



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

GEF ID:	<b>5171</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Indonesia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program-Coral Triangle Initiative, Phase III (COREMAP-CTI III)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>ADB</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; BD-1; BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$8,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$56,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$64,000,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>November 01, 2012</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Charlotte Gobin</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>M. Nasimul Islam</b>

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 country eligible?	Yes, Indonesia is a GEF eligible country.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the GEF OFP endorsed the project on March 16th 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, ADB is well suited to implement this third phase of the project with the Government of Indonesia, and specifically the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	

\*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, this child project is part of the GEF-4 Coral Triangle Initiative	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	As of 10/17/2012 there is \$23,769,775 left in BD STAR for Indonesia.	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N?A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, the project aims to establish 10 new protected areas and increase management of 2,233,308 ha's of ecosystem. Further, strengthening policies and regulatory frameworks and implementing sustainable financing for long-term success are key to the project's goals.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, BD-1 (Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2) and BD-2 (Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2) are identified and appropriate to this project and inline with the GEF-4 parent program.	
	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?	Yes, this project is inline with Indonesia's strong commitment to a healthy Coral Triangle. This includes the CTI-CFF National Plan of Action, Indonesia's Long-term (2005 - 2025) and Mid-term (2010-2014) Development Plans, and its National	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan. The project is also inline with the executing organization's strategic plan, Indonesia's Ministry of marine Affairs and Fisheries.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, increased financial resources mobilized for MPA conservation via PES is a specific aspect of the project. Expected Output 1.9 directly identifies conducting marine ecosystem valuation methodology in three pilot sites. Expected Output 1.10 will lead to ten MPA sustainable business plans and strengthening of financial management capacities. Expected Output 1.12 will then integrate these business plans into 13 sub-national coastal development plans and policies within Indonesia.	
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?	The baseline scenario for this project is sound. This is the third for three phases for COREMAP. This last phase is the most essential to ensure success of the CTI investment. Specifically, this phase aims to "institutionalize" the project by establishing sources of sustainable financing via PES and MPA business plans as well as establishing a nationally coordinated but "decentralized in implementation" of project activities as they become mainstreamed into government programs. Without GEF funding, the MPA management effectiveness - the core tool of the CTI in protecting ecosystems - would be obsolete and MPAs would either become "paper parks" or not exist at all. GEF funding will ensure institutional	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		arrangements are established and sustainable financing is produced.	
	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes, incremental reasoning was built into the three phase approach of the GEF-4 program. Because this project is implementing the last phase, it is building off of two previous projects successes. The additionality of this third phase will "institutionalize" the project by establishing sources of sustainable financing via PES and MPA business plans as well as establishing a nationally coordinated but "decentralized in implementation" of project activities as they become mainstreamed into government programs.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, the project framework is clear.  However, please note that Expected Outcome for Component 3 does not identify the percent increase in uptake of conservation based livelihoods - currently it says X%. Please address at full project document stage.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, the applied methodology for incremental benefits is sound.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	Yes. Socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, are key to the project's incremental benefits.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, community participation in the management of the MPAs is at the core of the project's management effectiveness strategy. Because the local ministry is executing the project, and it is part of a very large and popular regional initiative, stakeholder involvement is high.	
	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>No, not all risks are identified. The risk that government/community adoption of MPA management plans is not identified. The PIF should identify any anticipated changes in national government/ministries.</p> <p>Further, mitigation measures for impacts to climate change are poorly addressed.</p> <p>Please address at full project document stage.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is very closely coordinated with the parent program as well as the larger CTI. Because this is the third and final phase of the program, there is very high coordination built off previous successes.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, the ADB/Government of Indonesia Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries have a very good relationship built off previous phases of this project.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The PM for this \$8 million project is \$350,000 or 4.5% of the project's activities cost.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, to co-financing per objective is appropriate and demonstrates the country's willingness towards CTI and COREMAP.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Of the \$53 million in co-financing, \$50 million is coming from a hard loan from ADB to the government of Indonesia. This leaves a co-financing ratio of over 1:6. The large loan amount relative to the GEF grant demonstrates the interest and seriousness of Indonesia to protect its marine environment.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Of the \$53 million in co-financing, \$50 million is coming from a hard loan from ADB to the government of Indonesia. This leaves a co-financing ratio of over 1:6. The large loan amount relative to the GEF grant demonstrates the interest and seriousness of Indonesia to protect its marine environment.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		N/A
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators		N/A

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	No STAP comments have been provided at this time [10/17/2012]	
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.  Please address the two minor issues identified above at full project document stage.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please address the minor issues associated with risks and program framework should be addressed at the CEO Endorsement stage.	
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*	October 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
<b>PPG Budget</b>	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	02/08/2013: N/A
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	02/08/2013: N/A
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	02/08/2013: The PPG request complies with the new requirement (January 2013). The amount requested is US\$219,000 including Agency's fees.
	4. Other comments	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	First review*	February 08, 2013
	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.