



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\*

### THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4659		
Country/Region:	Vietnam		
Project Title:	Coastal Resources for Sustainable Development: Mainstreaming the Application of Marine Spatial Planning Strategies, Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	1124702 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; IW-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,500,000
Co-financing:	\$117,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$124,400,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Jiang Ru

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?		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the		

Resource Availability	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	<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>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes. However, in Table A: Focal Area Strategy framework, please provide Grant & Co-financing amounts for each outcome.  12 Feb 2013 UA: Provided.  Cleared
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		1 Feb 2013 UA: BD-1, BD-2, IW-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?		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.  NBSAP VN Fisheries Development Strategy

			<p>main PDO level results indicators are FULLY aligned with and support the implementation of the SDS-SEA targets. Maybe an additional output indicator or two needs to be included. Further, It is very hard to see reference to how this project will help the country to reach the agreed SDS-SEA Targets. Please do explain in much more detail.</p> <p>12 Feb 2013 UA: Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		<p>1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes. Capacity building is addressed within the institutional framework.</p> <p>Cleared</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>1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Project Design	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>1 Feb 2013 UA:</p> <p>Clarification request: The Project Paper for Additional Financing indicates that the GEF funding will lead to savings from the IDA credit, and as a result be allocated to finance few additional</p>

			<p>raises the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will GEF grant funding just replace loan financing of certain activities?</li> <li>- If a loan has already been released and the country has already agreed to use loan financing for the CRSD project with all results as presented in the results framework, why is additional finance from GEF justified?</li> <li>- Technically, the additional GEF finance would lead to financing of additional infrastructure activities in the project. This is not in our interest and counter to the concept of incremental finance (see comment #13 below).</li> </ul> <p>12 Feb 2013 UA: Addressed. The Decision Meeting Note has been amended and use of released funds will be decided at MTR stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>		<p>1 Feb 2013 UA: Incremental reasoning has been applied. However, please refer to comments under #12 and clarify incrementality of funding that only leads to savings in IDA finance.</p> <p>12 Feb 2013 UA: Addressed, refer above #12.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>		<p>1 Feb 2013 UA and Cseverin: Yes for the most part but please do make sure that the main PDO level results indicators are fully aligned with and support the implementation of the SDS-SEA targets. Further, proper</p>

		<p>targets also needs to be instilled throughout the document.</p> <p>12 Feb 2013 UA: Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>1 Feb 2013 UA: Please explain why the LMMA sites have not been finally selected at this stage.</p> <p>12 Feb 2013 UA: Clarified - Final selection of LMMA sites will be done in a participatory way.</p> <p>Cleared</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>1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</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>1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes. The project risk is rated as substantial.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes</p>

			Cleared
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes. In line with PFD approved by Council Nov 2011.  Cleared
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		1 Feb 2013 UA: No costs for GEF.  However, please make the project management costs consistent in Table B and table F, which should show the same amount.  12 Feb 2013 UA: Corrected.  Cleared
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		1 Feb 2013 UA:  Please provide co-financing commitment documents in order to process for CEO endorsement.  12 Feb 2013 UA: Provided. Refer to comment matrix of World Bank.  Cleared
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in		1 Feb 2013 UA: Yes

			Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>1 Feb 2013 UA:</p> <p>Yes for BD tracking tool. In view that LMMAs are only candidates that could be selected for GEF financing, the agency needs to ensure updating of the tracking tool. Furthermore, Candidate area 5 (Ca Mau/Dat Nui) has not been entered into the tracking tool.</p> <p>Please do insert into IW tracking tool projected reductions under "stress Reduction" so that it will be possible to identify the project output. Please do strongly consider to see if it would be possible to include one or more of the SDS-SEA Targets into the IW Tracking tool</p> <p>Cleared subject to later submission of an updated BD and IW tracking tool, latest at board approval.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>1 Feb 2013 UA:</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• Council comments?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>		
	31. Items to consider at CEO		

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?		n/a
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		1 Feb 2013 UA: No. Please address clarification requests.  12 Feb 2013 UA: Yes. Endorsement is recommended.  Cleared
Review Date (s)	First review*		February 01, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		February 12, 2013
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</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.