



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

GEF ID:	4930		
Country/Region:	Global (Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mozambique, Timor Leste, Vanuatu)		
Project Title:	Enhancing the Conservation Effectiveness of Seagrass Ecosystems Supporting Globally Significant Populations of Dugong Across the Indian and Pacific Oceans Basins (Short Title: The Dugong and Seagrass Conservation Project)		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$170,000	Project Grant:	\$5,884,018
Co-financing:	\$99,299,043	Total Project Cost:	\$105,353,061
PIF Approval:	April 20, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Edoardo

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?	04/06: Yes. Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mozambique, Vanuatu, Sri Lanka and Timor Leste are eligible for funding.	12/9: Salomon Islands joined the program. Salomon Island is eligible for funding. However, there is a discrepancy between the allocated financing mentioned in the letter (\$800,000) and the amount mentioned in Table D (\$803,405); please adjust accordingly. 04/10: Table D has been updated but a discrepancy remains. The allocated financing mentioned in the letter (\$800,000) and the amount mentioned in

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Table D (\$800,001); please adjust accordingly. 05/01: Cleared.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	04/06: The operational focal points of the concerned countries endorsed the project. However, there is a discrepancy between the figures shown in the Mozambique OFP's letter and Table D of the PIF. 04/19: Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	04/06: Yes	12/9: Yes.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	04/06: N/A	12/9: N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	04/06: This project is consistent with the UNEP Blue Carbon Initiative and UNEP is involved in several marine mammal action plans and projects. Finally, the UNEP-WCMC hosts the Dugong MoU secretariat. However, please provide more information on UNEP staff who will be directly involved in the project. 04/19: Addressed	12/09: The project fits well into UNEP's program. Cleared.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	04/06: Yes.	12/09: The proposed grant fits within the resources available from the STAR of the 8 countries. Cleared.
	• the focal area allocation?	04/06: N/A	12/09: Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	04/06: N/A	12/09: N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	04/06: N/A	12/09: N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	04/06: N/A	12/09: N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	04/06: The project is seeking \$880,000; which is about 16% of the total budget requested to the GEFTF.	12/09: The project is seeking \$880,000; which is about 13.5% of the total budget requested to the GEFTF. Cleared.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	04/06: Yes, the project is well aligned with the GEF-5 Biodiversity objectives.	12/09: Yes, the project is well aligned with the GEF-5 results framework. Cleared.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	04/06: Yes, the project will focus on the GEF-5 Biodiversity objectives 1 and 2.	12/09: Yes, the project will focus on the GEF-5 Biodiversity objectives 1 and 2. Cleared.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	04/06: Yes, the project is well consistent with the countries' national strategies.	12/09: Yes, the project is consistent with the countries' national strategies, including NBSAP. Cleared.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	04/06: Initial information is provided. However, please give more details on how the capacities developed by the project will contribute to the sustainability of the outcomes. Specify who are the different stakeholders concerned. 04/19: Information has been provided under section B2, however, further details are expected at CEO endorsement stage. Addressed at PIF stage.	12/09: The project will focus on stakeholder engagement and will develop national capacity to maximise the impact of the project at various governmental and societal levels. An indicative number of person trained by category (e.g. government, CSO, local communities...) will be useful. 04/10: Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	11. 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?	04/06: Preliminary information is provided. However, please, give accurate data on the Dugong current status for the concerned regions and better detail the threats. Furthermore, in order to strengthen the baseline, please explain the role and activities of the Dugong MoU secretariat, the activities implemented by countries, in compliance with international conventions (CITES, CMS...). 04/19: Addressed.	12/09: The baseline is sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions. Appendix 17 provides a global overview of the Dugong status and analysis of the past and current activities related to Dugong conservation. Cleared.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		12/09: Yes, the cost-effectiveness is well demonstrated. The anchoring of the project under the umbrella of the CMS Dugong MoU ensures the best expertise, methods and knowledge sharing. This also ensure a mechanism for capitalisation and replication of successful approaches. At the country level, working at community level for behavior change and at national level for strengthening legal framework are relevant approaches. Cleared.