

Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme to Ensure Integrated and Sustainable Management of the Transboundary Water Resources of the Amazon River Basin Considering Climate Variability and Change

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9770

Countries

Regional (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela)

Project Name

Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme to Ensure Integrated and Sustainable Management of the Transboundary Water Resources of the Amazon River Basin Considering Climate Variability and Change

Agenices

UNEP

Date received by PM

5/30/2019

Review completed by PM

10/3/2019

Program Manager

Christian Severin

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019 (cseverin): No. Some output indicators have been changed so they at CEO Endorsement stage appear more generic. Please change the output indicators so that they explain what will be delivered, and have a format that uses more action oriented wording.

6th of September 2019 (cseverin): Please upload the revised Results Framework (Appendix 2). It seems to be missing from the portal.

1st of October 2019 (cseverin) Addressed

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 23/07/2019

Since the CEO doc table B provides a summary, detailed information have been captured in the project log frame (Appendix 2 to the prodoc or Annex A to the CEO document) with the overall project intervention logic and structure identical to the approved PIF and in alignment with the Ministerially endorsed SAP Strategic Actions as also documented in the PIF – Table B – Project Components. To that affect, also note Table 3 of the prodoc show casing the relation between project outcomes and SAP Strategic Actions. In line with the project cycle policy calling for a strict compliance at outcome level and, as recommended by the UNEP Quality Assurance Review process, changes from the original PIF were effectuated and documented in Section A (part II) of the CEO endorsement document. In essence, the project structure has been subject to language fine tuning to ensure more clarity and better flow in the intervention logic whilst not changing the expectations or ambitions of the PIF. Consequently, Outcome 1.1 and 1.2 were merged, Outcome 3.1 language was simplified, Component 2 outputs language was refined to match their respective outcome hence the sequence reorganised accordingly. In order to fully meet the outcome level, a new Output (2.7) ‘Understanding the wellbeing and socioeconomic impacts of resilience-building interventions under potential climate variability and change scenarios’, has been included in Component 2 to assess the impact of the project interventions on water management behaviour. Overall though, the content and the expected contributions to the outcomes remain unchanged.

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 06/09/2019

A revised log frame with an added ~ 404 ktCO₂ of carbon sequestered against output 1.3 has been appended.

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019 (cseverin): No, please address below issues:

- 1) 1)Activities of this SAP implementation project is too focused on data generation, compared to SAP implementation towards decreasing stress on the shared river basin. In general the proposed set of investments are focused on soft measures. SAP implementation projects are to be delivering tangible stress reduction measures on the ground. Such activities needs to be much better articulated.
- 2) 2)Output indicators need to be quantifiable in nature.
- 3) 3)Considering this is a SAP implementation project, it is remarkable that the cofinancing is SOLELY consisting of in-kind cofinancing. How is such in kind cofinance envisioned to deliver towards implementation of on the ground stress reduction measures?? It calls in to question whether the SAP implementation activities identified, includes the economic important sectors in the shared basin. Further, there is an apparent lack of private sector engagement. This was also pointed out at time of PIF submission, but still needs to be addressed.
- 4) 4)It was also pointed out during PIF phase of the project that an update of the newly approved SAP would not be eligible for funding and hence agency provided comments that this was not the thinking either. Nevertheless, the wording persists in this submission. Please remove. It is not deemed to be advisable to update a SAP, that was finalized in 2016 and have not even had led to ANY impact on the ground. Instead if there is a need to work on implementation details of certain aspects of the NAPs, please consider to include a implementation guide or the like to the SAP.
- 5) 5)The Output indicators and impacts included in the GEB table, are delivering very low impacts, considering that this investment will be investing more than \$155 mio. Please reassess the output indicators and the GEB s listed.
- 6) 6)The project will be moving 500 ha to become protected areas, compared to the size of the investment (\$155 mio), this is an incredible small area to be impacted, equivalent to 0.067 % of the amazon basin.
- 7) 7)A number of the figures (2,3,4 and others) are nearly impossible to read, please fix in resubmission.
- 8) 8)As there is a lack of tangible output indicators it is puzzling, why eg the formulation of policies described in the prodoc has not been listed in the RF and table B etc.
- 9) 9)Output 2.1 focuses on forecasting for three countries. It seems from the general description included in the prodoc, that this may be needed across the basin. Please explain.
- 10) 10)Most of the climate benefits listed in the project core indicator framework, is stemming from an investment of \$130K in Venezuela (32k t of CO2). How come none of the other investments planned will not have any tangible stress reduction impacts, apart from the mangrove restauration in Guyana??

11) 11)Output 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 in prodoc description have no identified cofinancing. However, in the budget table, cofinancing has been identified for these activities. Please ensure consistency.

