



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------------------|
| GEF ID: | 4533 | | |
| Country/Region: | Global | | |
| Project Title: | Development of a Methodology With Tools and Decision Support Systems to Incorporate Floods and Droughts into IWRM in Transboundary Basins | | |
| 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; Project Mana; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$4,090,275 |
| Co-financing: | \$20,957,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$25,047,275 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | January 01, 2012 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Ivan Zavadsky | Agency Contact Person: | Kelly West |

| 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? | N.A. This is a global project. | |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | N.A. This is a global project. | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | Yes. The agency has experience and proven record of results in scientific assessments and development of innovative approaches and tools. This project aims at development, testing and dissemination of broadly applicable methodology of incorporation of floods and droughts management into decision support systems for transboundary basins and their incorporation into IWRM approaches at different scales. This fits with UNEP global mandate and recent work programmes. | |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency | N.A. | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | Yes. The UNEP's current Programme of Work includes support both to the development and application of IWRM and to building resilience to the adverse environmental impacts, including floods and droughts. Under the Sub-Program on Ecosystem Management, UNEP supports countries to identify and develop and test tools to strengthen ecosystems functioning for water regulation and purification services, particularly in developing countries. The tools developed include policy planning; assessment/identification of drivers, in particular climate variability. UNEP also supports countries in building climate resilience of vulnerable human societies, ecosystems and economies through increased understanding of multi-stressor interactions and the mobilization of knowledge, capacities and integrated assessment. | |
| Resource Availability | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | N.A. | |
| | • the focal area allocation? | Yes. | |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | N.A. | |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF | Yes. The project will contribute to the Outcome 1.4, as stated in the PIF. The | |

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| | | Objective and expected outcome in 1st line of Table A. Dec 02, 2011: The requested correction was made. Cleared. | |
| | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified? | Yes. GEF IW 5 SO 1, it is however not clear whether also SO 3 is proposed, please clarify in Table A. Dec 02, 2011: The requested correction was made. Cleared. | |
| | 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? | N.A. This is a global project. | |
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes? | Yes. | |
| 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? | In principle yes but it is not entirely clear how the described recent and planned activities of key executing partners (DHI and IWA) in the field of DSS and droughts and flood mangement constitute the baseline projects, particularly from a global perspective. Please provide more justification. Dec 02, 2011: The requested justification was provided in the revised document. Cleared. | |
| | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | similar benefits? | | |
| | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning? | <p>No, the Incremental Reasoning needs to be rewritten and the arguments strengthen.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The requested information/argumentation was provided in the revised document. Cleared.</p> | |
| | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear? | <p>The project design is sound but several items require more clarification or specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project should be more specific on the importance of the methodology and tools for GEF IW transboundary basin projects; - The expected outcomes need to be more specific, in particular to make clear what are the differences between various outputs on stakeholders training (e.g. output 2.3 v. 3.2); - Stakeholder consultation workshops for selected basin will serve only to the component 1 outcome or they will be used for pilot basins testing use of DSS and TDA/SAPs review? - In component 3 review and amendment of up to five TDAs and SAPs is expected. It is not clear whether the project will look through these and see how they compare to what tools the project has developed, please clarify; - The language of the outcome 3.3 is not clear, please revise; - The outcome of component 4 is not | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>between the urban and (agro) industrial water users in optimisation of basin water management, it sounds like a one way street input from those water users;</p> <p>- The output 4.4 is meant to communicate results only to stakeholders of this component or to all project stakeholders, please clarify.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: All above concerns, questions and requested clarification were addressed in the revised document. Cleared.</p> | |
| | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate? | <p>No. The GEB are neither described nor justified.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The requested GEB justification was included in the revised document. Cleared.</p> | |
| | 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? | Yes. | |
| | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly? | <p>No. Although this is a global project the application of the project outputs at number of pilot basin require consider the role of civil society, indigenous people and gender issues.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The document was revised accordingly. Cleared.</p> | |
| | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation | Yes. | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | N.A. This is a global project. | |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | Yes. | |
| | 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? | Yes. It is within GEF acceptable range and proportional to the overall co-financing ratio. | |
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | <p>Not possible to assess at this stage since the agency is being asked to strengthen the incremental reasoning.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The requested information/clarification on GEB was added in the revised document. Cleared. However, the overall co-financing is not adequate, the agency is being asked to increase the co-financing at minimum 1:5.</p> <p>Jan 04, 2012: The co-financing was increased to 1:5. Cleared.</p> | |
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | The co-financing is appropriate to this type of project. | |
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the | Yes | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | line with its 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? | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | • Council comments? | | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | <p>Not yet. The agency is asked to address the comments above.</p> <p>Dec 02, 2011: The agency addressed all but one concerns and comments satisfactorily. The PM would recommend the CEO clearance into the next WP when agency will increase the co-financing to minimum 1:5.</p> <p>Jan 04, 2012: The agency addressed all concerns and comments satisfactorily. Now the PM recommends the CEO clearance into the next WP.</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* | May 17, 2011 | |
| | 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

| Review Criteria | Decision Points | Program Manager Comments |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| PPG Budget | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | It is not clear what type of input is requested to be paid for in the activity 1 on PPG coordination and consultation. Please be more specific. Also the first item in activity 2 seems to be the same as (or a part of) very similar output in Component 1 in the PIF. Please clarify. Dec 05, 2011 (IZ): The revised PPG responded accordingly to concerns raised. all prposed activities and PPG outputs are appropriate for this project. Cleared. |
| | 2. Is itemized budget justified? | Not possible to asses yet according to questions raised above. Dec 05, 2011 (IZ): Yes. |
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PPG approval being recommended? | Not yet, the agency is asked to provide clarifications or revise the PPG request according to the comments above. Dec 05, 2011 (IZ): The PM now recommends the PPG approval once the CEO clears the PPG for next WP inclusion. |
| | 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.