



# REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Enabling Transboundary Cooperation and Integrated Water Resources Management in the Chu and Talas River Basins.			
Country(ies):	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5310
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	5167
Other Executing Partner(s):		Submission Date:	11 July 2014
		Resubmission Date:	29 Aug 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	NA	Project Agency Fee (\$):	95,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>			

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-3 (select)	<p>Science based consensus among the countries on major transboundary problems of the basin.</p> <p>Increased political commitment and institutional capacity for collective action on transboundary water concerns</p> <p>Transboundary water management priorities incorporated into national planning frameworks</p>	<p>National inter-ministry committees established</p> <p>Strategic Action Programme (SAP) based on Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses and successful local pilots agreed by ministers.</p>	GEF TF	1,000,000	6,173,970
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
<b>Total project costs</b>				1,000,000	6,173,970

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<b>Project Objective:</b> Strengthening transboundary cooperation and promoting integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins, and empowering the Water Commission of Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic						
<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Grant Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)</b>
1. TDA including climate scenario analyses to inform adaptive management of the Chu-Talas shared water resources.	TA	<p><i>Outcome 1:</i> Science based consensus among the countries on major transboundary problems of the basin.</p> <p><i>Outcome 2:</i> Improved understanding of the transboundary implications of the shared nature of the Basins' water resources.</p> <p><i>Outcome 3:</i> Improved knowledge of the consequences of extreme weather situations.</p> <p><i>Outcome 4:</i> Capacitated local stakeholders ready to minimize negative consequences for economic sectors as well as the environment in the basin.</p>	<p>(1) Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) of the Chu and Talas River Basins</p> <p>(2) Scenarios of Water Futures with a focus on climate variability and transboundary issues</p> <p>(3) Seminars for stakeholders on adaptive management</p>	GEF TF	300,000	1,500,000
2. Building the foundation for broadened and improved bilateral water cooperation	TA	<p><i>Outcome 5:</i> Visioning process and agreement on priorities for action opens the way for systematic cooperation in the integrated management of the transboundary Chu Talas River Basins.</p> <p><i>Outcome 6:</i> Strengthened collaborative</p>	<p>(1) A Strategic Action Program (SAP) formulated and approved by the countries (Horizon 5 years) addressing main issues of transboundary concern and containing concrete actions (legal, policy, institutional reforms, and investments).</p> <p>(2) Establishment of</p>	GEF TF	200,000	1,400,000

		<p>mechanism for bilateral cooperation framework for the further improvement of joint management of the Chu and Talas basins.</p> <p><i>Outcome 7:</i> Steps taken for the involvement of stakeholders in the decision making process.</p> <p><i>Outcome 8:</i> Project experiences and lessons disseminated globally and regionally</p>	<p>Inter-ministerial committees in each recipient country, or strengthening of existing inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms.</p> <p>(3) A Stakeholder involvement, gender mainstreaming and outreach communication strategy</p> <p>(4) Revised Statutes of the Commission/Secretariat and establishment of a joint Environmental Expert Group under the Commission with clear mandate and work plan.</p> <p>(5) Twinning and experience sharing exchange with another transboundary basin, strategy for replication of best practices in the Chu Talas basins.</p> <p>(6) Project web page (following IW LEARN standards) created on the Commission website, international waters experience notes with best practices from the project produced, use of GEF 5 IW tracking tool and participation at GEF IW conferences and other IW LEARN activities ensured. 1% of the project total budget will be used for these types of activities as required by GEF.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

3. Strengthening capacity of water resources monitoring in the Chu and Talas River Basins.	TA	<p><i>Outcome 9:</i> Improved basis for the dialogue on transboundary water management on the basis of a better understanding of the quantity and quality of water resources, and their variability in the two basins.</p> <p><i>Outcome 10:</i> Consensus on joint monitoring activities between the two countries.</p> <p><i>Outcome 11:</i> Countries capacity built for improved coordinated monitoring.</p>	<p>(1) Assessment of present situation of surface and groundwater quantity and quality monitoring in the two basins</p> <p>(2) Training on water quantity monitoring and data exchange</p> <p>(3) Training and capacity building for joint water quality monitoring</p> <p>(4) Formalization of agreement on coordinated monitoring and data exchange in the two basins</p>	GEF TF	400,000	2,720,000	
Subtotal						900,000	5,620,000
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>					GEF TF	100,000	553,970
<b>Total project costs</b>						1,000,000	6,173,970

