



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------------------|
| GEF ID: | 5132 | | |
| Country/Region: | India | | |
| Project Title: | Integrated Management of Wetland Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services for Water and Food Security | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNEP | GEF Agency Project ID: | |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | Biodiversity |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-1; BD-2; Project Mana; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$4,196,575 |
| Co-financing: | \$20,217,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$24,413,575 |
| PIF Approval: | April 24, 2013 | Council Approval/Expected: | June 01, 2013 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Yoko Watanabe | Agency Contact Person: | Maz Zieren |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible? | Yes, India has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance. | |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | Yes, a duly signed letter from the OFP is attached. | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | UNEP's experiences on relevant activities are noted. | |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | n/a | |
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | Please provide additional information. 10 Feb 2013 Additional information was provided. | |
| | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Resource Availability | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? | <p>Yes, the project is for a total of \$5m and it is within the remaining STAR BD allocation to India.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 With an update on the GEF-5 utilization information on BD STAR in India, we recognize that the total utilization will go beyond the allocation with this PIF for an amount of \$283960. Please revise the amount based on the BD STAR for India.</p> <p>10 Feb 2013 The GEF grant amount + Agency fee have been revised to \$4595250, and it is within the GEF-5 STAR BD allocation.</p> | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? | <p>Refer above comment.</p> <p>10 Feb 2013 Adequately addressed.</p> | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | n/a | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | n/a | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | n/a | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? | n/a | |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework? | <p>No, the outputs are not in line with the GEF-5 BD FA results framework. Please revise.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 Additional information has been provided. The FA outputs should be exactly in line with the concerned BD FA results framework's output(s)</p> | |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>PAs are new or existing PAs.</p> <p>10 Feb 2013 Adequately revised based on the comment.</p> | |
| | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified? | Yes, BD1 and BD2. | |
| | 9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP? | <p>Please further clarify how this project is in line with the NBSAP.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 Adequate additional information has been provided.</p> | |
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes? | Component 2 is dedicated to institutional and individual capacity building activities on wetland management. | |
| | 11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions? | The project is built on the National Wetland Conservation Programme as a baseline project, which is a significant project funded by the government for wetland conservation. | |
| Project Design | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? | | <p>Please provide brief information.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 Additional information has been provided. Further information, including cost effectiveness of the project approach and methods are expected at the time of CEO endorsement</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning? | Yes, general information has been provided. | |
| | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear? | <p>With lack of specific description on the project site, the GEB of the project is unclear. Please further clarify, including coverage and species.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 Additional information has been provided which now provides better understanding of the scope of the project. The project covers 7 pilot sites and 3 river basins covering vast landscapes at all sections of India. With the limited funding from GEF, and even with the substantial NWCP as cofinance, we suggest that the project to focus on fewer and concentrated sites while ensuring larger demonstration impact on integrated wetland management by mainstreaming water management in related sectors. Integrated wetland management activities on the ground requires extensive investment. Further prioritization is requested for site selection, and at least reduce to half of the identified sites.</p> <p>There are massive infrastructure development planned, particularly on the planned dam constructions in the Indian Himalayas. It is hard to understand in concrete terms, how the project will make sure that the development and conservation needs would be balanced and mainstreamed in sector strategies and plans. Which</p> | |

mainstreaming: the focus of this project? The PIU and Wetland International alone would not be able to do this, and national and state commitment and institutional framework needs to be further clarified.

On restoration activities, this is beyond our regular investment thus please clarify the type of planned interventions and how to ensure cost effectiveness.

The project design in general involves quite excessive amount of assessments, studies, and applied research. Please review and concentrate further on site investment.

10 Feb 2013

1) Sites: While the pilot sites have decreased from 7 to 4, the project still intends to cover four extensive river basins in India: River Periyar Basin, North Gangetic floodplains, lake Pulicat Basin, and River Jhelum Basin. The sites are all over the vast territory of India. Learning from experiences and the complexity of working on multi-sector and stakeholder initiative such as integrated water management and mainstreaming in India, it is rather unrealistic to expect significant results in all four basins within this funding. The PM strongly advise to further prioritize in line with the earlier comment, in a limited geographical area (maybe focus on one or two river basins in the Northern states), and provide concrete demonstration impact on

mainstreaming water management in key sectors, including infrastructure and agriculture, which could have a real replication/scale up impact and could provide a very timely and important contribution, considering all the development opportunities and pressures in India.

2) Studies and assessments

While the budget has been reduced, there are still excessive amount of economic studies and assessments suggested in the project. While it is academically and scientifically interesting to conduct these studies in various river basins, one needs to look it from a efficiency and effectiveness perspective to achieving larger impacts and avoid duplication of similar initiatives in the country.

3) Multi-sectoral Institutional framework

While the lead ministry is clarified, it is still unclear how mainstreaming of integrated water management would be achieved through a development of multi-sector institutional framework and applied to different sector policies and approaches at the national and river basin levels. The PM considers that in order to have a sustainable impact in scale, development of such institutional framework should be considered as one of the key outputs/outcomes of the project. It would be important to demonstrate (in one or two river basins that may likely to succeed) how such a sustainable multi-sector institutional

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | to a solid development/sector plan that promotes integrated water management, i.e. agriculture and infrastructure/dam construction that takes biodiversity in consideration. An integrated water management plan alone may not result in an intended results, unless it is mainstreamed in key sector plans and strategies. Considering the massive infrastructure development and agriculture development that is planned in India, a piece meal approach working on restoration and agro-practices could not be sufficient. | |
| | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate? | Yes, please further elaborate at the time of CEO endorsement. | |
| | 16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits? | <p>Please clarify how the project will ensure socio-economic and gender benefits would be adequately reflected in the project design.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 Adequate information has been provided. Please further elaborate socio-economic indicators by the time of CEO endorsement.</p> | |
| | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly? | <p>Please clarify any indigenous peoples involvement in the project.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 Additional information provided. Please clarify in the text that appropriate concent will be received on project approach and interventions by the time of CEO endorsement. Please refer to the new GEF IP principles and guidelines document.</p> | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| | | Adequate additional information has been provided. | |
| | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience) | Yes, adequate information provided at this stage. | |
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | Adequate information provided. | |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | Please further clarify with appropriate information. 11 Jan 2013 As noted above, further alignment with the national program on wetland conservation, and lead national and state agencies need to be clarified. Considering the theme, and the need to mainstream water management in multi-sector policies and approaches, a clear leadership is required while taking a multi-sectoral approach. | |
| | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | |
| | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | | |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate? | The PMC is identified slightly higher than the 5% practice. Please revise. 11 Jan 2013 Additional information has been provided. | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | <p>The GEF finance on the policy and capacity building components are rather excessive. Please revise with a view to strengthen work on the ground under component 3.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 Revision has been made. Considering the scope of the pilot activities, it is recommended that further concentration on component 3 should be considered during project preparation.</p> | |
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | <p>Cofinance is identified at 1 to 5 ratio and considered adequate.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 It came to attention that the type of cofinancing has not been identified. Considering the capacity of India, and the theme that focuses on mainstreaming, we would like to see concrete cash cofinancing to the project.</p> <p>10 Feb 2013 Adequate revision has been made with indication of cash cofinance.</p> | |
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | UNEP is providing \$260000, with further details under page 17. | |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | |
| | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| Agency Responses | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? • Convention Secretariat? | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | <p>No. Please further clarify based on above comments, particularly on the GEB which is weak and also revise the project finance.</p> <p>11 Jan 2013 No. Additional information has been provided but project scope needs to be further reviewed. Please provide further information and revision, and resubmit the proposal for further review.</p> <p>10 Feb 2013 No. Please address further comments provided under item 14, particularly on the design and scope of the project. With further consideration in the approach and geographical scope, this project could have a tangible impact and timely contribution in mainstreaming biodiversity in water management in India.</p> <p>112 April 2013 Yes, The GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately responds to the earlier comments. The PM recommends the PIF for future work program inclusion.</p> | |
| | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? | | |
| | 33. Is CEO endorsement/approval | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|------------------|--|
| Review Date (s) | First review* | October 02, 2012 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | January 11, 2013 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | April 12, 2013 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points | Program Manager Comments |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| PPG Budget | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | |
| | 2. Is itemized budget justified? | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PPG approval being recommended? | |
| | 4. Other comments | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | |

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.