

Enabling concerted Source to Sea management in the Paz river watershed

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10074

Countries

Regional (El Salvador, Guatemala)

Project Name

Enabling concerted Source to Sea management in the Paz river watershed

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

9/25/2018

Review completed by PM

3/6/2020

Program Manager

Christian Severin

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I – Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: The proposal is aligned with the IW focal area mandate, however, considering the scope of the project, please address the funding to be coming from the strategic action "enhancing regional and national cooperation on shared freshwater - surface and ground water basins.

The project is weakly aligned to the chemicals and waste focal area. The disposal of a small amount of DDT does not strongly justify the utilization of chemicals resources for this project.

May 14, 2019 - Please include the HHP's that will be dealt with in the core indicators section. HHPs will be found under 9.1. Also please note that DDT disposal will come from POPs and not SAICM. In this regard please revise the programming of funds.

June 24 - Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

Funding coming from IW-3-6 has been duly addressed.

The text has been revised since proposed project activities consider more than just the disposal of a limited quantity 15 tons of obsolete DDT. Activities will, additionally, address the new programming lines of the Chemicals and Waste program 2 on Agriculture Chemicals in which the target is to reduce Endosulfan, Lindane and HHPs from the food chain. This will be done through the life cycle approach, in fact prevention from use, decisional making process, elimination of waste and testing of alternatives will be the key activities.

FAO is preparing an Agrichemical program under GEF that will consider the elimination of use of several POPs/HHPs from key crops such as coffee and other. This work will be aligned to the mentioned programme. Agriculture is known as the primary polluter to the watershed, hence the project will contribute to the reduction of exposure and release of POPs to protect human health and the environment. From the baseline, it is well known that water is contaminated with dozens of chemicals from agricultural activities. Presently in use, pesticides are mainly provided to farmers under government incentives programmes; thereby this problem has to be addressed through a better decision-making process. Concerning pesticides used in the project area, the situation can be described as follows:

At upper catchment level: Coffee is cultivated above 900 masl---application against coffee rest and coffee berry borer of Endosulfan (there are records on the use of 14 tons of Endosulfan and 55 tons of Paraquat in the coffee sector in Guatemala in 2015).

At middle catchment level: Use of Glyphosate and other herbicides (Paraquat) for corn production. A global ban on the use and manufacture of Endosulfan was considered under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants due to the threats it poses to the environment.

June 4, 2019 - Noted. The project is likely to avoid 140 tons of HHP in the coffee and banana sectors of El Salvador and Guatemala during project timeline (it is expected that benefits will consist in avoiding 70 tons of HHPs per year). On this account, risks to health of local communities and consumers, that may be exposed to pollution from stockpiles of POPs and other HHPs used in agriculture, will be reduced. Moreover, it is expected that a land area of 2,642 km² will be clear from the effects of HHPs. This has been reflected under section 4) *alignment with GEF focal area and/or impact program strategies* as well as in section 6) *global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)* of the CEO Endorsement Request. Sub-Indicator 9.1 has been filled accordingly.

As for the Programming of funds, it has been revised, DDT disposal has been marked as coming from POPs and not SAICM.

2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Considering the large focus on DDT removal through the project interventions, there is a lack of agricultural sector engagement, both through the TDA formulation process as well as the following SAP. The lack of private sector engagement is especially obvious when looking at activities. Please reformulate so that private sector engagement becomes an integral part of the TDA/SAP process, including the formulation of financing strategy for the SAP implementation. A stronger private sector engagement description, will also make it easier to understand how the project will be able to move from the 0 USD private sector funding leveraged to the 4 mio USD leveraged by the end of the project.

14th of May 2019: Addressed

3rd of July 2019:

Please ensure that the starting time and finishing time of the project is correct. further, please ensure that the right duration of project is included.

Under Output 3.1.3. project promotes integrated SLM approaches and includes an indicator “Area covered by SLM practices by participating farmers in pilot communities (GEF indicator)”. Please capture these results under GEF sub-indicator 4.3. Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems.