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Melioration of the Kyrgyz Republic	In-kind	750,000
National Government	Ministry of Environment and Water resources of Republic of Kazakhstan	In-kind	750,000
National Government	Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Kyrgyz Republic	In-kind	420,000
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	SDC	Cash	2,200,000
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	UNECE	Cash and in-kind	440,000
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	UNDP Kyrgyzstan	Cash	300,000
Others	Government of Finland	In-kind	1,313,970
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			6,173,970

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	201,000	170,000	371,000
National/Local Consultants	149,000	335,000	484,000

**F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

*N/A: no change since PIF submission.*

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. **NA**

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: **Addressed in PIF (see section B.3 of the PIF)**

The proposed project fits with the new UNDP’s Strategic Plan for 2014-2017, and with its three development focus areas: (i) Sustainable development pathways; (ii) Democratic Governance; (iii) Resilience. Particularly, the project will contribute to the sub-pillar on “Assistance for integrated water resources management and efficient use of water, efforts to protect and restore the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems, sustainable land management and restoration of degraded land, and management of chemicals and waste”.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: **N/A: no change since PIF submission.**

A. 5. **Incremental /Additional cost reasoning:** describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCE/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated **global environmental benefits** (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF) to be delivered by the project: **NA**

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: **Please refer to the attached draft project document, in particular Section VII Annexes. Annex 1 Risks Analysis and Risk Mitigation Measures (page 47).**

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

#### A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives.

Although there is no GEF financed project of relevance, the proposed project will be implemented in close cooperation with the following initiatives in Central Asia:

- EU/UNDP initiative “Promoting IWRM and fostering transboundary dialogue in Central Asia”;
- EU/UNDP initiative “Strengthening capacity in disaster risk management in Central Asia”;
- UNDP initiative “Climate risk management in Central Asia”;
- Initiative within the framework of regional action plan on environmental protection project;
- UNDP/Coca-Cola initiative “Every drop matters”;
- Initiative of Central Asia on Land resources management;

The proposed project will coordinate activities with the policies, reforms and initiatives of the governments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, donors and project implementation/management units of the World Bank, Asian development Bank, European Commission, JICA, SDC, TACIS, UNECE and others on water and environment. The Project will also accrue on lessons learned of the projects mentioned above in “Other initiatives and projects”.

In addition, positive experience of GEF-Small Grants Programme in Kyrgyzstan will be referenced in planning and implementation of project components and activities to strengthen transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in Chu-Talas river basin. GEF/SGP national coordinator will be regularly invited for discussion and project implementation.

#### **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Section V "Management Arrangements" (page 36) of the attached project document also describes the management roles these partners will assume during project implementation, while in Section II (Strategy) and its subsection on "Stakeholder Analysis" (page 26) the various project stakeholders have been described. In addition, several activities foreseen by the project will be largely based on the active participation of various stakeholders in an innovative approach at the Regional level.

**B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):**

Human/community benefits at local level: Currently, the population in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan within the Chu-Talas river basin is counted for more than two million people. About half of them live in rural areas and are employed in agriculture, mainly irrigated production. Consequently, welfare and local livelihood of rural communities heavily depend on adequate access to equitable water resources. Implementation of project activities to ensure sustainability of aquatic ecosystems, improve management of water infrastructure and water administration will prevent or at least mitigate the threat of water scarcity. Project interventions will create favorable conditions for productivity, employment, and increase in income of the rural population within the basin boundaries.

Implementation of project activities to develop water resources monitoring will identify root-causes of water pollution and provide for set of actions to improve water quality in natural water facilities and drinking water systems. Mixed with awareness raising and information sharing initiatives on safe water consumption and utilization, sanitation and hygiene, these activities will contribute to improved quality of drinking water, particularly in rural areas, reduced number of infectious diseases associated with the consumption of inadequately treated water. In addition, advanced aquatic ecosystems and water quality will create preconditions for sustainable development of recreation areas, industrial and recreational fishing, tourism and environmental services of environmental and water services and thus will create job opportunities for rural poor, including women and youth.

