



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

GEF ID:	5284		
Country/Region:	Regional (Ecuador, Peru)		
Project Title:	Integrated Water Resources Management in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla Transboundary Aquifers and River Basins		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4402 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,960,000
Co-financing:	\$20,375,773	Total Project Cost:	\$24,485,773
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Vicente Troya

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, participating countries are eligible	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the OFP has endorsed the PIF.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the money is available within the IW Focal area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project is aligned with the GEF 5 IW strategy and its results framework.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes	
Project Design	<p>6. 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?</p>	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the Baseline is sufficiently described at PIF stage. Please expand further at time of CEO Endorsement.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the outcomes and outputs are ok at this stage, but please do make sure to be much more explicit at time of CEO endorsement. especailly for output indicators for the targetted interventions ounder component 3. These need to include quantifiable indicators. Further, please make sure to mention that 1% of the GEF grant will go	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		towards supporting IWLEARN activities.	
	8. Are global environmental benefits adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): YEs, the GEBs identified and the incremental reasoning is appropriate.	
	9. 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?		11th of February 2013 (cseverin):Yes the proposal includes a clear description of both the Gender and Socio economic benefits from this project.
	10. Is public participation , including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin):yes, however, please do provide more detailed information on their engagement in the project at the time fo CEO Endorsement.	
	11. 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)	11th of February 2013 (cseverin):Yes, the proposal includes a matrix outlining potential risk (including Climatic variability and change) and associated mitigation measures.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin):Yes, a number of regional activities has been identified with which coordination will be taking place.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): This project is innovative in its approach towards developing a TDA and a SAP for the three aquifer systems, to inform and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. - Assess the project's sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature. - Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project? - Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up. 	guide the regional management of these shared resources.	
	14. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. 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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes.	
	17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any comment on the indicated amount and composition of cofinancing ? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes the amount that UNDP is bringing to the project is inline its role.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PM costs are in line with the GEF guidance.	
	19. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	20. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PIF clearance is being recommended.	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	25. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested and approved? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.**