



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

GEF ID:	4489		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	A Transboundary Waters Assessment Programme: Aquifers, Lake/Reservoir Basins, River Basins, Large Marine Ecosystems, and Open Ocean to catalyze sound environmental management		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; IW-2; IW-4; IW-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$24,074,000	Total Project Cost:	\$29,074,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	February 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Isabelle Van der Beck

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?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): N.A. this is a global project.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): N.A.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the agency's comparative advantage is clearly described and supported.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): N.A.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): This is a global project, so this question is not really applicable.	
Resource	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the funds are available within the focal area allocation.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project is aligned with the IW focal area framework, as the project will work towards undertaking a global assessment of transboundary water bodies leading to a robust set of indicators and projections that in the future will inform the GEF IW programming process.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the GEF 5 IW objectives (1,2 & 4) have been identified and mentioned in the PIF.	
	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?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): It is a Global project, that will support existing and future GEF IW TDA-SAP projects that are country-driven, by assessing transboundary waters, developing sustainable partnerships for assessments, and providing feasible assessment methodologies that can be adapted and implemented for all transboundary water systems. The proposed project will be linked to planned and ongoing assessment activities at national, regional and global levels.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, as the proposed project will formalize	

	of project outcomes?	regional organisations, academic networks funded by governments, research programmes, private sector, and local and indigenous communities and catalyse an institutional arrangement to establish a sustainable global process for Transboundary Assessment of water ecosystems.	
Project Design	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?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the baseline projects are detailed described and based on strong data backed assumptions.	
	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the activities will be complementary to further be able to advance the issues associated with a global assessment of the transboundary water ecosystems.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes 8th of December 2011 (cseverin): yes, however, please strengthen the project framework's output indicators during project preparation, as it will be hard to properly assess the progress and accomplishment of activities that output	

		sustainable consortium, sustainable partnership, etc. please make these output indicators more directly measurable.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, a global assessment of Transboundary water ecosystems leading to the formulation of robust indicators to guide future programming seems to be a sound and appropriate strategy that has been well described.	
	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?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the socio-economic issues are described in detail. 8th of December 2011 (cseverin): Gender and social issues will be addressed by this project as they are important drivers and incentives for achieving global environment benefits.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes 8th of December 2011 (cseverin): As the project is to carry out a global assessment of five identified transboundary water systems, the project will engage with stakeholders on all levels, from community to cabinet, including research organisations.	
	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)	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, a matrix outlining the potential risks and associated mitigation strategies have been included. The consequences of climate change is not a direct threat to the suggested project and its activities, however, the assessment will reflect appropriately upon any changes in datasets and indicators caused by climatic variability and change.	

	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project includes all major stakeholders (sofare 130 institutions and agencies), that are considered to be valauble in connection to be able to undertake a global assessment of the transboundary water systems.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the project implementation arrangements seems to be adequate for execution of this complex project.	
	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?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the PM budget follows the GEF Guidance on project management budgets and is accounting for 5% (\$500K) of the total GEF grant. 8th of December 2011 (cseverin): as the project budget has been considerable lowered the PM bduget has been lowered too. accounting for 9% of total project budget.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the distribution of GEF funds and co-financing to each component have been carefully planned.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): The indicated level of co-financing seems to be adequate for the proposed activities and is at a level of a little more than 1:2 28th of November 2011 (cseverin):	

		1:4	
		8th of December 2011 (cseverin): CO-financing has been adjusted to 1:4.8	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the agency co-financing amount is clearly in line with its GEF defined role.	
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:		
	• STAP?	22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): No comments recieved.	
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>22nd of March 2011 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is being recommended.</p> <p>6th of April 2011 (Aduda):The co-financing presentation in the PIF seems unbalanced and not clear. The PIF should be revised to include a clear table of cofinancing by component and source. Of special importance is that the UNEP baseline project is not clear in the PIF and the co-financing brought by UNEP as GEF agency is mixed with others in Table C. Better clarity is essential for the UNEP baseline programmes upon which GEF incremental cost would be added with</p>	

		<p>Without this clarity, the PIF is not be recommended for work program inclusion.</p> <p>15th of August 2011 (cseverin): the Agency has provided the needed clarity on co-financing resources, hence the PIF is recommended for CEO Approval.</p> <p>28th of November 2011 (cseverin): No, the PIF can not be recommended for CEO approval, please lower the suggested budget to \$5 mio GEF grant. Please also ensure that the co-financing will be increased to 1:4.</p> <p>8th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is recommended for CEO approval</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 being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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

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.