Currently, farms and cooperatives in arable segment of agriculture sector in water intakes of tail-end areas have no guaranteed access to irrigation water due to technical problems of the irrigation distribution network and unauthorized water consumption of upstream water users. Unequal access and distribution generates latent local conflicts and social tensions between local communities. Proposed by the project measures to regulate water distribution technologies and procedures, both at the local and transboundary levels will significantly reduce the risks of such conflicts.

Local communities will be more actively involved in the activities of the WUA, FWUAs, CDWUA, RWUCC and other independent associations of water users and businesses in the basin. As a consequence, participation of local communities, including women and youth in the planning, coordination and decision making will be broadened in the field of water management and protection.

The project will also collaborate with the GEF Small Grants Programme to involve community-based organizations to support local initiatives in addressing challenges of sustainable environmental management. With a greater focus on development and support of vulnerable groups, women and youth.

Gender considerations: Most of the staff of the management and protection of water resources authorities at all levels, especially in leadership positions, as well as leadership of independent associations of water users are male. In this regard, the project will gradually balance gender participation and representation in these organizations no more than 70% of the same sex, in accordance with the laws of the Kyrgyz Republic and Republic of Kazakhstan on State Guarantees of Equal Rights and Equal Opportunities. As part of this project capacity building, training, curricula, etc. are developed and tailored to different training recipients within water management and protection field. Project will provide actions to increase women participation by at least 30% in number of participants in conferences, seminars, workshops and other events. Professional gender balancing will also be sustained through equal employment opportunities for women – staffing, counseling, research etc.

**B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

The proposed project will be cost effective in achieving its objective to promote integrated water resources management in transboundary Chu-Talas river basins, including empowerment of "Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic on shared costs for interstate facilities operations in Chu-Talas river basin (Chu-Talas Commission) because of several aspects:

- Diversified strategy involving maximum stakeholders including central and local water management and conservation structures, local government, water utilities, non-governmental organizations, WUA, FWUAs, CDWUUs and others to achieve expected outcomes;

- Pragmatic tools for scarce resources distribution for implementation of priority tasks of the project in meeting social and economic benefits;
- Effective operations of existing institutions such as the Chu-Talas Commission, including its Secretariat and expert working groups, Talas and Chui Basin Water Councils, as well as the Coordinating Council of the National Policy Dialogue in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. Operations of these institutions will benefit cost effectiveness of the project through shared resources, discussions of over project implementation, awareness raising and advocacy, trainings, experience exchange and other activities provided by the project.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:**

The project team and the Principal UNDP CO supported by the Regional Service Center based in Istanbul, Turkey will be responsible for project monitoring and evaluation conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures.

The Project Results Framework (PRF) provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation, along with their corresponding means of verification.

The following sections outline the principle components of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities. The project's M&E plan will be presented to all stakeholders at the Project's Inception Workshop and finalized following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

#### **Project start:**

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP CO, UNECE and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RSC staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- b) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- c) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- d) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- e) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organization structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

#### **Quarterly:**

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically



classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).

- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

### **Annually:**

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Review Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports.
- Risk and adaptive management.
- ATLAS Quarterly Progress Report.
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

### **Periodic Monitoring through site visits:**

UNDP CO and the UNDP RSC with UNECE participating will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the UNDP CO, UNECE and UNDP RSC and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

### **Mid-term of project cycle:**

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation, and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO and UNECE based on guidance from the Regional Service Centre and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The four GEF tracking tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

### **End of Project:**

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO and UNECE based on guidance from the Regional Service Centre and UNDP-GEF. The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which

should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

*Table 1. Project monitoring and evaluation plan and budget*

<b>Type of M&amp;E activity</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Budget US\$</b> <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	<b>Time frame</b>
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO, UNECE and UNDP RSC</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.</li> </ul>	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oversight by Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ Project team</li> </ul>	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Coordinator and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNECE</li> <li>▪ UNDP RSC</li> </ul>	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Coordinator and team</li> </ul>	None	Quarterly
Mid-term External Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project team,</li> <li>▪ Project Board,</li> <li>▪ UNDP-GEF RSC,</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (Evaluation Team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost : 20,000	At the mid-point of project implementation
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Coordinator and team,</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RSC</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost : 25,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Coordinator and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ local consultant</li> </ul>	0	At least three months before the