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	04/06: The seagrass ecosystem is globally significant, as key habitat for a variety of commercial and ecological important species and as a provider of key ecosystem services such carbon sequestration. The Dugong will be used as the overall "Flagship species" of conservation concern within this project. The proposed activities aim to improve the management effectiveness of targeted habitat and species (in and outside PAs). Addressed at PIF stage.	12/09: Yes, activities funding are based on incremental reasoning. The project will build on global and national existing initiatives and will contribute to their scaling-up, replication. The project will support the implementation of incentive mechanisms, which have been developed as pilot.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>04/06: Articulation and coordination arrangements among the local, national, regional and international levels of intervention have to be further explained. The project's outputs to alleviate the identified threats are listed, however, please provide further details on the expected activities to achieve these outputs and demonstrate the integrative approach. Table A-Framework: please remove the last row mentioning the set-aside and spread the budget under the three other rows. Clear expected targets on biodiversity status will have to be defined (status of marine species, rate of seagrass coverage, coverage and integrity of habitats...).</p> <p>Component 1: Please, clarify which activities will be undertaken in PA and outside PAs. Incentive and certification mechanisms are mentioned in the project framework, therefore could you please provide more detailed information on how these outcomes will be achieved.</p> <p>Component 2 and 4 have the same objective: increase knowledge and awareness. Therefore, it is recommended to merge them and to include all the studies, toolbox in this component.</p>	<p>12/09: The project framework is well developed and detailed. Annex 4 and 20 provide substantial and useful details. Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Component 3: Please provide more information on the expected output 3.2.3.</p> <p>04/19: Clarification and detailed information have been provided. Addressed at PIF stage. Targeted sites, measurable indicators for each outcome, METT score for concerned PA will be provided at CEO endorsement stage.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>		<p>12/09: The project methodology was reviewed and approved by CMS Dugong MoU technical advisors. The methodology proposed is based on scientific research, described in Annex 17, and on the field experience. The project has developed sub-projects responding to national priorities and specificity. Cleared.</p>
	<p>16. 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?</p>	<p>04/06: Preliminary information has been provided. However, please give a first insight of the expected number of person targeted.</p> <p>04/19: Justification is provided. It is noted that further information will be provided at CEO endorsement. Addressed.</p>	<p>12/09: The socio-economic benefits are mentioned but at very generic level, please provide some specifics that will arise from this project including gender dimensions (e.g revenue generated for communities or number of community benefitting from LMMA), and how this will support the sustainability of outcomes post-project.</p> <p>04/10: Cleared.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>04/06: yes, however more information is expected at CEO endorsement phase.</p> <p>04/19: Substantial information has been included in section B2 and B5. It is noted that further information</p>	<p>12/09: The public participation is clearly mentioned as a key element of the project success. Stakeholder consultation have taken place at PIF and PPG stage, resulting in the development of 40 sub-projects addressing national</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		(measurable) will be added at CEO endorsement. Addressed.	priority issues. Cleared.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	04/06: Yes, however, please include the consequences of climate change and provide appropriate mitigation measures. 04/19: Addressed.	12/09: Yes, the potential major risks have been taken into account and risk mitigation measures are relevant. Cleared.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	04/06: Yes. However, please provide also information on the related on-going regional or national initiatives (including SPREP program, the French MPA agency activities in Mayotte...) and specify the added-value of the proposed project. 04/19: Addressed.	12/09: Appendix 22 gives a full picture of the related initiatives in the region and countries. A steering committee will be established in each of the 8 countries to ensure good coordination and complementary with these on-going and future initiatives. Cleared.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	04/06: Please provide more detail on the implementation arrangement and coordination at the national, regional and international level and please give a first insight of the cost. 04/19: Comprehensive information has been added on the implementation arrangements. However, as noted, the coordination cost will have to be provided at CEO endorsement stage. Addressed at PIF stage.	