

# Reducing Pollution and Preserving Environmental Flows in the East Asian Seas through the Implementation of Integrated River Basin Management in ASEAN Countries

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

9654

**Countries**

Regional (Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Philippines, Viet Nam)

**Project Name**

Reducing Pollution and Preserving Environmental Flows in the East Asian Seas through the Implementation of Integrated River Basin Management in ASEAN Countries

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

11/13/2018

**Review completed by PM**

8/11/2022

**Program Manager**

Taylor Henshaw

**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 Request (Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. In considering the 7 selected rivers for the project, the newly identified rivers have significant **marine debris** concerns. In GEF-6 the GEF did not invest in addressing plastic pollution; consequently, there cannot be activities to address plastic pollution in the project. That said, the project description indicates the project will be conducting an assessment of the biophysical, socioeconomic and governance context, which is within the IW GEF-6 strategy and not actually implementing activities to address plastics. Please confirm that funding will not go to marine debris activities, but rather to assessments of the issues which may include marine debris.

15th of May 2019: No, even though references have been removed in the portal submission, the main annex K that is laying out the national activities still lists plastic and marine debris. This is especially evident in the case of Indonesia, Myanmar, Malaysia and Vietnam. Please remove

this reference, as asked in original comment. There is also a reference to this investment will be financing marine litter/plastic reduction under the agency responds to USA council comment #7. Please remove this.

Further, some of the national investments seems bto be nearly duplicative, where as others are clearly more detaied assessments. Myanmar and Indonsia seems to be identical when looking at the different components. Please ensure that the national projects are reflecting upon the specificity of each country and the chosen site and hence include activities that will address the specific local set of stressors to the specific S2S system.

Moreover, please include more information on the national investmetns into the portal submission. It is okay to have the more detailed information in Annex K, however, teh submission need to include some of the information each planned investment. It is not enough to simply mention the sited and info as presented in Table 1 and 2. One suggestion woudl be to include a couple of pages on each national investments into the portal, and keep the rest in Annex K

Please correct the mentioning of 8 countries under "executing partners" as the project is only enagging with 7 countries.

27th of April 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Regarding references to Myanmar: Not addressed. References to Myanmar have been removed in the Project Document and the Word version of the CEO Endorsement Document uploaded to the portal. However, the portal submission still shows Myanmar as a listed country under Part I: Project Information. Please remove this reference.

(2) Regarding references to marine litter and plastics in Annex 15 (previously Annex K): Not addressed. There are several references to plastics in Annex 15. See Malaysia Component 2; Viet Nam Component 3; Indonesia Component 3... Please revise Annex 15 accordingly.

(3) Regarding references to marine litter and plastics in the response to the USA Council comment #7: Not addressed. In the Word version of the CEO Endorsement Document "marine litter/plastic reduction" has been removed from the comment #7 response. In the portal submission, the "marine litter/plastic reduction" phrasing remains. Please revise the portal submission accordingly.

(4) Regarding ensuring national projects are reflecting upon specificity of each country: Addressed.

(5) Regarding more information on national projects in the portal submission: Not Addressed. The comment asks for more information on the national investments directly into the portal submission and to not present all information in Annex K (now Annex 15) only. Please include 1-2 pages on each national investment directly in the portal submission.

(6) Regarding number of "executing partners". Addressed. The project is now only engaging six countries and there are now executing partners for six countries noted in the Part I: Project Information section.

8th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

(5) Addressed.

#### Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 23 December 2021

All references to marine litter and plastics have been removed from Annex 15 (previously Annex K), and replaced with 'solid waste management/materials recovery, reuse and recycling' as appropriate.

All references to marine litter and plastics have been removed from the response to the USA Council comment #7 (CEO Request, Annex B) and replaced with 'solid waste management/materials recovery, reuse and recycling' as appropriate.