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
			end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ Project Coordinator and team</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 3,000 (annually)	As per FRR of UNDP
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RSC (as appropriate)</li> <li>▪ Government representatives</li> </ul>	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	UNDP Staff travel at least yearly; government representatives as needed
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b>		US\$ 58,000	
Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		(+/- 5% of total budget)	


### PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mr. Sabir ATADJANOV	Director, GEF OFP	STATE AGENCY ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND FORESTRY UNDER THE GOVERNMENT OF KYRGYZ REPUBLIC	22 NOVEMBER 2012
Mr. Nurlan KAPPAROV	Minster, GEF OFP	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND WATER RESOURCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN	29 NOVEMBER 2012

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (Month, day, year)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Adriana Dinu, UNDP – GEF Executive Coordinator and Director a.i		Aug. 29, 2014	Vladimir Mamaev, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor for RBEC	+421 2 5 9337 267	vladimir.mamaev@undp.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Project strategy	Verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p><b>Objective:</b> Strengthening transboundary cooperation and promoting integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins, and empowering the Water Commission of Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic</p>	<p>Science based consensus on major transboundary environmental concerns and possible solutions (TDA), leading to agreement between the two countries on a joint program of corrective actions (SAP) and on harmonized monitoring and data exchange protocols.</p> <p>The Water Commission strengthened through improved water monitoring ability, and its mandate expanded to include environmental aspects.</p>	<p>Currently, transboundary cooperation in the Chu-Talas basins is mainly limited to the implementation of the existing water sharing agreement and does not include consideration of ecosystem integrity and environmental sustainability in view of climatic variability and change.</p> <p>Deteriorated monitoring networks hinder ability of the Commission to implement the water sharing agreement.</p>	<p>At the end of project:</p> <p>SAP endorsed by countries at government level.</p> <p>Governments approve expanded mandate of the Water Commission and establish Environmental Expert Group.</p> <p>Water quantity and quality monitoring procedures harmonized.</p>	<p>Governments of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan adopt appropriate changes in the Statutes of the Commission/Secretariat which envisages expansion of areas of bilateral water cooperation, and will formally endorse the SAP, and new monitoring protocols.</p>	<p>Governments and national executive agencies and local governance structures, water users and communities in two basins support interstate water cooperation.</p>
<p><b>Component 1</b> <i>Outcome 1:</i> Science based consensus among the countries on major transboundary problems of the basin.</p>	<p>The TDA of the Chu and Talas Basins prepared jointly by the two countries, identifying issues of transboundary concern.</p>	<p>At the moment there is not common understanding over transboundary issues in Chu-Talas river basins among the stakeholders in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan</p>	<p>TDA completed and approved by first semester of Year 2</p>	<p>Transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) of Chu-Talas river basins approved by the Water Commission.</p>	<p>Timely and adequate support in TDA development by all stakeholders.</p>

<p><i>Outcome 2: Improved understanding of the transboundary implications of the shared nature of the Basins' water resources.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 3: Improved knowledge of the consequences of extreme weather situations.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 4: Capacitated local stakeholders ready to minimize negative consequences for economic sectors as well as the environment in the basin.</i></p>					
	<p>Considerations based on Water Scenarios with focus on climate variability and change included into the TDA.</p>	<p>Currently there is no common understanding of possible future water resources scenarios in the basin. This hinders the decision making process on adaptation measures.</p>	<p>TDA document including consideration of future water scenarios.</p>	<p>The TDA and the Report on Future Water Scenarios approved by the Chu-Talas Commission and by key government agencies of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan.</p>	<p>Timely and adequate support by stakeholders in scenarios development.</p>
	<p>Program for seminars on climate change adaptation and integrated water resources management approved by the Commission and implemented.</p>	<p>Currently, local governments and others stakeholders in both basins are not prepared to adequately respond to the possible social, economic and environmental implications and risks associated with the transboundary nature of the water resources of the basins and with increased climate variability and change.</p>	<p>Seminars developed and held within first semester of Year 2 of the project implementation.</p>	<p>Seminar reports showing adherence with initial program; number of trainees.</p>	<p>Stakeholders actively participate in seminars.</p>
<p><b>Component 2</b></p> <p><i>Outcome 5: Visioning process and agreement on priorities for action opens the way for systematic cooperation</i></p>	<p>The Strategic Action Program (SAP), with a 5 years horizon and reflecting inter-sectoral dialogue and stakeholder</p>	<p>There is currently no detailed joint integrated program to address major transboundary issues in Chu-Talas river basins, and</p>	<p>SAP endorsed at governmental level by the end of project</p>	<p>SAP document formally adopted for implementation by the competent authorities of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan.</p>	<p>Political will to implement the SAP in the countries.</p> <p>Water users, NGOs and local communities will actively participate in the</p>

