headings".	

	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 proposal includes a matrix including potential 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 EAS Partnership Council as well as multiple ongoing GEF IW projects in the region.	
	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 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>12th of April 2013 (cseverin):</p> <p>This project will among others be demonstrating innovative financial and economic instruments and other incentives designed to drive positive changes in behavior at ICM sites (e.g., revolving funds, Public Private Partnerships (PPPs), Payment for Environmental Services (PES), markets for carbon credits, Corporate Social responsibility (CSR) and certification programs (e.g. Port Safety, Health and Environmental Management Code; ICM Code).</p> <p>This project will be working towards a sustainable coastal and ocean based economy in the East Asian Region, through making sure that PEMSEA becomes a self sustaining country owned regional mechanism for managing the 7 regional LMEs, while also scaling up interventions to reach the regional goal of 20% of coast line under ICM.</p>	
	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 funding suggested per component seems to be adequate.	
	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, table C outlines a diverse list of cofinanciers. Please consider during PPG phase to strengthen the Private Sector engagement in the project and its activities, as private Sector is understood to be an important driver in the region.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PM budget is in accordance with 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? <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): No PPG have been requested.	
	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		

	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?	<p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): The PIF is ready to be technically cleared and to be considered for inclusion in a future work program as soon as the endorsement letters from Thailand and Vietnam be submitted to the GEFSEC.</p> <p>15th of April (cseverin): Vietnam have submitted the Endorsement letter and a caveat on the Thailand endorsement letter have been included. hence above comment addressed and hence the PIF is ready to be technically cleared and to be considered for inclusion in a future work program.</p>	
	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.