The proposed approach to identifying, assessing and implementing priority pilot projects is systematic and comprehensive across all sites, designed to achieve outcomes that will solve identified priority IRBM problems. It is evident that the level of governance, awareness, human resource and financial capacities, and available information varies significantly across the river basins. Thus, while the process is consistent, the solutions will vary in accordance with the specificity of the situation. For example, there is an existing governance mechanism and a large amount of information available on the Ciliwung River Basin and Depok City in Indonesia. This implies that a greater amount of time and effort will be required to put in place a working institutional mechanism and develop and investible pilot projects in the Myanmar situation, versus Indonesia, where commitments have been made (i.e., Depok City) but know-how is lacking.

To help differentiate the priorities being considered for each pilot project, a text box has now been inserted into the project proposal for each country in Annex 15 of the Project Document. For example, the priority pilot projects being assessed in Depok City, Indonesia, include: integrated wastewater treatment (with nutrient management, water recycling and infiltration) including small-scale industry; integrated solid waste management (1,200 tons per day, with materials recovery, recycling and reuse); removal of the existing 'open dump' as a public health risk and a pollution hotspot in Depok City and the Ciliwung River via waste mining and materials recovery; and development

of an inclusive growth funding structure (public-private-community ownership of an operating facility).

Two-page summaries of each national IRBM project proposal have been incorporated into the Project Document, Annex 15.

#### UNDP Response, 8 May 2019

The issue of 'marine debris' will be de-emphasized in the Project Document as requested. The Project Document will refer to the assessment of priority issues within each river basin, including land-based pollution (e.g., nutrients and solid waste).

The 7 selected rivers embody a number of biophysical, socio-economic and governance challenges to IRBM, which will be assessed and reported in greater detail in Component 1. Inadequate management of solid waste (especially domestic garbage) is a visible problem in all of the rivers, which has implications on environmental flows, water use, flooding, human health and security, etc., as well as marine debris. It can be confirmed that, outside of assessments and associated recommendations for IRBM plans and strategies, project funding will not be used for marine debris activities, as requested. However, it should be noted that potential management interventions at pilot sites (Component 2) could have an indirect effect on reductions in marine debris/plastics loadings in the rivers and receiving coastal waters/LMEs.

#### UNDP responses , 12 May 2022

All outstanding comments have been addressed in the project document, CEO ER and all Annexes. On Comment #5, the description of each national investment is included in the CEO ER. The same brief description is also incorporated in Annex 15 as Part I. Summary for each national investment.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. As noted in the PIF Review, an **endorsement letter** signed by the current Malaysia OFP, Mr. Jaya Singam Rajoo, needs to be submitted.

The **Executing Partners** need to be identified at the national level beyond ?National implementing partners for each participating country?.

The **stakeholder** analysis and plan are strong on government engagement, but weak on NGOs, indigenous community engagement and very weak on private sector engagement. There is a tendency also to be top-down. Please reassess who will be engaged and how to ensure two-way engagement not only one-way, top down communication.

Please indicate the links between the selected rivers and the **LMEs** ? i.e. into which LME each river flows. A map would be useful.

While **Thailand** is not a part of the project, the nation is still a major contributor in terms of pollutant loadings to LMEs in the ASEAN region. As noted in Table 1, Thailand has 254 rivers draining into the ASEAN region out of a total of 772. Therefore, we encourage the project to consider ways to share knowledge and experiences with Thailand.

### ***Component 1***

There is a tremendous wealth of insights planned in Outcome 1.1. Yet, plans for **communicating insights** are limited to what are described as complex, detailed SORB reports. To affect change much more consideration needs to be given to the purpose of doing these analyses, for whom are these targeted and why, what insights will be useful to the audiences and how to convey these insights to those audiences for their use. Please describe the purpose of the analyses, the target audiences, what insights are expected to be relevant to their interests, and how to effectively share the key insights (i.e. not detailed reports, but one pagers, videos, cartoons or other means) with these audiences in venues relevant to them (e.g. attending fisheries coop meetings, community gatherings, etc).

The analysis of **socioeconomic aspects** (Output 1.1.2) focuses on threats. While these aspects are important, understanding the benefits and costs of the river ecosystems (e.g. livelihoods, freshwater access, food security, flood retention) provides valuable insights that can help gain stakeholder support as well as address concerns. Further, analysis of alternative management scenarios can ensure decision-makers make informed decisions. These aspects need to be included in the analysis plans.

