**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS**

**THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GEF ID: | **9919** | | |
| Country/Region: | **Regional** | | |
| Project Title: | **Implementation of the SAP of the Dinaric Karst Aquifer System: Improving Groundwater Governance and Sustainability of Related Ecosystems** | | |
| GEF Agency: | **UNDP** | GEF Agency Project ID: | **5776 (UNDP)** |
| Type of Trust Fund: | **GEF Trust Fund** | GEF Focal Area (s): | **International Waters** |
| Program Manager: |  | Agency Contact Person: | **Vladimir Mamaev** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CEO endorsement Review** |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Design and**  **Financing** | 1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided? | (SHansen 6.26.19): No significant changes. |  |
| 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | (SHansen 6.26.19):  1. As a general comment. Please look at the portal submission and:  A) make sure that text has been provided for all the portal headings - e.g. text is missing for the headings -  “2) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects”; “5) Global environmental benefits” and “6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up”);  SH (7.16.19): Not addressed.  - The submission lacks a clear description of information pertaining to innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up. Please address.  - The submission lacks a structured section pertaining to expected contributions from other baseline projects, including information on how ongoing or planned projects (funded by e.g. IFIs or bilateral donors) directly/indirectly supports the objective of the project. In addition, please make sure that the list of baseline projects is reflected in the targeted stakeholders’ involvement plan presented at inception.  - In relevant sections, please use the term Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs).  - Please delete headings from the portal submission which do not contribute to the flow of the text. Note that there should not be headings in the portal submission which only contain the text "NA".  B) eliminate duplicate headings which have been copy pasted from the agency project doc’s and into the portal submission.  C) Insert a new version of figure 2. Currently the figure is not showing in the portal submission.  SH (7.16.19): Not addressed. Figure 2 appears as an empty box. Note that it might be necessary to talk to GEF IT support to fix this technical glitch.  Additional comments:  2. Regarding output 3.1 and 3.2: Please explain how the project is securing the long-term sustainability of the groundwater multi-purpose monitoring network? Long term sustainability is expected to be closely linked to costs and resource mobilization with links to both national budget codes and bilateral support.  SH (7.16.19): Addressed. It is understood that the monitoring network is a commitment of the countries as indicated in the Strategic Action Program. Realizing that public and donor funds are often scarce, the project from its inception phase and onward should actively evaluate what actions can be undertaken to secure the long-term financial sustainability of the envisioned multi-purpose monitoring network.  3. Regarding project outcome 2 and source protection zones: Rightly so the project prioritizes the establishment and enforcement of source protection zones around springs and wells utilized for public water supply etc. Within this context, please explain:  A. A) How the project will secure the constructive involvement of agriculture and animal husbandry sectors? Such stakeholders are critical when developing and implementing policy/legal frameworks that feature both elements of “polluter pays” and “cost recovery” principles along with potential government sponsored incentive schemes. In general, it is concerning that the tourist, agriculture and animal husbandry have been under-represented and consequently not identified in the stakeholder analysis. Appropriate mitigation actions should be put in place during project implementation.  SH (7.16.19): Addressed.  B. B) It remains to be seen to what extent overlap between new protection zones and e.g. wastewater discharge sites/historical pollution hot-spots/ uncontrolled landfills etc. will occur. Has the project considered to what extent it can help facilitate resource mobilization activities (e.g. via the NICs) targeted the clean-up of heavy pollution such as PCBs, heavy metals, chlorine, lead etc.SH (7.16.19): addressed. | * **2)** text has been added at page 18 of the Request for Endorsement (similar text is present at page 68 of the PD) * **5)** and **6):** textcan befound on page 48, 49   Some of these comments were addressed in the previous resubmission and some we understand that they were not taken into consideration as they had not appeared correctly in the portal submission.  All portal headings are now displayed / completed correctly in portal |
| 3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective? | (SHansen 6.26.19): Yes |  |
| 4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience) | SHansen 6.26.19):  1. Please please consider expanding the risk response matrix. As an example, to what extent is is it a risk that during PPG the agriculture and animal husbandry sectors where not extensively consulted? Are there risks associated with the varying level of capacity across the participating countries?  SH (7.16.19): Addressed |  |
| 5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided? | (SHansen 6.26.19): Yes |  |
| 6. Are relevant tracking tools completed? | (SHansen 6.26.19):  1. Please populate indicator 7.2 and 7.3. Please also consider if the project contributes towards other indicators such as indicator 4 and 11?  SH (7.16.19): indicator 7.4 is set at 4. Please readjust to 1. | Indicators 7.2, 7.3 have been populated as requested  Indicator 7.4 revised as requested  Indicator 4: the project will promote new aquifer protection policies and tools throughout the Dinaric Karst System which includes very large sections of the territory of the project countries (>8m ha). This will indirectly have favourable impacts on karst biodiversity and land management. However, none of the sub-indicators seems to apply to this case.  Indicator 11: See above. The numbers would equal the total number of the project countries population, which seems excessive. |
| 7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented? | (SHansen 6.26.19): NA |  |
| 8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region? | (SHansen 6.26.19):  1. See previous comments. Also, the Knowledge Management section should contain a short description of how baseline initiatives will be incorporated into the overall project KM approach  SH (7.16.19): Addressed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | (SHansen 6.26.19): Yes |  |
|  | 10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan? | (SHansen 6.26.19): Yes |  |
|  | 11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[[1]](#footnote-1) stage from: |  |  |
|  GEFSEC | (SHansen 6.26.19):  1. Please include in the re-submission a LOE from Montenegro signed by the current GEF OFP.  SH (7.16.19): Addressed. |  |
|  STAP | (SHansen 6.26.19):  1. Overall yes. However, the project portal submission contains the following text: “The CIE shall be open to other Dinaric countries including but not limited to Serbia, Republic of North Macedonia, Italy and Slovenia, sharing the Karst aquifer system, upon their request and approval from the CIE Secretariat.”.  Within this context please specify if the PPG phase was used to establish a dialogue with the above-mentioned countries as to facilitate a formal request to the CIE Secretariat? If this is not the case, then please consider adding text in the project document which specifies the intention of the project to establishing such a dialogue during the project inception phase. `  SH (7.16.19): Addressed. |  |
|  GEF Council | 1. Overall yes. However, the project portal submission contains the following text: “The CIE shall be open to other Dinaric countries including but not limited to Serbia, Republic of North Macedonia, Italy and Slovenia, sharing the Karst aquifer system, upon their request and approval from the CIE Secretariat.”.  Within his context please specify if the PPG phase was used to establish a dialogue with the above-mentioned countries as to facilitate a formal request to the future CIE Secretariat? If this is not the case, then please consider adding text in the project document which specifies the intention of the project to establishing such a dialogue during the project inception phase.  SH (7.16.19): Addressed. |  |
|  Convention Secretariat | (SHansen 6.26.19): NA |  |
| **Recommendation** | 12. Is CEO endorsement recommended? | (SHansen 6.26.19): Please address comments and resubmit.  SH (7.16.19): Please address comments and resubmit. |  |
| **Review Date** | Review | 6/26/2019 |  |
|  | Additional Review (as necessary) | 7/16/2019 |  |
|  | Additional Review (as necessary) |  |  |

1. If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)