



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	10033		
Country/Region:	Regional (Bhutan, India)		
Project Title:	Manas Integrated River Basin Management Project (M-IRBM)		
GEF Agency:	WWF-US	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1 Program 1; IW-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,974,312
Co-financing:	\$50,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$58,974,312
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2018
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Isabel Filiberto

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>(March 26, 2018, LKarrer) Yes, the project is in line with GEF-6 commitment to foster cooperation of transboundary water systems as well as to increase resilience and flow of ecosystem services in melting high altitude glaciers.</p> <p>During the PPG phase the Project Document needs to include quantifiable indicators in the Results Framework and needs to include a</p>	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		completed IW Tracking Tool.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	(March 26, 2018, LKarrer) Yes.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	(March 26, 2018, LKarrer) Yes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	(March 26, 2018, LKarrer) No. More detail is needed in the Global environmental benefits section. (April 26, 2018, LKarrer) Yes. Point addressed.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	(March 26, 2018, LKarrer) No. 1) While the components are clear with regard to capacity building (component 1), demonstration pilots (component 2), knowledge gap filling (component 3) and knowledge management and M&E (component 4), the outcomes and outputs are not consistent. a) Output 1.2.2 Strengthened collaboration and engagement between government, local... is one of the main objectives of the entire project; yet, it is hidden within Outcome 1.2, which is focused on information systems. This output	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>needs to be in either a separate new outcome or moved to a more appropriate outcome, such as Outcome 1.1, so that this important work is more prominent.</p> <p>b) Outcome 2.2 is noted to focus on identifying, strengthening, developing and testing policies; however, Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 are focused on strengthening capacity, which is the focus of Component 1 not Component 2.</p> <p>c) Output 2.3.1 is an atlas and Output 2.3.3 is field studies, both which seem more in line with Component 3 on filling knowledge gaps than Component 2 on demonstration pilots.</p> <p>d) Output 3.2.1 includes capacity building, which is the focus of Component 1.</p> <p>e) Output 3.2.2 is the development of a SAP, which is an important piece of this project. Given the SAP is about taking action it is not appropriate as an output within an outcome within a component focused on filling knowledge gaps. This activity warrants a more prominent place in the framework at the level of a component or at least an outcome.</p> <p>2) The long-term sustainability of these efforts needs to be considered;</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>therefore, there needs to be some discussion of plans for determining financial sustainability in the project activities. There is mention of Bhutan for Life sustainable conservation financing initiative in the innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up section, but this aspect is not addressed in the Results Framework. Plans to consider the long-term financial sustainability may be most appropriate in Component 1, which addresses cooperation.</p> <p>3) For the basin-scale information systems (Outcome 1.2), please consider if the creating of a common harmonized monitoring protocol should be a tangible output within Output 1.2.1.</p> <p>4) Regarding Output 3.1.1 please clarify if this will lead to a draft multilateral agreement on the establishment of a consultation and information exchange body. And, if so, please clarify if this would require the formation of a permanent secretariat with government approval.</p> <p>5) The description of the SAP development activity (Output 3.2.2) suggests several actions have been pre-determined, which is counter-</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>intuitive to the cooperative TDA process of identifying issues and jointly agreeing on solutions. Please clarify that these are possible actions, not pre-determined.</p> <p>6) Regarding the SAP process, the GEF requires these signed at the minister level to ensure high-level commitment for subsequent SAP Implementation investments. If this is anticipated for Manas, then it is an important output to capture and is also an opportunity through a launch event to solicit investors to help ensure the financial sustainability of the SAP all of which would be useful to note as outputs.</p> <p>7) In addition, SAPs should lead to the preparation (and possible adoption) of National Action Plans for each of the participating countries. For the PIF Results Framework, these may need to be considered as outputs.</p> <p>8) In addition, the SAP often will lead to multi-country agreement on implementation mechanism for the SAP. The establishment of functional national inter-ministerial committees in each of the participating countries, or the strengthening of existing national mechanisms, would be an</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>important output.