FAO can not undertake both implementing and executing functions of the project. Please ensure that this is clear when reading the sections pertaining to project implementation and execution. Further, please provide written request from the governments that FAO has been requested to provide direct project services, as indicated in the submission.

26th of September 2019 (cseverin): Partly addressed, but missing to be addressed is the issue on implementation/execution. FAO can not both be an implementing and executing agency. Please make changes to the project so that other executing partners will be undertaking the activities that current remains as FAO executed.

2nd of March 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

13th of March 2020 (cseverin):

1) Please change the dates of the portal and CEO approval document submission, implementation start and completion, so that it is updated, all the actual dates. Moreover, please edit the foreseen 2 months duration of the project (it is impossible to implement all suggested activities in 2 months).

2) Please upload translations, into English, of the two letters, that supports that FAO will be executing the identified \$60k for the project's terminal evaluation. The original Spanish letters, clearly includes other services too, but as agreed, FAO will ONLY be executing the \$60k pertaining to the Terminal Evaluation.

23rd of March 2020 (cseverin): Partly addressed, please adjust submission date to be the first time project was submitted under GEF 7.

25th of March 2002 (cseverin) Addressed.

Agency Response

Jan 2020

Lead executing agency will be Catholic Relief Services (\$852k), and funds will also be transferred to Gov Institutions and local NGOs (\$773k). FAO's independent Office of Evaluation (OED) will carry out the project's final evaluation. FAO will manage the \$60,000 associated with this evaluation.

Project budget has been updated to reflect these changes. Implementation arrangement also reflect these changes.

September 2019

1- Project start and finishing time has been updated.

2- The indicator has been included.

3- The Governments of Guatemala and El Salvador have asked FAO to support project co-execution.

In this regard, letters from the countries' GEF Operational Focal Points have been uploaded in the GEF portal as supporting documentation.

Please note that the Governments of Guatemala and El Salvador will maintain ownership of the project because: (i) they will lead the Project Steering Committee via their International Commission for Limits and Water (CILA, in Spanish) and their respective Ministries of environment; (ii) they will host project coordination units (within MoE); and (iii) they will develop the Annual Work Plans and Budgets via the Project's Coordination Unit.

FAO's co-execution services will support CILA to fulfill its institutional mandate. To this purpose, FAO will use instruments such as Letters of Agreement to transfer resources and execution responsibilities to different government agencies (CILA, MoE, Depts Forestry/Land Cadastre), local NGOs and community organization to carry out the diagnostic assessments. This includes activities under "Contracts" (USD 600,000), Trainings and workshops (USD 283,000) and specific purchases for

collection of measurements/data (USD 200,000). Overall, it is expected that roughly 68% of the project resources (and execution responsibilities) will be transferred to other institutions as outlined above.

In addition, FAO will support the Governments of Guatemala and El Salvador in recruiting project staff and national consultants (USD 366,500) that will ensure timely delivery of the project. FAO will provide expert support in the selection of consultants using its network (this backstopping is covered by the fee).

This is a highly complex project that includes several sectors (foreign affairs, agriculture, environment, forestry, chemicals, nutrition). FAO's institutional credibility and convening power will allow CILA to effectively engage all these diverse actors with an integrated coherent approach. Given that this is a bi-national project, FAO will work as an impartial agent to support decision processes at the basin level. This includes acting as an impartial representative in the eyes of local communities, and in particular, indigenous peoples. While technical project teams will be established within each country to ensure the day-to-day activities are carried out, a regional operations manager (consultant, \$48,000 over a 2 year period) will be located in FAO to help ensure an integrated vision is agreed upon (TDA and SAP). This regional operations manager will help facilitate discussion and provide ad-hoc mediation services if required.

FAO will provide technical backstopping (covered by the fee) to support national institutions as they develop. The FAO will not, under any circumstance, use project funds to pay for FAO staff or cover the travel/supervision costs of such staff. Hence, FAO serving in the co-execution role means Government's capacity can be strengthened in this area while the project's work moves ahead at the desired pace.