The **rapid assessment of pollution** (Output 1.1.4) needs to consider the socioeconomic implications on such aspects as food security and water access.

### ***Component 2: Pilots & Rivers Plans***

The PIF (Output 2.1.1) indicated that IRBM strategies and action plans would be developed/updated to address priority needs and gaps. This critical activity is missing in the Pro Doc; although Output 2.2.3 notes that strategies and action plans.. endorsed to the appropriate? This wording needs correcting. Perhaps text could be along the lines, developed and submitted to the agencies for adoption.? Also it needs to be clear that the plans will be signed at the **minister-level** to ensure national support at sufficient levels? as noted in the PIF review sheet.

The **Results Based Framework** needs to be updated based on above requests.

15th of May 2019: in Annex A, three objectives are listed next to the project objective. the 3rd outcome indicator is focusing on direct beneficiaries. At mid term the project envisions to have engaged with 1000 persons, then at time of Terminal Evaluation the project is planning to have engaged with more than 260k persons. Please provide substantial justification that will enable the reader to understand how the project is planning to have engagement with local beneficiaries to undertake such an exponential increase over merely a few years. It may be that outcome indicator 3 in its targets is simply mixing different sets of deliverables, maybe the solution is to have trained persons and persons benefitting from the investment divided into two sub indicators for outcome 3.

Further, please rework outcome 3 and its output indicators (on pp 8-10 of the results framework in Annex A). it will be near impossible to measure progress against these extremely qualitative indicators. Please provide quantitative indicators instead.

27th of April 2022 (Thenshaw):

- (1) Regarding 3rd outcome indicator focusing on direct beneficiaries: Addressed.
- (2) Regarding quantitative targets for outcome 3: Addressed.

### **Response to Secretariat comments** UNDP Response, 23 December 2021

Please note that Indicator 7 in the SRF refers to the number of direct beneficiaries of the entire project. It does not refer to a specific benefit. Different groups/sectors of the river basin community will derive a variety of benefits throughout the project. Thus, at mid-

term, as stated in the SRF, those individuals who receive IRBM/ICM and special skills training for project planning, development and implementation will be identified and accounted for as beneficiaries. By the end of the project, another set of beneficiaries (i.e., approximately 2% of the river basin population) are accounted for, namely those that are impacted directly by social, economic and environmental benefits as a consequence of improved environmental services from the by the projects.

As stated in the SRF, the benefits and the beneficiaries will be determined through baseline studies, training workshop reports, case studies, monitoring reports, and the SORB reporting process, which is described in Component 1 of the Project Document.

Outcome 3 indicator has been modified as follows: Training workshops and other knowledge sharing/learning activities and events organized and conducted to enable execution and scaling up of IRBM strategies and action plans.

Quantitative targets have been identified as follows:

Mid-term:

? Two (2) regional and 6 national IRBM/ICM and special skills workshops/ learning activities organized and conducted, with at least 50% of the trainees being women.

? SORB baseline reports prepared across the 6 priority river basins/sub-basins and coastal areas.

? Two (2) representatives from the IRBM project participate in biennial GEF IW Conference to facilitate cross-regional collaboration and knowledge sharing on IRBM.

? Four (4) IRBM knowledge products developed and disseminated (i.e., IRBM training modules; SORB guideline; RB-IIMS manual; and TPL manual).

End-of-project:

? Four (4) regional and 12 national IRBM/ICM and special skills workshops/ learning activities organized and conducted, with at least 50% of the trainees being women.

? Six (6) end-of-project SORB reports for 6 priority river basins provide policymakers, planners, managers and the general public with information on the impacts and benefits of IRBM pilot projects, as well as gaps, needs and priorities for up-scaling to the river basin/sub-basin and coastal area.

? Six (6) Scientifically sound water quantity and quality M&E programs developed and initiated in 6 river basins hotspot locations and providing input to M&E reporting in accordance with common set of IRBM indicators.