</p> <p>9) Given the importance of the TDA/SAP (Component 3), process it would seem these would be important to include prior to the demo pilots (Component 2) since the idea is for the demo pilots to test out ideas.</p> <p>10) Component 4 regarding knowledge management and the very brief Knowledge Management section are focused exclusively on plans through IW:LEARN. Consideration needs to be given to other networks and opportunities by which this project could benefit and contribute lessons learned, particularly related to the Himalayan region and related to glacier melting. This includes for example:</p> <p>a) the UNESCO Project: The impact of glacier retreat in the Andes: International Multidisciplinary Network for Adaptation Strategies": Exchange of information from Andean project including links with the Snow Glacier Networks</p> <p>b) UNESCO Project Addressing Water Security: Climate Impacts and Adaptation responses in Africa, Asia and Americas (2014-2018)</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>At a global scale UNESCO is also working on the Snow Glacier and Water Resources within the framework of International Hydrological Programme (IHP VIII, 2014-2021) 'Water Security: Responses to Local, Regional and Global Challenges'.</p> <p>Other relevant global and regional efforts need to be identified and highlighted. Other regional projects are noted under the Coordination section, but not how they would share lessons and experiences. There also needs to be a discussion of initial ideas on how this project could interact with these other projects to share lessons learned and experiences.</p> <p>11) The discussion of plans to work with IWLEARN need to also include participation in webinars, listserv discussions, twinnings and cross-project synthesis products. And 1% of the project budget needs to be clearly allocated to IWLEARN.</p> <p>12) The Stakeholder section needs to be further detailed to specify stakeholder groups and to explain how they will be engaged. These need to consider downstream stakeholders.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>13) The Risks section needs improvement. The first risk "Stakeholder interest in transboundary cooperation..." is not articulated as a risk and the preventive measures are not clear how what is presumably "lack of stakeholder interest..." would be prevented. Further the measures to prevent the last risk, "Increased frequency of extreme weather events,..." focus on how the project is going to address climate change in general when this section is meant to focus on the impacts on the project itself (e.g. flooding of facilities, delays in meetings due to extreme weather) and how those would be prevented.</p> <p>14) The Coordination section needs to not only consider the UNESCO projects noted above, but also consider international finance institutions' investments (e.g. WB, EBRD, EIB), which work, amongst other places, in the central Asia region on climate change mitigation issues and within the context for melting glaciers.</p> <p>(April 26, 2018, LKarrer) Yes. The points are sufficiently addressed; however, during PPG, please: ensure that the project document describes in</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>more detail how the multilateral agreement on the establishment of a consultation and information exchange body will be established (4), ensure that the project document includes wording to the effect that the SAP will be signed at the minister level (6), clarify what additional organizations will be part of knowledge sharing (10), clarify plans to engage with IWLEARN (11), and clarify how the noted stakeholders will be engaged (12).</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>(March 26, 2018, LKarrer) No. The research gap analysis is heavily focused on the hydrological and ecological aspects with very little mention of the social, cultural or economic aspects such as which communities are at greatest risk, their dependence on the resource and their awareness and ability to adapt. Only an economic analysis is noted for Output 3.1.3. Yet the background information highlighted the importance of this region for local communities and "flow of ecosystem services" is part of the relevant IW Program. The social, cultural or economic aspects need much greater attention in the activities, particularly in Outputs 3.1.3 and 3.2.1.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		(April 26, 2018, LKarrer) Yes. Point addressed. However, during PPG please consider further how socioeconomic analyses will be incorporated into Component 2.	
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	(March 26, 2018, LKarrer) No. 1) The PPG request is for over the maximum. For projects over \$6M and under \$10M, the maximum is \$200,000. 2) The requested Agency Fee of \$800,917 is less than the maximum of \$845,412 (9.5% of the GEF Project Financing). 3) The co-financing amounts in Table C need to be noted for each source realizing these may change during PPG.	
		(April 26, 2018, LKarrer) Yes.	
	<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)? • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	(March 26, 2018, LKarrer) No. The above points need to be addressed.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		(April 26, 2018, LKarrer) Yes. It is technically cleared. Please note the points in #5 and #6 need to be addressed during PPG.	
Review Date	Review	March 26, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 26, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		