Finally, please be aware that FAO ensures alignment with the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy as FAO's project cycle Management Roles and Responsibilities establish a firewall between the execution and implementation functions. This is done by securing segregation of duties associated to the internal FAO roles, namely the Budget Holder (BH), Lead Technical Officers (LTO), Funding Liaison Officer (FLO), Office of Evaluation (OED), and Corporate Units as described in the FAO Project Document. Finally, FAO would like to reiterate that all project grants will be disbursed on the ground for the timely delivery of project outputs while FAO's oversight and supervision functions will be undertaken by FAO's own staff and co-funded by the agency fees.

May 2019

Noted, the engagement of the agricultural sector, as well as private sector, has been reflected in the TDA formulation process as well as in the development and agreement of the SAP.

The inclusion of private sector stakeholders in project activities is demonstrated in paragraphs 48, 50, 52, 53, under subsection 3) "The proposed alternative scenario with a description of outcomes and components of the project."

The involvement of the agricultural sector in the TDA and SAP has been integrated in the CEO ER and is emphasized in paragraphs 47, 49

Regarding the funding leveraged from the private sector under Output 2.1.2, perhaps it would be appropriate diversify the portfolio of potential funding sources and to consider other financial mechanisms and instruments, aside from the private sector. Other potential funding sources are :

- State budget (through environmental taxes)
- Agricultural sector (tax on export of agricultural products, certified products/eco-labeling of coffee, sugarcane)
- Tourism sector (international tourist rates in airports, tax on the agricultural industry)
- Payment for Environmental Services (associated with mangroves)

13th of March

Noted.

1. Dates have been modified in the portal (1-May-2020 to 30 April 2022). Duration of the project has been edited to 24 months.
2. The letters from the Governments and its corresponding translations have been uploaded under the documents section.
3. **If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

4. **Co-financing. Are the confirmed amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Please identify which category the different sources of cofinancing falls under. Secondly, please double check the cofinancing from FIAES, as the cofinancing letter mentions cofinancing to be allocated from 2017, 2018 and 2019. Considering this is november 2018, it seems likely that the cofinancing from 2017 and most likely 2018 may not materialize.

14th of May 2019: Addressed

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

Duly noted, sources of co-financing fall predominantly under Recurrent Expenditures.

Regarding the co-financing from FIAES, we requested an updated co-financing letter to FIAES (USD 1,247,609) that comprises the period from 2019 to 2021.

5. GEF resource availability. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Yes

3rd of July 2019: Please ensure that the amount inserted in table A and D are similar for the CW funding requested.

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

September 2019

Noted, inserted CW funding amounts to USD 293,035 in tables A and D.

STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 15th of November 2018: Yes

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Please look at the core indicators reported. It seems that the 15t chemicals may be inserted at the wrong place, if this indeed is an output target of the investment. Further, it seems that a value is missing for sub indicator 7.3, and 5.2 please fill in

On core indicator 10 there is no value included.

14th of May 2019: Please include the HHP's that will be dealt with in the core indicators section. HHPs will be found under 9.1.

June 24th - comment cleared

4th of March 2020 (cseverin): Please make sure there is coherency between results framework in both CEO Approval document, results framework in portal entry and portal template table E. The Result frameworks include mentioning of 1500 ha under improved management and 200 ha under SLM, as well as 15 Mt of DDT to be removed, however, have NO mentioning of the 140.5 Mt of POPS, which is mentioned in Table E.

Table E, includes only the 200 ha, but does not mention the 1500 ha, nor does it have any value under core indicator 11, which is odd, considering that the result frameworks indeed identifies beneficiaries. (btw, please re-assess to ensure that the total project envelope of ~\$4 mio will only have 400 beneficiaries. It sounds extremely low.) When this number have been reassessed and inserted in the respective results frameworks, please ENSURE to add to the Table E under core indicator 11. Further, please note that this indicator is disaggregated by gender.

6th of March 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

6th of March 2020

Noted.

The avoidance **140 tons of HHP** in the coffee and the banana sectors during project duration has been included under Output 3.1.4 in the Results Framework.

1500 hectares covered by management plans have been added under core sub-indicator 4.3 in the portal.