? One (1) Regional IRBM knowledge-sharing platform set up and fully functional, providing access to knowledge products and support services produced by the project, as well as linkages to other related KM platforms, at the national, regional and global levels, including the IW/LME Learn platform and regional training and outreach program.



The endorsement letter from Malaysia, dated 10 August 2018 and signed by Mr. Jaya Singnam Rajoo, is included in Annex J of the Project Document.

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

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. The **PPG** is noted as \$288,000 which is above the limit of \$200,000 for PIF up to \$10M. The PF is \$8,479,123.

Despite adding a significant new Output of a set of pilot projects into Outcome 2, the **budget** allocation for this Component only increased by 10%. This needs reconsideration. In particular the knowledge management component increased significantly as well although no new significant activities were added. Perhaps some of the KM funding could move to Component 2.

15th of May 2019: Please insert into the portal entry the supporting arguments as to why the seven country project needed additional ppg resources.

27th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed. Linked UNDP PPG Initiation Plan demonstrates the extensive outputs necessitating a higher PPG request/approval.

**Response to Secretariat comments**  
UNDP Response, 23 December 2021

Please note that the PPG grant was \$288,000 (refer to the PIF and PPG Approval letter from the GEF). As identified in Annex C of the GEF CEO Request Document, this was the amount of GEF grant expended during the PPG phase. The grant was fully expended. Furthermore, the regional nature of the project required more resources compared to a national project with the same grant amount.

The PPG Initiation Plan prepared by UNDP is in this link: <https://pims.undp.org/attachments/5635/214387/1705960/1706475/5635-Signed IP Plan.pdf>

UNDP Response, 8 May 2019

For clarification, it is noted that the approved PIF identified a PPG of \$288,000. This was confirmed in the PPG approval letter from the GEF CEO to the UNDP GEF Executive Coordinator, dated 28 April 2017. UNDP finds this amount reasonable for a regional project. However, it is noted that to complete the project preparation, an additional \$16,348 was co-financed by UNDP Manila and PEMSEA in response to requests from the 7 countries for a third round of planning and awareness building workshops at the national and site levels to secure commitments from both levels of government, NGOs and others.

The rationale for the current budget allocation was: a) national and local governments have committed a significant amount of co-financing for the project, primarily targeted at Component 2 and the pilot projects (i.e., from \$19 million targeted in the PIF to more than \$100 million committed in the Project Document); and b) Component 3, knowledge sharing, is the essence of a regional project. The experiences across 7 countries, 7 river basins and 7 pilot sites with numerous political, social, economic and environmental disparities means that there is much to be shared and learned, which can help in up-scaling and replicating IRBM good practices. Thus, the GEF grant portion for knowledge sharing was raised from \$1.7 million in the PIF to \$2.2 million in the Project Document. We hope that this rationale is acceptable.

**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 Request  
(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). Yes.

8th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Please add a Covid-19 risk and opportunity analysis.

3rd of August 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response 20 July 2022

The section on Risks in the CEO ER now includes an analysis of the COVID-19 risks and opportunities (Section A.6 pp 24-25).

In the Project Document, the UNDP Risk Register (Annex 5) now includes separate risk and mitigation measures related COVID 19.

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

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. The **co-financing letters** are missing.

(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. The **co-financing letters** are missing.

While the four-fold increase in co-financing is very welcome, it is disappointing to see that it is entirely **in-kind**. The grant funding noted in the PIF from ASEAN Secretariat and from the Chuncheon Global Water Forum were important for demonstrating regional interest and commitment to this project. Please reexamine the co-financing and seek support that is not in-kind.

15th of may 2019: Annex J seems to be missing. Only the grant cofinancing letter from Philippines can be located. Please upload Annex J

27th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Not Addressed. The 17 Annexes do not appear in the updated Project Document nor are they uploaded individually or consolidated in the portal. Please include all 17 Annexes as one document or include them in the updated Project Document so they can be part of the circulation package.

8th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Partially addressed. Upon review of the co-financing letters in Annex 14, which is now uploaded to the portal, it is noted that each co-financing letter, other than UNDP, is dated between the June 2018 through September 2018 period (and one March 2019 and one June 2019). When reviewing co-financing letters that were secured four years ago, it is difficult to determine whether the co-financiers are still willing to co-finance the project and whether they have their stated co-financing still available. Please secure new/up-to-date co-financing letters from each co-financier (other than UNDP) and ensure that each letter follows the GEF policy requirements.

