



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

GEF ID:	9566		
Country/Region:	Regional (Colombia, Ecuador)		
Project Title:	Integrated Management of Water Resources of the Mira-Mataje and Carchi-Guaitara, Colombia-Ecuador Binational Basins		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5753 (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:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,850,000
Co-financing:	\$16,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$19,850,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Vicente Troya

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	4th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project is fully aligned with the GEF IW focal area and its strategic objectives.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	4th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, the project is consistent with the national plans for both Colombia and Ecuador.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	4th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project will enable better	

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
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	informed management of the two distinct, but shared water bodies/ Further the SAPs will identify investment opportunities for upscaling sustainable water management practices.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	4th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed investment is well designed, with sound incremental reasoning.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>4th of August 2016 (cseverin): The components are clearly describing what will be delivered. However, as this project will develop TDA/SAPs for two river basins that are not directly connected, but essential for both countries, it is expected that the project will deliver two separate TDAs and two separate SAPs. It will be fine if the TDA/SAPs are presented together in a binational report, but should also be self standing documents at the same time. Please make changes to the project document to reflect upon this.</p> <p>It is not clear from the description to which degree the private sector (especially the agricultural sector) is a major player in the two river basins, please include information on this and if the private sector is an essential player, please make sure to include wording to support actions that</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>includes the private sector.</p> <p>Component 3 seems to be rather well funded considering the entire proposed project budget, please consider to move some of these funds to either component 1 or 2. Especially component 2, seems to be have been allocated a rather low budget for what it is trying to achieve.</p> <p>Climate Change and its potential impact on the two river basins, have been omitted in the risk matrix. Please include.</p> <p>Please make sure to insert a paragraph that mentions that at least 1% of the GEF grant will be going towards supporting IWLEARN activities.</p> <p>23th of August 2016 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>4th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, at this stage the socio economic aspects are reflected upon, however, please make sure to make reference to the GEF6 GENDER indicators in the relevant sections.</p> <p>23rd of august 2016(cseverin):Addressed</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
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? 	<p>4th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes the funds are available under the IW FA allocation.</p> <p>Please make sure to specify the cofinancing resources in table C, "VARIOUS" is not detailed enough.</p> <p>23th of August 2016 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<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)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>4th of August 2016 (cseverin): No, please address above comments.</p> <p>23th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, the project is recommended for technical clearance</p>	
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?		
	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?		
	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		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.