



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

GEF ID:	9359		
Country/Region:	Regional (Moldova, Ukraine)		
Project Title:	Enabling Transboundary Cooperation and Integrated Water Resources Management in the Dniester River Basin		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5269 (UNDP)
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,950,000
Co-financing:	\$19,465,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,465,000
PIF Approval:	February 23, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Steffen Hansen	Agency Contact Person:	Vladimir Mamaev

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	13th of January (SH): Yes, the project is in line with the GEF IW 6 strategy (Objective 1 and program 1).	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	13th of January (SH): Yes, the project is consistent with the national/regional strategies and plans of both Ukraine and Moldova.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	13th of January (SH): Yes, this is a classic IW foundational project that positions the GEF to play a key	

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>catalytic role in developing and harmonizing IWRM across the Dniester basin. Both countries realize the necessity of regional cooperation to attain long term sustainable growth, which will be secured via the development of a full-scale TDA, the development (and approval) of the SAP and the initiation of the implementation of prioritized initiatives identified in the SAP (regional) and in the IWRM Plans (national).</p> <p>Please by CEO endorsement further describe how project executive arrangements will contribute towards enhanced country capacity/long term sustainability of project outcomes (i.e. how will involvement of government counterparts be secured)?</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>13th of January (SH): Yes, the project is important in assisting Ukraine and Moldova to implement the 2012 Moldovan-Ukrainian Dniester River Basin Treaty. It will foster concrete cooperative frameworks and institutional set-up, along with commitments to and implementation of priority actions. As part of this process involvement from the wider inter-sectorial water users into transboundary management will be secured.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Please by CEO endorsement further explain how the project will engage the private sector, making sure that all relevant private sector actors will engage in the TDA TDA/SAP formulation, as well as pilots and the activities related to SAPs implementation.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	13th of January (SH): Yes, components are well described and appropriate towards achieving project objectives/GEBs.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	13th of January (SH): Yes, cooperation with a broad range of stakeholders will be secured as part of the TDA/SAP process. In addition the project will implement a gender mainstreaming strategy .	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	13th of January (SH): Yes	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• 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?	13th of January (SH): PM recommends CEO Approval. The PPG request of \$50,000 is within norms.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?	Shansen(3.23.17): The CEO endorsement package is sufficiently in line with the PIF content.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	SHansen (3.23.17): Yes, however, please address the below points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please fill out the "other executing partner(s) section in the CEO end doc. - Output 2.1: please correct language so that it is clear that the Strategic Action Programme for the basin will be approved at ministerial level. - Please look at table B and make sure that the project outcomes # match the project outputs # 	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- The project aims towards identifying potential sources of financing for SAP/RBMP implementation. Please explain if the project aims towards securing commitment from national gov stakeholders towards the financial long term sustainability of the envisioned commission?</p> <p>Shansen (4.10.17): Above comments have been addressed.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	SHansen (3.23.17): Yes	
	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)	SHansen (3.23.17): Yes, including considerations from the side of the project as to securing appropriate participation of the Transdnierster region of Moldova.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	SHansen (3.23.17): Yes, signed co-financing letters have been provided matching the amounts stated in the endorsement documents.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	SHansen (3.23.17): Yes	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with	SHansen (3.23.17): Yes, while the	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	project will be executed by OSCE strong country ownership is secured and the project will work closely with EU (and others) funded initiatives within the region, including a strong IW:LEARN baseline.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	SHansen (3.23.17): Yes	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	SHansen (3.23.17): Yes, also, the project will develop communication and gender mainstreaming strategies during the inception phase that will guide the overall implementation of the project.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	SHansen (3.23.17): Yes	
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	SHansen (3.23.17): No, please address comments and resubmit. SHansen (4.20.17): Yes, the project is recommended for CEO endorsement.	
Review Date	Review		

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
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		