



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

GEF ID:	6920		
Country/Region:	Regional (Indonesia, Timor Leste)		
Project Title:	Implementation of the Arafura and Timor Seas Regional and National Strategic Action Programs		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$9,745,662
Co-financing:	\$101,550,000	Total Project Cost:	\$111,595,662
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Erezo Padila

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	(Aug 14) Yes, both Indonesia and Timor Leste are eligible.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	(Aug 14) Yes, both focal points have endorsed the project.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	(Aug 14). Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	(Aug 14) The budget is within the IW allocation. However, please clarify allocations between IW and BD. In section B. Indicative Project Description Summary, please clarify whether IW or BD will be covering the costs. You can	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>note by Component or by Outcome.</p> <p>(Aug 25) Addressed.</p>	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>? <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>(Aug 14) Yes, the project is sufficiently aligned.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>(Aug 14) Yes, the project supports both regional and national priorities as defined in the SAP and NAPs.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>(Aug 14) As one of the 4 nations in the ATSEA region, PNG engagement is important to ocean governance in ATSEA. The PIF discusses briefly the history of PNG engagement in ATSEA; however, this is quite limited. Could you please provide more explanation as to the status of their engagement, including extent to which they have been engaged</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>in other initiatives in the region to provide perspective. We would also like to understand PNG's role in the region - not only in size, but also pressures on the resources and benefits PNG receives to understand relative importance of their engagement.</p> <p>The PIF notes in Component 1 plans for continuing to engage PNG, which is important to address and we look forward to more detail on these plans in the Pro Doc.</p> <p>(Aug 25) Yes.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>(Aug 14). Please address the following overall and component-specific comments.</p> <p>Please edit Project Objective to take out "restoration".</p> <p>Now moving into implementation, there need to be not only policy-level activities but also on the ground activities as noted in the TE. In the second recommendation the TE highlights the need to uptake the NAP priority actions into national and sub-national operation programs and notes specific relevant efforts. Please address this need in the PIF.</p> <p>The TE also notes the need to carry out a strategic review of the SAP/NAP priority actions and targets with scientific and governmental stakeholders. Please address this point as an important step in shifting from developing to implementing</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the SAP and NAPs.</p> <p>The emphasis in the project tends toward the marine realm, yet as IW is working toward improving source-to-sea efforts, consideration needs to be given the land-based activities. The TE notes the importance of address land-based activities, particularly agriculture and mariculture, in this region. Please consider how these will be addressed.</p> <p>Please note the key IW-3 Program 6 and 7 indicators (listed as follows for your convenience from the GEF-6 Strategy) that you will monitor over the course of the project. In the Pro Doc you will need to quantify the baseline for these and identify quantified targets.</p> <p>Indicator 6.1.1: Adoption and implementation of ICM plans and reforms to protect coastal zones in LMEs (% of country coastline under ICM, # of countries adopting and applying ICM) as reported in GEF IW tracking tool score card.</p> <p>Indicator 7.1.1: # of management plans and appropriate measures implemented for rebuilding or protecting fish stocks including alternative management approaches.</p> <p>Indicators 7.1.2: \$ of private capital directed to support sustainable fishing in targeted LMEs.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Indicator 7.1.3: # targeted communities of fishers have adopted an ecosystem approach to fisheries management</p> <p>While it was very useful to have an upstream version of the TE, we look forward to the final report and will consider the recommendations in the Pro Doc before proceeding with the project. Please, therefore, carefully consider the TE recommendations.</p> <p>Component 1  One of the overarching recommendations of the TE was to strengthen stakeholder engagement, including participation by sub-national governmental administrations. This section highlights the SPF as better engaging at the regional and national levels (not sub-regional); however under the A1.6) innovativenessâ€¦ section, there is mention that the SPF will include representatives from local communities. The A1.6 section also notes institutional strengthening at local levels. Please clarify if the SPF will include sub-regional and/or local representation. Regardless, if local action is a priority for this project (as recommended by the TE and in the SAP), then there needs to be a mechanism for working with these communities on a regular basis beyond an office in the capital and once per year meetings with representatives. As the TE notes, local extension officers can be important for making this connection to local management. Whatever they are</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>called, consideration needs to be given to having local staff with outreach responsibilities directly and regularly involved with the communities.