3rd of August 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed. The GEF Secretariat accepts the Agency's proposal to secure up-to-date co-financing letters during the inception phase of the project (to avoid further project implementation delays).

Response to Secretariat comments  
UNDP Response, 21 December 2021

Annex 14 is included in the updated Project Document.

UNDP Response, 8 May 2019

The co-financing letters may be found in Annex J, Additional Agreements.

Additional cofinancing letter (grant) is being provided by the Philippines. Also attached is the letter of support from the Chuncheon Global Water Forum. Note that the amount of cofinancing that was indicated in the PIF is no longer reflected as the project has long been completed. Through discussions with UNDP and PEMSEA, the ASEAN Secretariat has indicated full support for this project in line with its coordination of the activities of AWGWRM.

UNDP responses 12 May 2022. The entire set of Annexes is uploaded in the portal.

UNDP Response, 18 July 2022

UNDP proposes to secure all the co-financing commitment letters within the first 6 months of project implementation.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. The project contribution to **GEF6 indicators** needs to be noted in the table in section *E. Project's Target Contributions to GEF 7 Corporate indicators* (and needs to note GEF 6, not 7). The table refers to Annex B in Pro Doc, but the annex refers to the IW tracking tool, not to the corporate targets.

15th of May 2019: Addressed

Response to Secretariat comments  
UNDP Response, 8 May 2019

Section E, CEO Request document, now includes the GEF 6 Corporate Target: Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services; Replenishment Target: Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins; and Project Target: 7 freshwater basins.

Reference to Annex B has been deleted.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). **Not relevant.**

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 Request  
(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. The pilot project (Outcome 2.1) heavily emphasize **cities**. These efforts could benefit from and contribute to the GEF has the Sustainable Cities GEF6 and GEF7 programs. Please discuss possibilities for sharing experiences with the Sustainable Cities programs.

Given the premise of the project is the linkages with **LMEs**, there needs to be plans for coordination with the LMEs and consideration of linkages to the SAPs and their implementation. There also needs to be collaboration with the relevant regional bodies for the various LMEs.

15th of may 2019: Addressed

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 8 May 2019

Output 3.1.4, Regional IRBM knowledge and communication management platform operationalized, has been modified in response to this comment: Regional forums/events

will be organized and conducted in collaboration with (a) the existing ASEAN governance framework, particularly the ASEAN Working Group on Water Resources Management (AWGWRM) and the ASEAN Senior Officers on the Environment (ASOEN) as applicable to accelerate adoption, uptake and upscaling; (b) other GEF-supported LME projects in the region, including SDS-SEA, Gulf of Thailand and South China Sea, and Indonesian Seas, among others; (c) other GEF-supported programmes in the region, including Sustainable Cities, Sustainable Forest Management, and Climate Change Mitigation; and (d) PEMSEA's regional networks (e.g., local governments; universities).

In addition to knowledge sharing aspects of Component 3, collaborative planning and implementation with LME projects/programs will be facilitated through the national tier coordinating arrangements established for such purpose (see Comment 2).

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. The plans for developing the technical report/guide and tying with the 7 rivers (outputs 3.1.1, 3.1.2) need to address the spectrum of issues, including biophysical, **socioeconomic and governance** as planned in Component 1.6 as noted in the PIF review sheet.

There is an impressive suite of activities planned for knowledge sharing under Output 3.1.4. Additional consideration needs to be given to using social media to share experiences to reach a wide audience. Further, that there be means for **two-way** interactions such as WhatsApp, listserve and other fora.

For the knowledge sharing it is unclear that the project regional leadership will be responsible for pulling out insights from the 7 river and pilot experiences for cross-cutting lessons learned. This **synthesis** is part of the justification for having a joint project with multiple rivers with varying experiences from which lessons can be drawn.