12) 12)Please include wording under component 4, that makes it clear that minimum 1 % of the GEF IW grant will be allocated to support IWLEARN activities.

13) 13In budget table 2.7 and 3.2 have no cofinancing attached. Is this an oversight??

14) 14)In the results framework, 1.1 mentions an indicator of “four sources of co-financing identified” Please adjust this indicator to a specific amount of \$\$ identified or something that is a bit more meaningful. Further, this may also be a good place to insert output indicator pertaining to leveraging target of private sector financing.

S6th of September 2019 (cseverin): It will be easier to fully comprehend the changes made, when the revised results framework have been uploaded. However, based on responses and adjustments/reformulations it seems that a number of the above points have been addressed.

It is IMPORTANT to note that the project wil NOT be reformulation the SAP, but instead formulating quantitative indicators that will be informing analysis on status of SAP implementation.

Please calculate and include in the results framework and the core indicator matrix the co2 benefits from the 541 ha of reforested area, teh 800 ha of rehabilitated mangrove forest and other investments that would have direct benefits.

1st of October 2019 (cseverin) Please ensure that there is full alignment between the results framework and the core indicators. moreover, please ensure to use the 20 yr accounting period for the carbon sequestration calculation. Further, it will be beneficial to include a description, maybe as an annex or footnote, that explains how to the Core Indicators were derived.

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 23/07/2019

Response 1. While the detailed project document aligns with the Ministerially endorsed SAP, one should note that generally the entire project through its suite of activities will generate long lasting stress reduction on the basin and demonstrate improvement from existing baseline situation. The project as described in the PIF focusses on priority SAP actions addressing transboundary stresses in a mega-basin.

In addition to the stand alone interventions in Components 1 and 2, the management process as well as governance strengthening both at national and regional level and monitoring activities in Components 1, 3 and 4 will ultimately contribute to improved ecosystem health and will provide data to update the environmental status/health baseline over time.

For example, the alert system will help protect landscapes (and communities) through enabling management responses to potential floods/droughts hence alleviate stress on the environment.

The detailed logframe has been refined to ensure more clarity on the nature of expected impacts form intervention. Targets have been further quantified and rolled out at project level in the objective statement.

Response 2. At submission, the logframe in Appendix 2 to the prodoc and Annex A to the CEO endorsement document provided a suite of output indicators and targets as well as a comprehensive definition of the baseline situation for benchmarking with the latter to be further strengthened during the first year of project execution.

Also note that output targets were rolled out at outcome level. At resubmission, targets have been reviewed yet again and refined as appropriate. Targets have also been further rolled out at project level in the objective statement.

Response 3) Co-financing at CEO endorsement stage matches pledges made at PIF stage both in terms of sources and category at the exception of Brazil (see below). The co-financing ratio is over 1:10.

As stated in the CEO endorsement part II section A, the Co-financing at CEO endorsement has even increased by USD 35,857,977 given the additional resources received from Bolivia, Colombia and Suriname.

Co-financing has been recorded as per the latest co-financing policy and indeed corresponds to investments mobilised nationally or from other donors by riparian countries themselves and which will support project execution. Given that such resources will not be managed by the project itself, they are therefore accounted as in-kind contributions. This will not diminish their relevance and importance to support project execution.

Such recording of the co-financing aligns with the PIF, at the exception of part of Brazil’s co-financing. Indeed, the PIF cash contribution from the Brazilian Water Agency (ANA) in support of the hydromet network was already passed on to ACTO in early 2019, in anticipation of the project initiation. For administrative reason, Brazil, therefore, does not want this to be recorded as cash as it will be difficult to record it as spent during project execution. They however prefer that it be recorded as Brazilian co-financing rather than ACTO’s. At CEO endorsement, Brazil’s co-financing is therefore entirely accounted for as in-kind.

As stipulated in the stakeholder analysis and mapping see Table 5 of the Prodoc on page 114, participation of the **private sector** into the project is generally small scale. While during project execution one might be able to leverage more co-financing stemming from their engagement, at this stage it has proved difficult to secure specific co-financing prior to their hands-on participation.

More resources will also most likely be leveraged during project execution through implementation of the financial strategy.