12/09: This is a large and complex project involving 8 countries, and a wide range of partners. Effective implementation of the project requires robust implementation arrangement. UNEP will supervise an oversight the project. MbZSCF will be responsible for the financial administration and technical execution of the project at the global level. A project coordination team will be set-up. The CMS Dugong MoU secretariat will have an advisory role. At the national level, the project will be implemented by project partners and coordinated through a national project steering committee, including a representative of the CMS Dugong MoU. Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		12/09: Yes, the project is sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF. Cleared.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		12/09: N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	04/06: The project management cost is about 4.5%; which is fine.	12/9: The project management cost increased from PIF stage from 4.5% to 7.7%. We fully recognize the complexity of management arrangement however, please keep the PMC under the standard ceiling. 04/10: Justification for the project management cost has been provided and is acceptable. Cleared.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	04/06: The proposed budget for knowledge and awareness activities seems excessive (\$1,263,448) considering the activities proposed and the on-going initiatives through CITES, CMS. The budget for component 2 seems also excessive (\$1,076,272) considering the outputs expected (Identification of policy and sectoral gaps, initiation of process for PA designation). Therefore, please either reduce these budgets or provide sufficient rationale. 04/19: The new budget breakdown replies to comments raised, more emphasis is given to incentive-based sustainable financing and certification mechanisms. Addressed.	12/09: The funding and co-financing per objective is appropriate. Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>04/06: As a matter of presentation, please use one line per co-funders and if possible indicate the type of cofinancing. The current cofinancing ratio is 1:3.4. A large part of the activities will have a significant impact at the local level and national level, thus please balance the budget between GEF and other co-financiers.</p> <p>04/19: Co-financing has been increased. The co-financing ratio is now 1:3.65. It is noted that contacts with potential co-financiers will be undertaken in order to increase the co-financing ratio by CEO endorsement stage. Addressed.</p>	<p>12/9: The cofinancing ratio has significantly increased from PIF stage from 1:3.65 to 1:16.8 due mainly to the Australian in-kind contribution of \$85,000,000.</p> <p>For some co-financing, there is discrepancy between information in the letter and Table C, as described below: The Mohamed Bin Zayed co-financing will be in inkind, as mentioned in the letter dated 9/10/2013; please update Table C accordingly. The CMS office-Abu Dhabi co-financing is only in-kind, as mentioned in the letter dated 09/17/2013, please update accordingly. The SPREP co-financing is \$18,000 in cash and \$40,000 in-kind, please update accordingly Table C. The University of Malyasia co-financing has to be mentioned in dollars, please update accordingly. Most of the other co-financing letters (42 of them) are either missing or not mentioning the level of their contribution to the project; please update accordingly.</p> <p>04/10: It is noted that project partners may have incorrectly interpreted their contribution but Table C has to reflect the information provided by the co-financiers letters. Therefore please update Table C, in including the information provided in the co-financiers' letters. Regarding the co-financing letters with</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>co-financing in local currency; please ask the project's executing partner to write and sign an umbrella letter listing those cofinancing and indicating the amount in US, for reference. Table C will use this amount in US\$ as reference.</p> <p>For some co-financiers, the project has now three different letters of support. In the next set, please only include the most relevant ones.</p> <p>Indonesian support: could you please explain the footnote 6, as the total indicated in the co-financing letter (US\$1,489,198) seems correct.</p> <p>The in-kind supports from the Government of Papua New Guinea and Solomon Island government are missing in Table C.</p> <p>The Australian co-financing: please report in Table C the information provided in the co-financing letter: an in-kind contribution of US\$85 million. Some co-financing letters are missing e.g. Sea World, Lamina Foundation, Bogor university, WWF Indonesia; please adjust accordingly.</p> <p>05/01: Cleared.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>04/06: UNEP-CMS will provide \$2,574,500 as cofinancing. Please, specify the type of this cofinancing.</p> <p>04/19: Co-financing from UNEP-WCMC has increased from US\$2,5 to US\$2,8. UNEP headquarter will also provide US\$150,000 in kind.</p>	<p>12/9: UNEP co-financing has significantly decreased, from US\$ 2.9M at PIF stage to US\$0.12M at CEO endorsement; please provide the rational for such decrease.