As part of the IW LEARN Output 3.1.5, the project needs to plan to contribute Results and Experience **Notes** highlighting lessons learned.

Similar to the previous point related to Component 2, there needs to be plans to share experiences with the relevant **LMEs** of the various rivers to ensure connections between the rivers and marine management.

Given the importance of **learning**, please revise the title of Component 3 to include 'learning' as it had in the PIF.

The activities under the PIF Output 3.3 Knowledge management platform facilities replication of good practices and up-scaling of IRBM as well as 3.2.2 seem to be missing from the Pro Doc plans. Please clarify.

15th of May 2019: Addressed

#### Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 8 May 2019

Activity 3.1.1.2 has been modified to: Prepare a technical report/guide based on the desk study, recommending a list of SMART indicators (e.g., socio-economic, governance, stress reduction, and environmental status, among others). Socio-economic indicators will be focused on providing, communities, decision-makers and the business sector with a clear justification of the value and benefits of protecting, maintaining, and/or improving environmental flows and water quality for priority uses (e.g., water supply; recreation; fisheries), including cost-benefit analysis of management options. Indicators will be gender specific where appropriate. Disseminate the draft report/guide to relevant organizations and individuals in participating countries and organizations for review and comment.

Activity 3.1.1.3: Revise the draft report/guide based on feedback; publish and disseminate it to national and local governments, river basin organizations and Project Teams for application in baseline assessments of river basins and State of River Basin Reporting (Output 1.1).

.

Agreed. Activity 3.1.4.6 has been modified to include:

?Communicate project progress and findings regularly to national and local governments, river basin organizations, communities, regional organizations and projects across the region, including:

?

c. Using social media to share experiences to reach a wide audience and enhance two-way interactions, such as WhatsApp, list serve and other fora.

?.?

-

-

Output 3.1.4 has been amended to clarify the situation, as follows:

To build IRBM knowledge management awareness and support in the ASEAN region, among ASEAN Member States and across the East Asian region, actions in Output 3.1.4 will focus on: a) building an e-portal that is readily accessible and proactive in communicating project findings and impacts to key regional bodies through face-to-face events organized by the project or co-organized with other organizations; b) producing and disseminating informative documents that are based upon the insights, experiences and cross-cutting lessons learned from the 7 river basins and pilot projects; and c) promoting the replication of good practices generated by the project and upscaling of IRBM within each respective river basin and participating country, as well as across the region.

Regional:

3.1.4.1 Gather, package, and disseminate knowledge products from the various project activities, events, and outputs in the 7 river basins and pilot projects, including a synthesis of good practices, lessons learned, policy briefs, case studies, guidance documents, technical reports, etc., using various formats and content that are readily accessible and understandable by target audiences including political leaders, planners, IRBM managers and practitioners, investors, and the general public.



Activity 3.1.5.3 has been added to Project Document as follows: Contribute knowledge products, including case studies, experience notes, policy briefs, etc. to GEF IW Learn, highlighting lessons learned and good practices from the work undertaken in the 7 river basins and respective pilot projects.

Activity 3.1.4.6 has been amended as follows:

Share experiences, project progress and findings regularly to national and local governments, river basin organizations, communities, and relevant LME projects and regional organizations, including:

- a. Transferring findings and strategic directions of IRBM at each year's AWGWRM and AWGCME meetings;
- b. Presenting briefings on outputs and outcomes/impacts that are strategic to the targets and objectives of ASOEN and EAS Partnership Council as well as LME projects and programs (e.g., South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand; Indonesian Seas; Bay of Bengal; and CTI Sulu Sulawesi Seas) and GEF-supported initiatives (e.g., Sustainable Cities; Sustainable Forestry; Climate Mitigation; etc.), as well as networks of local governments, universities and the private sector.

?