Co-financing at PIF stage

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
	Government of Bolivia		TBD
	Government of Brazil		2,000,000
	Government of Brazil	In kind	1,029,412
	Government of Colombia		TBD
	Government of Ecuador		82,690,103
	Government of Guyana		300,000
	Government of Peru		17,862,098
	Government of Suriname		TBD
	Government of Venezuela		1,060,000
	ACTO		2,560,100
GEF Agency	UN Environment	In-kind	1,000,000

Total Co-financing			108,501,713
---------------------------	--	--	--------------------

Co-financing at CEO endorsement stage

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
	Government of Bolivia	In-kind	10,841,100
	Government of Brazil	In-kind	25,361,248
	Government of Colombia	In-kind	2,454,421
	Government of Ecuador	In-kind	82,690,103
Recipient Government	Government of Guyana	In-kind	586,000
	Government of Peru	In-kind	\$17,862,099
	Government of Suriname	In-kind	206,500
	Government of Venezuela		1,100,000
	UN Environment	In-kind	600,000
Others	ACTO	In-kind	2,658,219
Total Co-financing			144,359,690

Response 4. The intention is indeed not to reformulate a new SAP but rather supplement the existing SAP (aka update it) on the basis of supplementary information generated *inter alia* through more science based quantified baseline setting using the TWAP methodology in support of the TDA. This project will also formulate NAPs for each riparian country to operationalise the SAP at the country level and facilitate its implementation. Finally, please note that Component 4 supports the establishment of a monitoring and reporting system to monitor SAP delivery/implementation over time. The wording “update” has been substituted with “supplement” to the extent possible.

Response 5. One should note that the project level impact was assessed based on the GEF grant. Table E of the CEO document has been revised slightly.

Response 6. In actual fact, 641 ha of protected areas is quite large compared to the financing invested. The problem though is that the Amazon basin is so large hence the denominator for this percentage equally large.

It should also be noted that the benefits stemming from the co-financing to the project have not been quantified. Core indicators in Table E are only reflecting the likely impact to be generated by the GEF Grant. As it is a project primarily funded by GEF International Waters, the contribution from the other focal areas investments hence core indicators is indeed limited and only supported by small STAR investments. As discussed bilaterally with GEF Sec, it was agreed that potential additional benefits and impact would be documented in the logframe. It would however be difficult to capture such details in the GEF 7 core indicators matrix. Annex E and Table E have however been refined.

Response 7. From our end, all looks readable. It might be easier to read through the prodoc appended to the submission.

Response 8. Output 1.2 indicators have been amended to reflect the formulation of policies. Indicators and their targets have been refined in the revised logframe in Appendix 2/Annex A

Response 9. It is a step-by-step process. Given the size of the basin and considering that the available funding is for transboundary priorities, the forecasting system piloted in the trinational MAP region (Br, Bol, Peru) during the SAP formulation project is now upscaled in 5 locations which are assessed as hotspots. The experience and information generated will be used for the monitoring system which will help for the forecasting system in Component 3. At the national level, stemming from the experience of the SAP formulation project, Peru has been upscaling the MAP experience nationally. This is a true demonstration of the catalytic effect of the GEF intervention.

Response 10. As already reflected in the core indicator sheet, the total climate benefit is 42 K ton of CO₂. Out of which 32 is from Venezuela and the other 10K is from Guyana achieved through mangrove restoration. There are several climate change adaptation benefits but they cannot be captured in the core indicator sheet.

Response 11. This has been addressed accordingly.

Response 12. At submission, as recorded in the budget table in Appendix 01 to the Prodoc, a total of USD 117K was reflected under output 4.4 in support of IWLEARN. This corresponds to 1% of the GEF Grant.

Output 4.4	Project experiences and best practices exchanged with GEF IW-LEARN.	117,000	205,000	322,000
Activity 4.4.1	Sharing knowledge and best practices through GEF IW:LEARN	17,000	150,000	167,000
Activity 4.4.2	Participating in GEF IW:LEARN sponsored regional and global fora	70,000	5,000	75,000
Activity 4.4.3	Participation in regional and global twinning events	30,000	50,000	80,000

Response 13. This has been addressed accordingly.

Response 14. The amount of resources leveraged as a result of the delivery of the financial strategy cannot be pre-empted at this stage prior to its execution. The project is however committed to ensure that one secures resources from at least 4 different funding sources as mentioned in the logframe matrix. One of those four sources could potentially be from private sector e.g. water utilities –small private companies including fishing cooperatives.

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 06/09/2019

An extra ~ 404,000 tCO2 of carbon sequestered have been added under core indicator 6.1 for output 1.3. Please note though that 10,000 tons of CO2 sequestered were already reported in indicator 6.2 corresponding to output 2.2 for Suriname. There must have been a confusion with Guyana as Guyana is focussing on other types of nature-based solution which do not account for reforestation.