700 direct beneficiaries have been included under core indicator 11 in the portal. 40% of beneficiaries are women. These additional beneficiaries come from Output 2.2.3, where 30 stakeholders groups will be involved in the establishment of committees covering the basin.

Jan 2020

No response required

May2019

15 Tons of DDT were inserted under Indicator 9.1 Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type) since the proposal aims at identifying and re-packing up to 15 tons of DDT stockpiles

Regarding sub indicator 7.3, an inter-ministerial committee for S2S management will be established in each country under Output 2.2.2. No IMC exists at the moment. Support to undertake priority reforms in S2S management will be provided under Outcome 2.1. A rating of 1 has been inserted under sub indicator 7.3

As for sub indicator 5.2, the Pacific Central American Coastal LME has been selected.

Concerning Indicator 10, Output 3.1.4, has been revised. As final target, 15 tons of DDT, a pesticide listed in Annex B of the Stockholm Convention, will be removed from a contaminated site in El Salvador. Indicator 10 requires only to provide information on the amount of emissions from chemicals listed in Annex C of the Stockholm Convention.

June 4, 2019 - Noted. As mentioned earlier for point 1. the project is likely to avoid 140 tons of HHP in the coffee and banana sectors of El Salvador and Guatemala during project timeline (it is expected that benefits will consist in avoiding 70 tons of HHP per year). This has been duly reported under Sub-Indicator 9.1. On this account, risks to health of local communities and consumers, that may be exposed to pollution from stockpiles of POPs and other highly hazardous chemicals used in agriculture, will be reduced. Moreover, it is expected that a land area of 2,642 km² will be clear from the effects of HHPs.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 14th of May 2019: Yes

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Part II – Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/ adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Partly,

- 1) for the most part, but the activities leading to the 15 t chemicals being removed seems to lack. Please include.
- 2) The TDA formulation process described in the results framework, seems to focus on Ministries of Foreign Affairs to be main entities for collecting data for inclusion into the TDA. One of the strengths of the TDA/SAP process is that it is based on science, many times derived from research institutions and universities. These entities seem to be lacking. Please include.
- 3) subcomponent 2.1.2 describes an exit strategy including a donor conference to leverage funds for SAP implementation, Please consider if it makes sense to specifically mention the IFIs that are active in the region.
- 4) Please elaborate on how the project through its activities envision in mobilizing the ambitious amount of 4 mio USD from the private sector. It is encouraging to see, but would be interesting to learn what process will be put in place.
- 5) Please consider if the end of the para 17 may need to be reformulated " Recently, hurricane Mitch (1998) and Hurricane Stan (2005)", ofcourse this is all relative, but 20 years ago, may in some instances not be considered "recently".

14th of May 2019: Addressed

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

1. Noted. The activities leading to the removal of chemicals include: Reporting to the Government about the presence of the 15 tons of obsolete DDT, approval of contracts for disposal operations and the international transport and incineration of obsolete DDT. This is highlighted in the Project Results Framework, Annex A, under Output 3.1.4.
 2. Noted. The main entities responsible of collecting the data will be Ministries of Environment and Natural Resources of each country, acting as Project Executing Entities, in close consultation with other line ministries and district/local governments participating in field activities. Research institutions and universities from both countries have also been included as responsible entities for data collection under Outcome 1.1.
 3. Noted. Active relevant IFIs in the region include FUSADES, FONAES, and FONTAGRO, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the Central American Bank for Economic Integration.
 4. Noted. Given the fact of the ambitious amount of leveraging USD 4,000,000, and as stated earlier for point 2 under part I of this response sheet, it is pertinent to expand the portfolio of potential funding sources for the SAP. Other potential funding sources are :
 - State budget (through environmental taxes)
 - Agricultural sector (tax on export of agricultural products, certified products/eco-labeling of coffee, sugarcane)
 - Tourism sector (international tourist rates in airports, tax on the agricultural industry)
 - Payment for Environmental Services (associated with mangroves)
 - Grants or in-kind contributions from other multilateral and international institutions
 5. Noted and addressed. Please refer to paragraph 17 of the CEO Endorsement Request.
- 2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 15th of November 2018: yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: yes

The project is quite weak on the linkages to the chemicals focal area as the majority of the work is disposal of a small stockpile of DDT.