Component 3 title has reverted to Knowledge Management and Learning

As requested by the STAP reviewers (please refer to Annex B, Responses to Project Reviews, CEO Request document), Outcome 3 has been revised in the Project Document. PIF Output 3.3 has been transferred to Output 3.1.4 in the Project Document. Output 3.1.4 includes:

?To build IRBM knowledge management awareness and support in the ASEAN region, among ASEAN Member States and across the East Asian region, actions in Output 3.1.4 will focus on: a) building an e-portal that is readily accessible and proactive in communicating project findings and impacts to key regional bodies through face-to-face

events organized by the project or co-organized with other organizations; b) producing and disseminating informative documents that are based upon the insights, experiences and cross-cutting lessons learned from the 7 river basins and pilot projects; and c) promoting the replication of good practices generated by the project and upscaling of IRBM within each respective river basin and participating country, as well as across the region. ?

UNDP response 12 September 2022

1) The text that was missing has been added in the portal. Now, this paragraph is complete: *PEMSEA will serve as Executing Agency for the project and UNDP will provide technical and financial oversight. As the EA, PEMSEA will be responsible for the overall execution of the project and monitoring progress and for adaptive management. It will directly implement regional activities while the national executing agencies in all participating countries will implement national activities with support from the Regional Project Management Unit that will be hired and hosted by PEMSEA.*

2) i) M&E has been added as component 4 and related adjustments were made under component 3 in the table B. These outcome and Outputs for M&E have been added:

**Outcome 4:** Project-level monitoring and evaluation, in compliance with UNDP and mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements

**Outputs:**

4.1.1 Inception Workshop and Report

4.1.2 Annual GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR), and M&E of GEF core Indicators, Gender Action Plan, Safeguards Frameworks and Action Plans

4.1.3 Independent Mid-Term Review

4.1.4 Independent Terminal Evaluation

ii) Information that was missing under Output 3.1.5 has been added. Now the output reads ? *3.1.5 One percent of the GEF grant allocated for participation in regional and global forums, preparation of experience notes, and organization and conduct of regional twinning activities in collaboration with GEF LME/IW Learn*?.

4) i) "Miscellaneous" \$4,900 in the Annex C table has been described and broken-down.

ii) Adjustments have been made in the portal to properly align the Annex C table lines.

## Agency Responses

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

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. Please see above comments.

15th of May 2019: Still a need for addressing some of the initial comments.

27th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No,. Please see above comments.

17th of August 2022 (thenshaw): Please address below comments:

(1) In the front matter, all Executing Partners are Governmental Institutions, so the type must be classified ?Government? instead of ?Multilateral?. Also, in Section 6 there is no description of the role that each of these institutions will play in the project?s execution. Please revise accordingly.

(2) M&E outputs and outcomes in Table B are missed. There is also one dollar difference between the amount allocated to M&E in Table B vs. the amount in M&E Budget in Section 9. Please revise accordingly.

(3) Please ensure the latest version of the V) Project Results Framework in the Agency?s own project document is readable. The pdf file currently displays the results framework in landscape mode but printed in portrait mode, which hides the columns furthest to the right.

(4) On the Utilization of PPG: please provide a breakdown of activities funded through the PPG instead of providing a line with the lump sum.

7th of September 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Partly addressed. The paragraph included in the 22 Aug 2022 response below does not appear in the CEO Document. It appears only the first sentence is included at the conclusion of section 6. Please revise accordingly.

(2) Partly addressed. It is noted that M&E is now merged with Component 3 in Table B and the \$254,373 M&E budget has been added to Component 3. Component 3 does not

include an M&E outcome. It also appears that output 3.1.5 is incomplete, as it currently ends with "and". Please revise accordingly. Please ensure the new M&E outcome is supported by M&E outputs in Component 3 of Table B.

(3) Addressed.

(4) Partly addressed. Please describe and breakdown "Miscellaneous" \$4,900 in the Annex C table. Further, the Annex C table lines do not align properly. For example, the amount for Training, Workshops and Conferences appears to be \$0, as no figures correspond to that line item. Please revise accordingly.

15th of September 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(4) Addressed.

## Response to Secretariat comments

### UNDP Response, 8 May 2019

In addition to the responses/amendments provided herein, please refer to the PIF responses provided in Annex B of the CEO Request document for further clarification.

### UNDP Response, 23 December 2021

All comments have been addressed.