<p>in the integrated management of the transboundary Chu Talas River Basins.</p>	<p>involvement and addressing the major issues of transboundary concern agreed upon by the two countries.</p>	<p>stakeholders have little participation in discussions and decision-making.</p>			<p>process of discussion and decision-making in water management and conservation in Chu-Talas river basins.</p>
<p><i>Outcome 6:</i> Strengthened collaborative mechanism for bilateral cooperation framework or the further improvement of joint management of the Chu and Talas basins.</p>	<p>Amendment to the Commission regulations establishing a clear environmental mandate, and a joint Environmental Expert Group.</p>	<p>Currently, the functions and competencies of the Chu-Talas Commission are limited to joint water management (quantity) coordination in the two basins.</p>	<p>Amendment to the Statutes of the Commission/Secretari at adopted by governments by end of Year 1.</p>	<p>Joint decision on the changed statutes by the competent organs in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan</p>	<p>Political will to improve regulatory framework and participation for bilateral water cooperation</p>
<p><i>Outcome 7:</i> Steps taken for the involvement of stakeholders in the decision making proces.</p> <p><i>Outcome 8:</i> Project experiences and lessons disseminated globally and regionally</p>	<p>Twinnings and experience exchanges with other transboundary basins, dissemination of project results and participation to IW LEARN activities</p>	<p>No ongoing or previous outreach, dissemination and awareness raising activities related to the two basins management.</p>	<p>Twinning with at least another river basin showing similar characteristics and problems, and communication platform (website) established during the early project phases</p>	<p>Published project materials. Website performance.</p>	<p>Active participation of project staff and stakeholders in the dissemination of information on lessons learned and project experience.</p>

<p><b>Component 3</b></p> <p><i>Outcome 9:</i> Improved basis for the dialogue on transboundary water management on the basis of a better understanding of the quantity and quality of water resources, and their variability in the two basins.</p> <p><i>Outcome 10:</i> Countries capacity built for improved coordinated monitoring.</p> <p><i>Outcome 11:</i> Consensus on joint monitoring activities between the two countries.</p>	<p>Report containing the assessment of present situation of surface and groundwater quantity and quality monitoring including redommendations for an harmonized system completed.</p>	<p>Currently latent conflict situations between Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan exist in regulation of water resources distribution and allocation, and pollution in both basins due to differences in technologies and procedures for monitoring the quantity and quality of water resources.</p>	<p>Assessment Report completed and approved by the Commission and by national agencies of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, by the end of Year 2.</p>	<p>Assessment Report and proof of approval by the Commission and governmental agencies.</p>	<p>Political will and support from national executive agencies of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan to strengthen collaboration between stakeholders over water resources monitoring.</p>
	<p>Reports containing (i) the assessment of capacity building needs in water resources monitoring; (ii) a program for ad hoc training of staff of the two countries; (iii) the results of the capacity building activities and events, including number of participants and results assessment</p>	<p>Currently, water monitoring is poor and sporadic based on limited number of observations and indicators. Staff has no capacity to use new monitoring technologies.</p>	<p>Reports on needs assessment and on implementation and results of training program prepared by the end of the project.</p>	<p>Reports approved by the Commission and by national agencies of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan.</p>	<p>Active participation of project staff and stakeholders in the dissemination of information on lessons learned and project experience.</p>
	<p>Formal agreement on harmonized monitoring and data exchange protocols in the two basins.</p>	<p>No approved rules for transboundary water quality monitoring and information exchange exist</p>	<p>Agreement between the two countries formalized by project completion.</p>	<p>Text of Agreement and proof of approval by the two countries at governmental level.</p>	<p>Sustained political support from Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan for joint harmonized monitoring of shared water resources.</p>



**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

N/A

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>5</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US \$50,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Travel	10,000	3,000	7,000
International Consultants	25,000	15,000	10,000
Local Consultants	10,000	5,000	5,000
Workshops and stakeholder consultations	5,000	5,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>28,000</b>	<b>32,000</b>

<sup>5</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

**N/A**