</p> <p>The Agency fees cannot exceed 9.5% of the GEF grant, please adjust accordingly.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		04/10: Cleared.	04/10: Cleared.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>12/09: GEF tracking tools have been provided. One sheet per country. However, further information needs to be provided. On the top of the "national" tracking tool sheet, it is expected to receive the information for each of the eleven targeted existing PAs.</p> <p>04/10: Thanks for the updated information regarding the 10 targeted existing PAs. Please, confirm that blank cells means 0. Please indicate the total score for each of PA (and check the number for Bazaruto). The Objective 2 TT lack of information, we understand the constraints. The CEO endorsement will be signed with the condition that the project includes fully completed METT in the first PIR review; which will constitute the baseline.</p> <p>05/01: As agreed, the CEO endorsement will be signed with the condition that the project includes fully completed METT in the first PIR review; which will constitute the baseline. Cleared.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		12/09: Yes, the project include an M&E plan, which will cost US\$215,633. The M&E plan will monitor the indicators and targets defined in the result framework, in Appendix 4. A budget is dedicated to the publication of lessons learnt; which is good. Cleared.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	04/06: No, please address the comments raised in the review sheet. 04/19: All the issues raised have been well addressed, therefore the Project is recommended for CEO Approval.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		12/09: The project cannot be technically cleared at this stage. Please respond to the questions raised on the above items.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		12/19: The project cannot be technically cleared at this stage. Please respond to the questions raised on the above items. 04/10: The project cannot be technically cleared at this stage. Please respond to the issues raised in items 1, 25, and 27. 05/01: The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO approval.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 19, 2012	April 10, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		May 01, 2014
	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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>04/25: Could you please explain why PPG activities will only start end of September 2012. For all components, please better identify the outputs expected and list them.</p> <p>Component 2: - Please provide more detail on the activities developed regarding the monitoring and evaluation. - In the PIF document, it was specified that at the PPG stage, studies and analysis will be undertaken to confirm the targeted sites; therefore please confirm that these activities will be done.</p> <p>Component 3: The outputs of component 3 (endorsement of the project document + Regional steering committee established) seem redundant with component 1; therefore please clarify the activities developed in each of these components.</p> <p>05/07: Addressed. It is noted that baseline, mid-term and end-of-project targets, and SMART indicators will be developed for each expected outcome.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>04/25: The budget requested to the GEFTF (US\$ 295,910) is excessive and should be significantly reduced.</p> <p>- The budget of component 1 on the coordination arrangement (US\$85,000) and component 3 on endorsement of the project document (US\$90,910) seem excessive even in the particular context of this global project. The two components could be merged and their budget reduced.</p> <p>- Component 4 on the preparation of the project document (US\$35,000) cannot be funded by the GEF and should mainly be supported by the Agency or co-financiers.</p> <p>- Annex A: Consultants cannot be involved in the project document writing; therefore please confirm that it will not be the case.</p>

		<p>05/07: The components on project preparation are now funded by the partners. The budget has been significantly reduced from \$295,910 to \$170,000, which is welcomed. Regarding this adjustment, please update Table D accordingly (specifying the amount requested per country).</p> <p>Regarding the suggestion made to move the PPG money cut to the project at CEO endorsement; this proposal is not possible. The project budget has already been approved and recommended to Council.</p> <p>06/14: Addressed, table D has been updated. Regarding the budget adjustment, if at CEO endorsement, the project amount is increased, CEO has the authority to endorse the larger project amount as long as the increased amount is 5% or less from the PIF amount approved by Council. Any increase above the 5%, the project will need to be re-circulated to Council. In both case, such increase in project amount will have to be well justified.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>04/25: No, please address the issues raised in the review sheet.</p> <p>05/07: No, please address the issue raised in Item 2.</p> <p>06/14: The PPG is being recommended for approval.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 25, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 07, 2012

* 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.