</p> <p>The TE also notes the importance of private sector engagement. While the revision provides a bit more information, there needs to be more information in the PIF on these plans – please note which sectors and provide a preliminary list of organizations. The PIF notes tourism and fisheries sectors, but the TE notes oil and gas as important sectors and even notes relevant initiatives. More thought needs to go into at least identifying the key sectors.</p> <p>Stakeholder Participation Forum – please explain to what extent the ATSEF members will be subsumed into the SPF. Currently text implies will consist of indigenous peoples' and women's groups only. And please clarify how the Regional Coordination Committee is different from the SPF.</p> <p>The text notes "This involves adoption of a formal regional cooperation agreement that will be implemented in a stepwise manner (SAP)." We assume this is not referring to the SAP, which is not an "agreement". If you do not mean the SAP, then delete "(SAP)", which implies you do mean the SAP.</p> <p>Inter-sectoral coordination (1.2.3) seems more appropriate within 1.1 where</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>discussing governance bodies; whereas 1.2 is about capacity through guidebooks and training.</p> <p>Given the extensive amount of existing guidebooks, we don't the development of more materials as warranted. Instead we ask that this output be modified to focus on training.</p> <p>In the first paragraph of Component 1, please edit the first sentence to include "implementation" and "mechanisms for cooperation and implementation (Outcome 1.1) created to promote and implement regional level planning"</p> <p>Component 2 The SAP includes an emphasis on empowering local communities with regard to habitat restoration/protection (see Table 2, p20). As this section discusses MPAs and ICM, there needs to be consideration of how local stakeholders will be engaged. You they will be given access to information, but providing information (one-way interaction) does not suffice as "engagement" (which is two-way). "Engagement" is intended to ensure the communities have a voice. Please reconsider to ensure engagement.</p> <p>The ICM section notes only 6 sites in Indonesia and 2 sites in Timor Leste. This seems like a small number for SAP implementation when decentralization and local empowerment is a critical part</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of governance in the region. Local action was noted as a priority in the SAP and in the TE.</p> <p>Component 2 is strong on habitat degradation and good on fisheries, but weak on pollution measures. The SAP includes clearly outlined measures, such as Table 2, p 21 - strengthen and harmonize laws and policies to control LBS pollution and develop early warning system for oil spills. In section 2.2 most of the outputs relate to data and information. The only text close to proposing measures to manage pollution is "appropriate controls of point and non-point sources of pollution initiated" . Please be more specific on what sources will be addressed (e.g. mining, etc) and what measures will be considered to actually address pollution (not just study it).</p> <p>While GEF IW can support regional-scale early warning system development, we cannot support national response or prevention measures. Please ensure the pollution section is focused on regional early warning system activities.</p> <p>In section 2.2 text, please note that the marine litter piece, including the clean-ups, will be funded by government sources as you noted in Output 2.2.2 in parantheses.</p> <p>In Output 2.3.1 please edit first word "Improved" to "Updated".</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>With regard to Output 2.3.1, please clarify if the priority conservation areas have been identified through the CTI-USAID project.</p> <p>Component 3 As IW and BD funds do not explicitly support climate change adaptation, these activities need to be incorporated elsewhere, such as within ICM activities.</p> <p>The current PIF focuses on IW related activities. To justify Biodiversity support, there need to be clearer Biodiversity activities. Please develop an output within Component 2 or as a separate component on BD activities with direct relevance to the GEF-6 Strategy BD priorities (available at <a href="http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEF_R.6-Rev.04%2C%20Programming%20Directions%2C%20March%2031%2C%202014.pdf">http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEF_R.6-Rev.04%2C%20Programming%20Directions%2C%20March%2031%2C%202014.pdf</a>).</p> <p>Component 4 “ Knowledge Management While this component addresses sharing of information related to the project and developing indicators, it does not address the need for a long-term, regional information management system as noted in the TE (recommendation #4). Please consider including this as an activity.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	(Aug 14) Yes.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?	(Aug 14) Yes.	