14th of May 2019: Addressed

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

The disposal will be only one part of the activities that are tackling prevention and decisions making process with the scope of eliminating the use of DDT and HHPs in agricultural area related to the watershed. Capacity building, awareness raising, and testing of alternatives to the use, in particular, of Endosulfan on coffee against Coffee Berry Borer will be the main interventions.

FAO applies a holistic approach and involvement of local associations of farmers, governmental programs that are subsidizing pesticides and ministerial focal points from environment and agriculture will be essential for apply the theory of change and transform the cropping systems.

4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Yes

The project while seeking to reduce 15 MT of DDT does not link this to the agricultural sector. Are there relevant agricultural chemicals being addressed by the project and if so how is the core work of FAO being leveraged to create the enabling conditions for the introduction and deployment of alternatives both chemicals and non-chemical. As it is currently described the alignment to the GEF 7 CW strategy is very weak as it is not addressing the sound management of GEF relevant chemicals in the agriculture sector.

June 24 - Comment cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

The intervention at level of POPs and agrichemicals is a necessary condition for sustainable land and landscape management. POPs and Highly Hazardous Pesticides in agriculture production are responsible for the decrease of water quality, menace to food security and safety, depletion of ecosystem services and, last but not least, a threat to adequate nutrition.

By addressing different steps of the pesticides life cycle (POPs and HHPs), the project aims at raising awareness on the prevention rather than other future cleanup operations, which are very expensive and not decisive. The activities of this Component part will comprehend the disposal of around 17 tons of DDT, Aldrin and Endosulfan, capacity building on agricultural waste management and research on alternatives to the use of hazardous POPs and HHPs.

One key example is the extensive use of Endosulfan on coffee borer. To intervene on and change this type of unsustainable cropping system, which is causing depletion of ecosystem services, pollution in water and contaminated food, it is important to address all the causes that bring, as the effect, to the pollution burden of the territory (soil, water and food). Clean up is only an activity aiming at the upstream of pesticides management.

5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: yes

On the chemicals linkages this is very weak.

14th of May 2019: Addressed

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

Duly noted. Linkages to the Chemical & Waste focal area have been included under subsection 5 of the CEO ER document.

The description of the Chemical & Waste focal area related activities funded by the GEF incremental financing for each of the components demonstrates this linkage in a more clear manner.

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 15th of November 2018: yes

Agency Response

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 15th of November 2018: yes

Agency Response

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 15th of November 2018: yes, basin map has been included

Agency Response

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Stakeholder groups have been identified and there is description alluding to the multiple stakeholder groups will be engaged. However, it is a bit less clear what the engagement during project preparation was (please describe) and what process will be rolled out for stakeholder engagement during the project implementation.

14th of May 2019: Addressed

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

Duly noted, a proper stakeholder engagement plan has been elaborated under section 2. Stakeholders of the CEO Endorsement Request.

11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Please include gender analysis

14th of May 2019: Addressed

4th of March 2020 (cseverin): The document mentions that the project will submit a more specific gender engagement plan at the latest 6 months after project approval. We take note of this and expect to receive this, at the LATEST 6 months after project approval.

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

Noted. The preparation of a gender action plan has been incorporated in section 3 Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment of the CEO ER document

12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Yes, Private sector identified, but please include more information on how private sector will be engaged through the TDA/SAP process

14th of May 2019: Addressed

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

Noted. Output 1.1.1 stresses that the developed TDA will be agreed between all the stakeholders, including the private sector. As for the SAP, it will be developed and agreed by the partners based on the TDA, following a participative and inclusive process including all key stakeholders, involving the private sector.

Furthermore, the private sector will be part of the binational technical committee, which serves as a forum for both TDA and SAP.

Subsection 4 on Private Sector Engagement has been further developed.

