

# Danube River Basin Hydromorphology and River Restoration (DYNA)

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

9801

**Countries**

Regional (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia, Ukraine)

**Project Name**

Danube River Basin Hydromorphology and River Restoration (DYNA)

**Agenices**

WWF-US

**Date received by PM**

5/31/2019

**Review completed by PM**

9/6/2019

**Program Manager**

Steffen Hansen

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**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**

SH (7-10-2019): no significant changes since PIF WP inclusion.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

SH (7-10-2019):

Comment 1: **a) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed:** Note that while it is fine to be concise and use bullets etc. when presenting info, this section currently reads like a short summary. Please include more information.

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

· Comment 2: **b) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects:** Note that while it is fine to be concise and use bullets etc. when presenting info, this section currently reads more like a short summary. Please include more information, including a more elaborate regional and national baselines.

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

· Comment 3: **c) The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project:** This section should include short but clear descriptions of both the project components, outcomes and associated outputs.

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

· Comment 4: **A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment:** Will the project address key gender gaps by incorporation gender aspects as part of not only new country level plans and strategies but potential policy/regulatory reforms?

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

· Comment 5: **A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination:** please consider if the sub-sections titled “GEF initiatives” and “Other donor initiatives in the region” fits better under the section titled “b) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects”.

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

Comment 6: **Annex 6 in the World Wildlife Fund GEF Project Document:** Please note that currently Annex 6 describes the anticipated engagement of stakeholders during the PPG phase. Please revise this annex (or submit an additional annex) so that the actual level of stakeholder engagement during the PPG phase is presented.

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

- Comment 7: **ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK:** Please expand the Results Framework so that all Outcomes and Outputs include both an Indicator, Baseline and Target. Please make sure that these changes are reflected in the GEF Portal section C titled “The proposed alternative scenario”.

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

SH (10-10-2019):

Please note that GEF guidelines precludes the merging or crossing over of the implementing functions of the GEF Agencies and the execution functions undertaken by EAs. However, in exceptional cases, and as per the request of the beneficiary country/countries, GEF Agencies may carry out both functions. Note that it is important that the agency discuss with the GEF before discussing such a request with beneficiary countries. The GEF will assess whether to approve the request.

Note that for this project ICPDR appear to be well positioned to host the PMU. This is the preferred Execution modality of the GEF.

Additional comments:

Project Manager, Project Coordinator and Project Assistant have been charged to the project’s components. As per the guidelines, these positions must be covered by the Project Management Costs which according to the CEO Endorsement request, amounts to \$4,554,701 from GEF and co-financing. In exceptional cases where the PMC is above 5 % of the GEF project financing a justification should be submitted for GEF to review.

Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation: Ineligible expenses has been charged in M & E Plan – Please follow the Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle and charge the eligible budget items as per Table 1 of Annex 3.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

1) Thank you for your comment. The section on “a) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers” has been expanded in the CEO Endorsement Document.

- 2) The baseline section has been expanded in the CEO Endorsement Document.
  - 3) The proposed alternative scenario and GEF focal area strategies has been expanded in the CEO Endorsement Document.
  - 4) Thank you for your comment. The project aims to harmonize national policies and regulations with the EU Water Framework Directive, which is gender neutral. Gender dimensions will be taken into consideration where possible and appropriate, especially as it relates to ecosystem services.  
  
In the ICPDR water management community, there is a good gender balance. The project will work within this community to ensure men and women are able to participate in decision making activities and processes.
  - 5) Thank you for your comment, we have moved the subsection “GEF initiatives” and Other donor initiatives in the region” to the section titled “b) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.”
  - 6) The annex has been adjusted to show the actual level of stakeholder engagement during the PPG phase. A summary of stakeholder engagement meetings is also provided in Section 4.2. and Annex 7 of the Project Document.
  - 7) The Project Results Framework now includes an indicator for each outcome. Indicators at the output level will be provided in the annual work plan and budget.
- 3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (7-10-2019): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments**

- 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** SH (7-10-2019): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments**

- 5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (7-10-2019):

Yes, however, please separate the ICPDR member states co-finance contributions from that of the ICPDR in-kind contributions and re-submit two separate co-finance letters.