Agency Response to Secretariat comments of 01/10/2019 received on 18 October 2019

Given that it is primarily an IW project (97% of the resources) with only 3% of BD, LD and CC in only two countries, we had adopted a conservative approach in reporting on core indicators. We have now adjusted the core indicator annex E and the corresponding section E of the CEO endorsement to ensure full alignment with

the logframe matrix. We have also cross referenced each of the outputs in the Annex E for ease of understanding. An added 380kt of CO2 captured have been added for the 800ha of mangrove in Suriname under output 2.2

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019 (cseverin): Please address comments under 2nd review question. When it is understood what tangible stress reduction the project will deliver, it will be possible to assess the cost effectiveness

6th of September 2019 (cseverin): please upload the revised results framework.

17th of October 2019 (cseverin) Audit expenses belong to PMC budget and not M&E Plan budget, please revise budgets accordingly.

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please remove Audit cost from M&E Plan Budget.

1st of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 23/07/2019

See above responses.

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 06/09/2019

A revised log frame with an added ~ 404 ktCO2 of carbon sequestered against output 1.3 has been appended.

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 17/10/2019

As presented inter alia in section C of the CEO document, audit costs are reflected in the M&E plan as normally done. However, the various M&E costs are spread across various budget lines amongst which PMC.

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 28/10/2019

Audit and related costs were removed from the table in Section C of the CEO endorsement document.

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)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, it is noted that there is NO private sector financing identified for this investment, which is puzzling, considering how the Amazon SAP identifies a range of economic sectors as essential towards addressing the multitude of stressors in the shared basin.

6th of September 2019 (cseverin): It is understood that attracting private sector financing/investments will be one of the main focuses of ACTO in relation to ensuring long term sustainability of the investment.

17th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please make sure that all cofinancing letters are translated to english and copies of the translation have been uploaded with submission.

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, now, as according to GEF policies) the original cofinancing letters have been accompanied by a translation in English.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 23/07/2019

As stated above the co-financing exceeds the PIF pledged amounts by 35M and aligns with the PIF. Private sector engagement and potentially additional leveraged co-financing will essentially stem from the execution of component 1 hence recorded as such during project execution. As mentioned, Table 5 with the stakeholder mapping, identifies private sector engagement and their role in four out of the 8 countries, listing the different sectors as well (fishery, mining, logging, rubber industry, farming, cacao, etc.)

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 06/09/2019

Noted

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 17/10/2019

While the essence of the co-financing is captured in self-explanatory tables, translation have been inserted in App 08.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019 (cseverin): yes, but please make adjustments after the outputs have been reassessed.

Response to Secretariat comments

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019 (cseverin): NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019 (cseverin): No, please address comments under review question 2.

6th of September 2019 (cseverin): addressed

Response to Secretariat comments [Comments under point 2: 23/07/2019](#)

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019 (cseverin): No, please address comments provided

6th of September 2019 (cseverin): No please address comments provided and ensure that all relevant documents have been uploaded into the portal.

17th of October 2019 (cseverin) No, please address remaining comments.

1st of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Response to Secretariat comments

23/07/2019

Comments Addressed

17/10/2019

Comments Addressed.

Agency Response to Secretariat comments 28/10/2019:

Comments Addressed.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The Amazon Basin constitutes the most bio-diverse and complex hydrographic River Basin in the world, accounting for more than half the world's tropical rainforest which, combined with the intense evaporation and absorption of atmospheric carbon, makes the region a defining factor in global climate. The basin covers more than 6,118,000 km², representing 44% of South America's land area, extending through Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname and Venezuela.

The Amazon Basin faces numerous challenges with regard to regional Integrated Management Water Resources (IWRM) within the context of its socio-economic development, and anthropogenic and climate impacts. The basin is a unique water system that crosses national borders of eight countries that agree on the need for a regional framework for IWRM to satisfy the urgent needs of the basin population and to promote the sustainable development of the Amazon Region.

With previous GEF support, the countries of the Amazon Basin, together with the regional co-ordination of the ACTO, have developed a regionally endorsed Strategic Action Programme (SAP). This project will initiate the long-term process of implementing the SAP, building on the experiences and lessons from the previous GEF actions in the region to support the countries and ACTO, in order to sustainably develop and protect the livelihoods and ecosystem of this globally-significant river basin.

The project is innovative by promoting integrated management of the Amazon Basin for the first time from ‘source-to-sea.’ Based on the recommended actions in the approved SAP, the project will implement approaches that are innovative in the basin, including:

- Developing the first basin-wide comprehensive environmental monitoring system;
- Developing early warning and response systems in transboundary regions, involving local communities;
- Encouraging a community-to-cabinet innovative IWRM governance model for the Amazon Basin;
- Formulating national water policies in Suriname and Guyana that enable establishment of water authorities and ensure compatible approaches with the other riparian states; and
- Promoting conjunctive use and management of surface and groundwater resources

It will be particularly interesting to witness how the project will be delivering on the opportunity, that this project provides, for significant cross-cutting benefits and cross-border collaboration in the Amazon Basin