GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**10035**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay)**		
Project Title:	**Preparing the Ground for the Implementation of the La Plata Basin Strategic Action Program**		
GEF Agency:	**CAF**	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-2 Program 3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	**$1,995,000**
Co-financing:	**$2,950,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$4,945,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Christian Severin**	Agency Contact Person:	**Mauricio Velasquez**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	25th of March 2018: Focal point endorsements have been included. This is a bridge between TDA/SAP formulation and a full SAP implementation project. As indicated in Component 2, one of the main outcomes is to harmonize between SAP priorities with national and regional priorities and actions plans, and identify solid proof of this, through the process of the MSP implementation from key sectorial ministries and key regional organizations. Further, another objective is to be	

[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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		identifying funding for SAP priorities, from, private, public and external funding funding sources. A number of the SAP priorities entail infrastructure investments, and hence inkind investments will not be enough to fund what is needed at the time of SAP implementation.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	25th of March 2018: for a bridge MSP, towards actual SAP implementation this is okay.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	25th of March 2018: Please include in resubmission the communication from the CIC, that in lieu, of the standard required national ministerial endorsements (of the Strategic Action Programme from sectoral essential ministries, such as Environment and water) details how the CIC fully ensures this process will be undertaken. 18th of June 2018 (cseverin): The requested letter have been resubmitted	
	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	25th of March 2018: The Strategic Action Program for the La Plata, includes a thorough description of these drivers and how they should be addressed, through the full size SAP implementation project, not this current MSP. Please submit Terminal Evaluation of the TDA/SAP formulation project upon which most substantial deliverable, namely the regional Strategic Action	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Design		Program, have been based on. 18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Yes, The signature page of the SAP has been submitted. However, the final SAP, including signature page should be submitted to the GEF as soon as this is available, along with the Terminal Evaluation when that becomes available.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	25th of March 2018: No, the incremental reasoning could be clearer. It is not easy to understand what the countries and the regional organization will be undertaking without the GEF investment contra the "with the GEF". Please make this more clear. 18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes, addressed in resubmission	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	25th of March 2018:No, One of the key deliverables of a bridge MSP like the proposed, is to identify a range of soft and hard funding sources to finance the suite of SAP priorities. This is lacking in the proposed MSP, please include this. June 18th 2018 (cseverin): Addressed, however, please ensure that this specific point is focused on during project implementation.	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	25th of March 2018: No, considering how essential the inclusion of socio economic aspects are, these sections needs to be further substantiated. 18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Inclusion of civil society, in all its forms, are essential	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		during the implementation of this MSP in order to ensure the needed buy in for the longer term sustainability of the projects interventions.	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	25th of March 2018: Yes, for the bridge MSP this is adequate. Secondly, please include in re-submission, co-financing letters from all sources to substantiate the indications provided in the MSP submission. 18th of June 2018 (cseverin): addressed	
	9. 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)	25th of March 2018: No, it is noteworthy, that Climate Change risk is not dealt with in the submission in the risk section, please add. There seems to be a difference between the heading, referring to two below MODERATE rated risks and then the three risks identified, that all have been rated LOW. Considering how difficult cooperation across national borders and between national ministries, it is remarkable that the MSP rates this as at LOW risk. 18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Addressed	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	25th of March 2018: please forward cofinancing letters 18th of June 2018 (cseverin): addressed	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	25th of March 2018: please forward IW tracking tool	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		18th of June 2018 (cseverin): addressed	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	25th of March 2018: please elaborate what other GEF and other financed national and regional projects and plans will be coordinated with. 18th of June 2018 (cseverin): addressed, but with a focus on closed projects and investments. Therefore, please ensure, during the initial phase of implementation to make sure to identify ongoing initiatives and ensure coordination with those.	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	25th of March 2018:Yes	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	25th of March 2018: yes, however, please include wording that makes it absolutely clear that 1% of GEF funds will be allocated towards supporting IWLEARN activities, such as the project produces and continuously support a project website, project staff and national representatives participation in relevant IWLEARN meetings, as well as IWCs, that fall within the project implementation phase.	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	25th of March 2018:It seems unlikely that funds will be available within this current replenishment. 18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Yes, IW funds are available to support this intervention	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	25th of March 2018:No, please address above comments and resubmit. 18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Yes	
Review Dates	First Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		