### UNDP Responses: 22 Aug 2022

1. Executing partner type is now corrected to Government.

The roles and responsibilities of the regional and national executing partners are now described in the CEO Endorsement Request, section A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.

*PEMSEA will serve as Executing Agency for the project and UNDP will provide technical and financial oversight. As the EA, PEMSEA will be*

*responsible for the overall execution of the project and monitoring progress and for adaptive management. It will directly implement regional activities while the national executing agencies in all participating countries will implement national activities with support from the Regional Project Management Unit that will be hired and hosted by PEMSEA.*

2. M&E component is included in the Component 3: Knowledge management and learning; and Monitoring and Evaluation in the Table B. M&E budget in Section 9 is now corrected to \$254,373.
3. Section V is now adjusted and readable

PPG budget is now revised

UNDP response 12 September 2022

1) The text that was missing has been added in the portal. Now, this paragraph is complete: *PEMSEA will serve as Executing Agency for the project and UNDP will provide technical and financial oversight. As the EA, PEMSEA will be responsible for the overall execution of the project and monitoring progress and for adaptive management. It will directly implement regional activities while the national executing agencies in all participating countries will implement national activities with support from the Regional Project Management Unit that will be hired and hosted by PEMSEA.*

2) i) M&E has been added as component 4 and related adjustments were made under component 3 in the table B. These outcome and Outputs for M&E have been added:

**Outcome 4:** Project-level monitoring and evaluation, in compliance with UNDP and mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements

**Outputs:**

4.1.1 Inception Workshop and Report

4.1.2 Annual GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR), and M&E of GEF core Indicators, Gender Action Plan, Safeguards Frameworks and Action Plans

4.1.3 Independent Mid-Term Review

4.1.4 Independent Terminal Evaluation

ii) Information that was missing under Output 3.1.5 has been added. Now the output reads ? 3.1.5 One percent of the GEF grant allocated for participation in regional and global forums, preparation of experience notes, and organization and conduct of regional twinning activities in collaboration with GEF LME/IW Learn?.

4) i) "Miscellaneous" \$4,900 in the Annex C table has been described and broken-down.

ii) Adjustments have been made in the portal to properly align the Annex C table lines.

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. STAP indicated in their review that more than one model needs to be used for the pollutant modeling. Please clarify if this recommendation is being addressed.

15th of May 2019: Addressed

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 8 May 2019

The following response was provided to STAP request (please see Annex B, CEO Request document):

?Given the scope of the project and budgetary constraints (due to budget reduction), modeling will be limited to rapid assessment of total pollutant loadings (TPL) and sources in the river basins. A variety of rapid assessment TPL models are already available and will be applied in Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, and Vietnam. For example, the recently completed GEF/UNEP project entitled, ?Global foundations for reducing nutrient enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution, in support of Global Nutrient Cycle (GNC Project)? developed and successfully demonstrated a rapid assessment model for nutrient loads from human and agricultural activities in the Manila Bay watershed. This model will be introduced to countries that currently have limited capacity in TPL modeling (i.e., Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar).?

In addition, the introduction to Output 1.1.4 describes the approach that will entail the use of different TPL models in 4 countries, and one common model in the three aforementioned countries.

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 15th of May 2019: The council comments from USA and Germany has been responded to.

Response to Secretariat comments  
UNDP Response, 8 May 2019

Comments from USA and Germany have been responded to, as reflected in Annex B of the CEO Request document.

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Karrer, Dec 10 2018).  
Yes. There were no Convention comments.

Response to Secretariat comments  
**Recommendation**

**12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(Karrer, Dec 10 2018). No. Please address above comments.

15th of May 2019: No, please address above comments.

27th of April 2022 (thenshaw). No, please address above comments and resubmit.  
Thank you.

8th of June 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

17th of August 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments (under section 11) and resubmit. Thank you.

7th of September 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments (under section 11) and resubmit. Thank you.

15th of September 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

#### Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Updates as of 23 December 2021

- a) The project document was transferred to the new UNDP-GEF Project Document template.
- b) Myanmar is now excluded from the project as directed by the GEF Secretariat.

#### Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	<b>12/10/2018</b>	<b>5/8/2019</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations