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

GEF ID:	**5729**		
Country/Region:	**Global**		
Project Title:	**GEF International Waters:Learning Exchange and Resources Network IW LEARN**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP and UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5337 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**International Waters**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**IW-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$140,000**	Project Grant:	**$4,987,500**
Co-financing:	**$12,269,312**	Total Project Cost:	**$17,396,812**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**May 01, 2014**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Christian Severin**	Agency Contact Person:	**Vladimir Manaev**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	11th of March 2014: NA, this is a global project	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	11th of March 2014: NA this is a global project	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	11th of March 2014: Yes, the funds are available within the IW focal area allocation. However, please note that the funds will not be available under OBjective 1, but objective 3, please do make this change.	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	11th of March 2014: Yes, this proposed project is fully in line with the GEF 5 IW strategy, that specifically under objective 3, mentions that this objective will fund projects with an "emphasis on active learning and South-to-South experience sharing for the GEF IW portfolio through new "Communities of Practice" and foster engagement with the private sector." Further, this proposed project will also be falling in line with the proposed upcoming GEF 6 IW strategy, that also has a focus on continuing and strengthening the Portfolio learning activities that have been supporting the IW focal area for more than a decade. Please make sure to allign fully with the GEF5 Objective three outcome and output indicators. Please then also make this change appear in table A, where right now objective 1 has been mentioned. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant	11th of March 2014: This is a global project. This project is fully in line with the GEF5 IW strategies on knowledge management, portfolio learning, south to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	south learning, communities of practice and will especially cater to Outcome 3.3: "IW portfolio capacity and performance enhanced from active learning/KM/experience sharing". It will be designed in line with the commitment of GEF in its upcoming stratgeic directions to step up protfolio learning and specifically in IW expand IW learn to a broader knowledhe network among a broad set of partners.	
Project Design	6. 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?	17th of March 2014: Please do not only describe IW learn baseline/previous funding, but also those of the partners in volved in project implementation and execution. These desriptions are provided elsewhere in the PIF. Please change as this phase of IW Learn constitutes a clear step-up to aspiring a hub for global learning on transboundary waters financed by GEF and others. The baseline in terms of issues and needs as well as achievements has changed since the first phases of IW-learn. Not only does the GEF but also many development partners now have engaged much more actively in transboundary cooperation in international waters which needs to be reflected both in the baseline and increment/co-finance to increment. Please at the time of CEO endorsement provide a much more detailed description (matrix or other) that will be able to explain which of these specific activities will support which of the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		proposed GEF funded activities. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): The baseline description has been enhanced sufficiently.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	17th of March 2014: Overall comments: The description of the baseline and alternative - financed by GEF and by partners - need to better reflect a scale up of IW learn in this phase - making a strong case for making IW Learn with its partners a knowledge hub. This will harness experience from more than 20 years of GEF portfolio and partner activities to improve current and future portofolios and impacts of investments (GEF and non-GEF). The current phase will aim to institutionalize and operationalize such a broader partnership within PPG and throughout the project - including defining during PPG on where IW Learn should be housed in future with a view of seeking greater collaboration of the IW Learn PMU with partners in freshwater field and seeking greatest cooperative advantage among implementing and executing partners. The proposed components seems to conform with the project objective (which may need some rewording - see below). However, with as many as 20 output indicators (which will all have a	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		set of supporting activities) the project will be rather complex to manage, please consider if it is possible to merge some output indicators and activities. - PDO: Please rethink language. (i) please make clear what is the outcome (e.g. improve the effectiveness of finance for transboundary water by GEF and partners to deiver tangible and sustainable results" and what are tools ot get there. (ii) It is not clear what "promote quality learning and dissmenated experiences" is meant to express. Component comments: Overall- please make more clear what components focus on what clients (either in component description or overall text), i.e.: There are some components that are mostly serve the GEF (i.e. GEFSEC and GEF agencies/IW Task Force) such as activities related to GEF portfolio management; other components/project outcomes serve/aim for improved KM on transboundary management; other components/project outcomes aim for knowledge exchanges/broader COPs among broad set of players in the countries and supported by IWlearn partnes; other components/project outcomes aim to develop tools and mechanisms to strengthen impacts on the ground. Right this distinction is not there (and hence we loose to see the stepping up of IW Learn from GEF centered to a	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		broader partnership which afterall underlies the reasoning for the request for increased finance !). 1) - 1.1. in framework - not clear what 'indicator based assessments of project interventions' is supposed to mean. Project indicators are part of each project approval. - 1.1 - the IW:Learn website needs to be searchable, a major concern of the current structure; also make sure that there is no impression that IW learn 4 funds would make up for unfinished tasks that should be finalized in IW Learn3. During PPG assure that lessons and comments of MTR with regard to website are clearly reflected. Increased in-house capacity of IW-Learn or leveraging such in a host location and/or contracting out work are options to be evaluated during PPG. - 1.4 - needs to be broader than only R2R and EBM; 2) - unclear why 2.4 is not part of 2.3; - unclear on why 2.3/2.4 and so distinct from component 3; its is therefore also not quite clear how the funds between these two components are allocated. 3) 3 - need to clarify what activities constitute these "Communities of Practice" that are not already included in other components - are these specific websites, listserves? How are these different from already identified	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		activities?; - Please make sure that IW learn PMU has strengtheneded capacity in itself to coordinate partners and be a hub to guide and energize COPs and can assure e.g. linkages across CoPs "surface" and "groundwater" CoPs to operationalize needs for move to conjunctive management of these resources; 4) 4.1 - during meetings there was discussion of integrating into appropriate journals that are read by relevant audiences (e.g. LME papers in Marine Policy; ICM projects in Coastal Management) instead of everything together in a generic journal; 5) 4.3 - this means conferences? 6) 5.1 - To be more clear, this refers to revising the TDA/SAP Guidance documents to provide guidance on conducting economic valuations, correct?; 7) 5 - We discussed including a subcomponent to link the TWAP to national policies by drawing out key messages through such media as watershed or national report cards that visually illustrate the state of the ecosystems for policy-makers to easy understand; 8) 5.4 - What is this? Please include mention of how IW learn will fill known gaps and experiences and needs, e.g. including what has worked/ what are lessons and best pratices on insitutional/legal frameworks; on	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		transboundary benefit sharing mechanisms (economic evaluation tools aid this); addressing Water-Food-Energy-Ecosystems Nexus; and bridging science-policy gaps (besides economic evaluatio tools). While details of such can be addressed in PPG phase, key items deserve mentioning to make a case for increased finance to IW-learn (in combination with LME global governance projcet). 9) Please add wording that will support activities linking IWLEARN with the GEFSEC wide KM and RBM systems both existing and future systems, throughout the project period. - Please reflect that the projects needs to involve basin/water body based organizations (surface and gw basin organizations, LBOs and LME based etc). These are not prominent in terms of being major clients (besides project managers within these organizations). - More broadly, there needs to be discussion regarding the links between this project and the LME CoP. And, relatedly, discussion regarding the emphasis on fresh water for this project. There are several points that need to be addressed during PPG: 1) 2) an appropriate location for the IWLearn team needs to be identified to take advantage of relevant expertise, especially with regard to freshwater	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		transboundary management and knowledge exchanges; 3) the list of partner activities needs significant refinement to better reflect GEF and co-financed activities in a consolidated fashion and building on comparative advantages of partners (where co-finance is "cash" and hence directly part of the project and its budget). 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): above points addressed to a degree that is okay at this stage. However, please continue to explore and deepend the respondses during the PPG phase.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	17th of March 2014: Yes, GEBs are identified in a more subtle way than the "average" IW funded project, as this project will be setting out to continue to support the enhancement of knowledge in the IW transboundary water and related ecosystems, as well as between these. Moreover this phase of IWLEARN will be focusing on bringing in experience and expertise and build on the comparative advantages of a set of new non-gef agency partners through operationalizing and broadening partners of an existing MOU of IW-Learn (GEF) and other key players in transboundary water management.	
	9. 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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	11th of March 2014: No, GENDER dimensions and more clear participation and opportunities working with a range of civil society groups within regions and countries/basins are not well described. Please take note hereof and make sure to include gender dimensions in the next submission while taking consideration of broader civil society inclusion in project design. Further, please especially focus on getting more private sector parties involved throughout the PPG phase while clarifying which of these partnerships are to materialize on global or regioal scale or where IW learn and its partners serve as brokers to encourage links on the ground (e.g. between basin organizations and private sector players). 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Above point on Gender inclusion addressed.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	11th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes a matrix outlining the potential risks along with possible mitigation measures have been included. Please expand during PPG phase. e.g. look at how climate risk tools existing among GEF agencies and IW learn partners can best be leveraged.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	11th of March 2014: No, please make sure: - better delineate baseline situation/projects/ actitivies in fields of transboundary water management and knowledge exchanges that the project will build on (see comment on baseline). - include language to design in the project coordination with GEFSEC activiites on RBM and KM, as outlined in the draft GEF 2020 stratregy as well as ongoing activities within these fields. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	17th of March 2014: The nature of the project is in itself to test innovative and "ahead of the curve" methodologies and techniques to foster portfolio learning, knowledge sharing and capacity building of the international waters across GEF/GEF agencies' and partner supported projects and programs as well as with partners from both the public and private sector. Sustainbility of the project will highly depend on the degree of its ambition to anchor IW Learn much stronger with ongoing efforts - esp.in the freshwater field - with GEF agencies and IW Learn partner activities. Co-location with strong KM networks in international waters would greatly enhance sustainability and leverage of impacts (to be considered/evaluated during PPG).	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	11th of March 2014: Yes, the GEF funding and associated co-financing is appropriate as long as the stepped up finance is clearly based on expanding the scope of IW learn 4 compared to its previous phase to a global knowledge hub on IW through working in cooperation with a large set of partners while at the same time leveraging experiences from over 22 years of GEF engagement in IW.	
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	11th of March 2014: Yes, the indicated co-financing amount is considered to be adequate to reach the indicated Objective. Please make sure that agency and other partners 'cash' co-finance is reflected in project budgets/activties. Please revise co-finance additions across tables to assure consistency ! 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	11th of March 2014: Yes the PM budget is in accordance with the GEFSEC guidance	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	13th of March 2014: Yes PPG is requested and is within the norm. Please ensure travel funding in PPG is sufficient to cover costs to global events that would aid coordination and consultations with partners (e.g. Stockholm Water week; LME July or Oct meeting; ..).	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	11th of March 2014: NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	17th of March 2014: No, please address above points. 24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is technically cleared and is recommended for inclusion into an upcoming WP.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO	17th of March 2014: We will summarize	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.	these here after the the revised PIF has been submitted. By CEO endorsement - in addition to earlier comments provided above for addressing at CEO endorsment/during PPG, please address the following: - Please make gender consideration explicit during PPG - specific materials/course support to agencies and project during project design may be helpful (e.g building on UNDP's pervious corporate efforts on 'gender and water resources' providing short guides by topic along the project cycle). Please take account of upcoming GEF6 gender action plan and GEF -wide and GEF 6-IW gender relevant indicators (once approved at Council). - Location of the project PMU/secretariat in vicinity of network partners, other larger players especially in freshwater and consideration of the agency's related efforts will be key to operationalizing the broader partnership on KM in transboundary water management as well as sustainability considerations for IW-Learn. - Please consider how the rich data and information (incl, maps, GIS data layers, etc.) can be best made available to IW-learn and MOU partner stakeholder via the IW-Learn webiste after TWAP project closure.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		- Please consider during PPG how to link to/make available a broad set of publically available global/regional data on water and related data (incl. on CV&C) to GEF/IW:Learn stakeholders via the IW: Learn website by building on GEF agencies, MOU and other partners ongoing efforts (one stop shop idea; meta-data and/or data). - Options on how MOU partnership will be institutionally structured within IW-Learn should be explored during PPG and discussed formally with the group of MOU and other co-financing partners to support and guid IW-Learn activities and its broader scope as a hub for KM and learning on transboundary water governance and management. - Nexus and transboundary benefit sharing - with view of GEF 6, please feature clearly as one item to explore in terms of experiences, tools, guidance. - Groundwater governance and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater - we appreciate the continued recognition of the need to broaden capacity and share global and regional experiences and lessons. - CoPs - please spend effort in PPG to take stock on IW:Learn and "outside" experiences (starting with GEF SEC; GEF agencies ; MoU partners; and basin commissions (such as RBOs/LBOs), GEF project managers/direct stakeholders) on	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		what stakeholders would like to see; what has and has not worked well in the past; innovative ways to encourage and enliven the CoPs; to employ/use the comparative advantage of the large range of GEF partnership and network partners in the CoPs; and possibly expand past an electronic/website presence only. - Please ensure engagement with the GEFSEC KM team during PPG phase and align/coordinate as needed.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	March 17, 2014	
Review Date (s)	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.**