	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)	(Aug 25). Yes, risks and consequences are sufficiently addressed.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	(Aug 14) No, see points in (7) regarding engaging local stakeholders, the SPF and private sector.  (Aug 25). These points are now addressed.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li></ul>	(Aug 14). Yes, the project is critical in moving the region forward by implementing the regionally agreed SAP.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>		
	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?	(Aug 14). Yes.	
	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?	(Aug 14). No, the baseline funding and co-financing appear to be the same. Please clarify what is the baseline and what is the additional co-financing for purposes of implementation of the SAP.  (Aug 25). Yes - to be addressed during PPG.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	(Aug 14). Yes.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency	(Aug 14). No, the finance breakdown and finance overview PPG / PPG Fee totals differ. Please correct.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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>	(Aug 25). Yes.	
	<p>20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
Agency Responses	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>(Aug 14). No, the above comments need to be addressed.</p> <p>(Aug 25). Yes, the comments have been sufficiently addressed.</p>	
	<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>During PPG and in the Pro Doc the following points need to be addressed:  1) PNG engagement is a continued priority for PPG Phase and plans for engagement need to be detailed in the Pro Doc.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>2) Project focus needs to consider regional, national AND local level activities, which need to be reflected in the Pro Doc. The project needs to ensure that as ATSEA moves into SAP implementation, on-the-ground, local activities are included in addition to regional and national activities. While this expanded agenda is somewhat reflected in the PIF, there are still statements such as the objective of Component 1, which is focused on regional and national (not sub-national) implementation mechanisms, that indicate the project is not fully embracing the idea of localized activities.</p> <p>3) In developing the Pro Doc Results Framework, be certain to consider the overall objective of protecting biodiversity and improving quality of life of inhabitants. The Results Frameworks needs to, therefore, include quantified baseline ecological and socioeconomic indicators and targets.</p> <p>4) In Component 2, pollution sources and potential reduction measures need to be clearly defined in the Pro Doc. The information in the PIF (Outputs 2.1.3 and 2.2.1 in particular) are vague with regard to what activities will be addressed and what measures will be considered. The explanation of ICM plans notes the "formulation and enactment of local regulations", but not which sectors (mining, agriculture, forestry and mariculture are not noted) or what measures will be considered. The Pro Doc needs to specify which sources will</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>be addressed and what measures will be pursued.</p> <p>5) The private sector needs to be engaged during PPG and the Pro Doc needs to clearly identify the key sectors, identify the relevant organizations and explain how they will be engaged based on PPG consultations.</p> <p>6) Local stakeholder engagement needs to be thought through and articulated in the Pro Doc. A.5 is useful in clarifying the addition of community organizers, local extension workers and technical experts; however, the explanation of the project plans in section A. A.1.3 implies local engagement will be through the SPF only. During PPG the important role of on-the-site staff needs to be well planned and clarified in the Pro Doc. Stakeholder engagement during PPG is critical and details of how it will continue need to be articulated in the Pro Doc.</p> <p>7) The key IW-3 Program 6 and 7 indicators need to be identified, the baseline quantified and the targets quantified during PPG.</p> <p>8) We look forward to the final TE report and will consider the recommendations in the Pro Doc before proceeding with the project. Therefore, please consider the TE recommendations carefully.</p> <p>9) During PPG the BD activities need to be further developed and related directly to the GEF-6 BD Strategy (link in Aug 15 comment above) and specific programs.</p> <p>10) In the Pro Doc please clarify what is the baseline financing and what is the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		additional co-financing for purposes of implementation of the SAP, which is unclear in the PIF Table C.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	August 14, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 25, 2014	
	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.**