



## 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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,902,272
Co-financing:	\$17,822,950	Total Project Cost:	\$22,725,222
PIF Approval:	April 20, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Edoardo Zandri,

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?	04/06: Yes. Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mozambique, Vanuatu, Sri Lanka and Timor Leste are eligible for funding.	
	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	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency	04/06: 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	
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.	
	• the focal area allocation?	04/06: N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	04/06: N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	04/06: N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	04/06: N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	04/06: The project is seeking \$880,000; which is about 16% of the total budget requested to the GEFTF.	
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.	
	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.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE,	04/06: Yes, the project is well consistent with the countries' national strategies.	

	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>04/19: Information has been provided under section B2, however, further details are expected at CEO endorsement stage. Addressed at PIF stage.</p>	
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>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...).</p> <p>04/19: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>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</p>	

		<p>the management effectiveness of targeted habitat and species (in and outside PAs). Addressed at PIF stage.</p>	
	<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>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>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		
	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>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>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<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 (measurable) will be added at CEO endorsement. Addressed.</p>	
	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)	<p>04/06: Yes, however, please include the consequences of climate change and provide appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>04/19: Addressed.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related	04/06: Yes. However, please provide also information on the related on-going	

	region?	(including SPREP program, the French MPA agency activities in Mayotte...) and specify the added-value of the proposed project.  04/19: Addressed.	
	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.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	04/06: The project management cost is about 4.5%; which is fine.	
Project Financing	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	

		<p>gaps, initiation of process for PA designation). Therefore, please either reduce these budgets or provide sufficient rationale.</p> <p>04/19: The new budget breakdown replies to comments raised, more emphasis is given to incentive-based sustainable financing and certification mechanisms. Addressed.</p>	
	<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>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>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators</p>		

Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	04/06: No, please address the comments raised in the review sheet.  04/19: All the issues raised have been well addressed, therefore the PIF 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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	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



		<p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please provide more detail on the activities developed regarding the monitoring and evaluation.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>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>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>04/25:</p> <p>The budget requested to the GEFTF (US\$ 295,910) is excessive and should be significantly reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Annex A: Consultants cannot be involved in the project document writing; therefore please confirm that it will not be the case.</li> </ul>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	04/25: No, please address the issues raised in the review sheet.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 25, 2012
	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.