13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 15th of November 2018: Yes

Agency Response

14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 15th of November 2018: Yes

Agency Response

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Yes, however, please ensure that both countries current focal points have signed off on the endorsement letters. It seems that the Focal Point from El Salvador has changed. Please double check

14th of May 2019: Addressed

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

Noted. Nevertheless we resubmitted this project on October 25th,2018, and the Operational Focal Point for El Salvador changed on November 26th, 2018. As stated in the Guidelines on the project and program cycle policy: the Letter of Endorsement is signed by the current GEF OFP (by the time when the project is submitted to the Secretariat.

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: Yes, however, please include in paragraph 131, that the project will be allocating a minimum of 1% of the GEF IW grant to support IWLEARN related activities.

14th of May 2019: Addressed

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

May 2019

Point taken. The link to IW:Learn is taken into account in the project budget and consists of USD 17,000 under Outcome 4.2. This has been reflected now in paragraph 143 as requested

17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 15th of November 2018: yes

Agency Response

18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 15th of November 2018: Yes

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements

1. Country endorsements. Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

15th of November 2018: No please address comments and resubmit

For the chemicals portions there needs to be strong justification and alignment with the GEF 7 CW programming directions.

Please note that all relevant information must be in the online portal version of the project as this is the official document on which the GEF review and decision making is based on. In this regard please ensure that references to uploaded documents unless they are scanned endorsement letters or co-financing are not done and include the text in the portal version.

May 14 2019 - No, please address above comments. In summary, the core indicators for chemicals is not accurately recorded in the relevant sections. The portal entry also still refers to a prodoc in the documents section. Please note reviews can only be done with completed portal entry, i.e all relevant text needs to be in the portal entry screens and not attached as documents.

No, please address the additional issues identified.

26th of September 2019 (cseverin): No, please address comment pertaining to the fact that a GEF implementing agency can generally not execute project activities.

4th of March: No, there are discrepancies between results frameworks and the core indicators included in Table E, and numbers for indicator 11 is missing all together. Please address.

25th of March 2020 (cseverin): addressed, CEO Approval is recommended.

Review Dates

1SMSP CEO Approval

Response to Secretariat comments

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The Paz watershed shared by El Salvador and Guatemala boast a variety of biomes ranging from lower montane sub-tropical humid very humid forests to mangrove forests on the coast. While there are isolated protected areas aimed at the conservation of discrete ecosystems, no management practices or legal frameworks are in place to ensure connectivity from upstream to downstream habitats. In particular, land conversion has resulted in fragmentation of the terrestrial natural ecosystems/habitats. In terms of aquatic habitats, interventions in the river morphology have reduced connectivity for migrating species such as shrimp and eels. Water resources are being degraded in terms of quantity and quality by unsustainable land and water uses along the source to sea continuum.

In the upper catchment, hillside agriculture, deforestation and unsustainable forest management practices, and unprotected streambanks and riparian zones cause sediment inflow, while unregulated wastewater discharge and deposition of waste in riverbeds causes pollution. In the middle catchment, water quality is threatened by unsustainable agriculture practices, agrochemicals, unregulated wastewater discharges and waste deposition, unprotected streambanks. In the lower catchment: unregulated water abstraction by large agricultural producers. Groundwater resources are threatened by unregulated pesticide use and overdraft during frequent dry spells in the basins.

The project will be developing a shared vision for source to sea management of the binational Paz transboundary watershed Among others the project will be delivering the following GEBs: (1) Contribution to the protection of shared water resources in the Paz basin through building

foundations for a cooperative management of watershed resources following the source to sea approach (2) Inventory of POPs-contaminated wastes in the project area and DDT stockpiles up to 15 tons re-packed.

The project approach offers a unique opportunity for replicability and potential for scaling-up, through the formulation of the TDA and the SAP, that will identify management and technical approaches for dealing with the multiple stressors to support the transition to a more sustainable development in the region. The project will promote sustainable management and restoration of natural resources used in the agriculture sector, will support family farmers adapt their livelihoods to climate change, and the integration of prevention, mitigation, response and recuperation actions, expanding their resilience to potential disasters. One of the most disruptive environmental challenges that the binational Paz transboundary watershed is facing today is large-scale land degradation and biodiversity damages caused by decreasing water resources.