



# GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT\*

GEF Program ID:	4635		
Country/Region:	Regional (Regional, China, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam)		
Program Title:	Scaling Up Partnership Investments for Sustainable Development of the Large Marine Marine Ecosystems of East Asia and their Coasts(PROGRAM)		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	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):	IW-2; IW-2; IW-3; IW-3; BD-1; BD-1; BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$43,500,000
Co-financing:	\$753,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$796,500,000
PFD Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
		Expected Program Start Dt:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, the participating countries are eligible.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Endorsement letters have not been attached. Please do attach and fill in table A in part 3 of the PFD template.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Endorsement letter for Philippines recieved, but still missing endorsement letters from China, Vietnam and Indonesia, however, the World Bank have communicated that these are expected over the coming days.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): No, please include description of the agency's comparative advantage.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Yes, this has been properly addressed.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): No
	5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): It is hard to establish excatly, as the agency's comparative advantage has not been described.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Addressed

Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	(Nglieur) Yes, BD STAR available for Indonesia,PI, & Vietnam as reflected in table D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>(Nglieur) Yes, BD STAR available for Indonesia,PI, &amp; Vietnam as reflected in table D.</p> <p>9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, funds are available under the IW focal area, however, the agreement was that the PFD would only request \$25mio, please lower requested amount.</p> <p>15th of September 2011 (cseverin): IW amount still at \$27.5</p> <p>20th of September 2011 (cseverin): IW amount now at \$25 excluding fees.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	
Program Consistency	7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	<p>(Nglieur) yes</p> <p>9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): The PFD is aligned with the IW focal area results framework, however, there is an apparent lack of quantifiable indicators, both in table B as well as in the description of the sub-projects. The PFD need to include a project results framework for both PFD as well as sub-projects to better understand what the targets for the programme investments have been identified as. In the results framework or project logframe please include an outcome indicator that delivers an annual status report of the PFD which explains the synergetic results that the subprojects are delivering when implemented under a programme compared to single country investments.</p> <p>Further, it is central that the results framework includes estimates of the effects of the interventions themselves at time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>On top of the results framework, please include a along the lines of: "Project level ecosystem and environmental results indicators will be established in each project and sufficient budget programmed to determine impact from the baseline situation consistent with GEF International Waters M &amp; E evidence and</p>

		15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Above points addressed satisfactory
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	(Nglieur) BD:yes 9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes
	9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, the proposed PFD includes sub-projects that are aligned with the countries priorities. However, please include description of the synergetic outputs and outcomes of the PFD, to make it apparent how these are consistent with the regions and countries national priorities.  Further, please do include where referenced, and include as appendix (in section 2,C (page 9)) the status report of the World Bank/GEF Strategic Partnership for Landbased Pollution Reduction Investment Fund for the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Above points addressed.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): NO, as the PFD does not clearly state quantifiable outcomes and outputs of the PFD in its totality.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Addressed
	11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Please explain why (under baseline description) it is mentioned why the baseline program will not be able to adress the challenges faced by the two projects under component 1. Is there a solution to that or ???  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Addressed.
Program Design	12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) <b>will not</b> materialize if the	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, for suggested sub-projects enjoy a large cofinancing from both the agency and the countries and would most likely also be undertaken without GEF investment.

	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>(Nglinear) Please specify under proposed program activities that 1% of the GEF IW grant funding will be allocated to IW-Learn.</p> <p>15th of September 2011 (cseverin): above point addressed</p> <p>Please ensure that climate changes activities adhere to IW-2 outcome 2.4. At present, there are a lot of adaptation to CC activities that are proposed under BD. It is suggested that funding for these activities is sought through SCCF or/and the adaptation fund as they do not qualify for BD funding.</p>
	<p>14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>(Nglinear) Please include in project framework component 2 outputs: increase in number, and coverage, of MPAs</p> <p>9th of September 2011 (Cseverin):No, please include detailed results framework that includes each of the sub projects and outlines the expected quantifiable outputs. It is central that the results framework not only sums up the number of interventions, but actually lists the effects of the interventions (eg reduction of N or BOD in tons), the latter at time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>The PFD as it stands presently, does not properly explains what the outcomes and outputs will be for the entire programme, nor for each sub project, it is essential that this is included.</p> <p>Please include wording along the lines of "Project level ecosystem and environmental results indicators will be established in each project and sufficient budget programmed to determine impact from the baseline situation consistent with GEF International Waters M &amp; E guidance and GEF 5 Strategy."</p> <p>Please consult with the African Fisheries PFD and include a results framework along the same lines.</p> <p>For consistency issues, please rename the PFD to following: "Scaling Up Partnership Investments for Sustainable Development of the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia and their Coasts"</p> <p>15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Above points addressed.</p>
	<p>15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the</p>	<p>9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, this is clearly described.</p>

	additional benefits?	
	16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, public participation has been taken into consideration and is described satisfactory.
	17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): A risk matrix along with potential mitigation measures has been included, however, it does not describe potential climate change risks to the PFD and the sub projects proposed. Please include this.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Above included.
	18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, the PFD identifies a number of regional bodies as well as on going projects.
	19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): NO, please explain in detail how the PFD and the sub projects will be implemented/executed.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Addressed satisfactory
Program Financing	20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, as \$0 have been set aside for programme management/project management.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Project management cost increased, but is only at %5, so still within the norm, and is co-financed appropriately
	21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, the proposed funding and co-financing amounts seems to be adequate to undertake suggested project activities. However, a bit hard to establish, as it is still not clear what expected quantifiable outcomes and outputs will be expected.  Please make sure that there is coherency between table B and Table D in section 1.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Addressed
	22. Comment on the indicated co-financing.	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): The indicated level of co-financing is more than 1:15, which is considered to be fine.
	23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): Yes, indeed, as the agency is bringing in \$580 mio in soft and hard loans.
Program Monitoring and	24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): No, the tracking tools have not been included, please fill in at time of CEO Endorsement for both JW and PD and

	25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
Agency Responses	26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	• STAP?	
	• Convention Secretariat?	
	• Council comments?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	<b>27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?</b>	9th of September 2011 (Cseverin): NO PFD clearance is not recommended at this time, please review and respond to comments and resubmit.  15th of September 2011 (cseverin): Yes, PFD clearance is recommended, with the caveat that three endorsement letters are still missing and these would have to be submitted within a reasonable timeframe.
	28. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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 program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.**

### REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program	1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat	<b>3. Is PCB/PPG for Program approval</b>	

	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.