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

**Response to Secretariat comments** Thank you for your comment. We have included two separate co-financing letters as requested – one letter for ICPDR member states and one of ICPDR in-kind contributions.

**6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (7-10-2019):

1. Comment 1: Please populate all sub-indicators pertaining to Indicator 7.

For indicator 7.3, in accordance with annex A this indicator should be set at "1" at the time of CEO endorsement. Please adjust. Further, for indicator 7.4 please note that the IWLEARN value should be "1" at CEO endorsement. Please adjust.

SH (04-9-2019): Addressed

2. Comment 2: Please consider if number of hectares being restored through the project can be captured via indicator 4.

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

**Response to Secretariat comments**

Thank you for your comment. We have provided targets for Core indicator 7.3 and 3.4 for areas of wetland restored. A TDA/SAP process was undertaken prior to this project, reporting against Core indicator 7.1. is not relevant under this project. For Core indicator 7.2, the baseline is already at the highest level (4). Therefore, additional progress cannot be reported against through the project.

03-9-2019: Indicator 7.3 and 7.4 have been set to '1' at CEO endorsement.

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (7-10-2019): 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** SH (7-10-2019): Yes, thank you for providing an elaborate description of other projects and programmes in the region.

#### **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** SH (7-10-2019): Yes

#### **Response to Secretariat comments**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (7-10-2019): 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** SH (7-10-2019): Yes

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

### **STAP**

## **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (7-10-2019):

Please include as part of annex B 1) a description of the WWF-STAP dialogue during PPG stage and 2) as appropriate, an overview of STAP feedback provided for the developed project documents.

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

**Response to Secretariat comments** Thank you for your comment. WWF GEF Agency sent a draft of the ProDoc to STAP during project preparation as discussed.



## **GEF Council**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (7-10-2019): Please address comments as stated in the review box titled "2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?"

SH (29-8-2019): Addressed

**Response to Secretariat comments** Thank you, comments have been addressed.

## **Convention Secretariat**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (7-10-2019): NA

**Response to Secretariat comments**  
**Recommendation**

**12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (7-10-2019): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (29-8-2019): please address comments and resubmit.

SH (10-10-2019): Please address comments in review box 2 and resubmit.

### Response to Secretariat comments

Thank you, all comments have been addressed.

03-9-2019: Thank you, the remaining comments have been addressed.

### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	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

All the countries of the Danube River Basin agreed to implement European Union's Water Framework Directive with the objective to 'achieve good chemical and ecological status.' To meet this objective, the International Commission for the Danube River Basin developed River Basin Management Plans to address issues impacting the water and ecological status.

Analyses undertaken identified that significant pressures derived from ‘hydromorphological alterations. These pressures are the results of over a hundred years of engineering alterations in the basin to improve navigation, harness the waters for hydropower and storage, flood protection, etc. The impacts of these structures have resulted in, amongst other, reduced ability of fish to migrate and a loss of significant wetlands that provide multiple ecosystem services.

Addressing pressures from hydromorphological alterations and avoiding future pressures through integrated planning is a relatively new concept that is a challenge for most countries. The countries in the European Union in the Danube River Basin are obliged to comply with the Water Framework Directive and have access to more resources, while non-European Union countries have limited resources (financial and technical) that can be applied to these problems. The same applies to the EU Floods Directive, which calls for measures aligned as far as possible with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. The GEF (Global Environment Facility) *Danube River Basin Hydromorphology and River Restoration* (DYNA) project aims to support Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia and Ukraine to develop the necessary capacity to monitor, assess and mitigate pressures arising from hydromorphological alterations and harnessing the benefits of restoration measures for nature and people such as flood risk mitigation.

The project will undertake a blend of regional and national actions that support the work of the countries and policies of the ICPDR, supported by national and transboundary pilots to demonstrate potential approaches to address hydromorphological alteration pressures. The project will actively work with stakeholders from community to cabinet and promote the scale up of solutions developed across the Danube River Basin and more widely. The project is expected to result in the adoption of agreed methods and techniques leading to reduced pressures from hydromorphological alterations that will lead to improved ecological status in the Danube River Basin.