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

GEF ID:	**9801**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Moldova, Montenegro, Ukraine, Serbia)**		
Project Title:	**Danube River Basin Hydromorphology and River Restoration (DYNA)**		
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-2 Program 3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$137,615**	Project Grant:	**$4,422,018**
Co-financing:	**$39,118,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$43,540,018**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Steffen Hansen**	Agency Contact Person:	**Andrew Hume**

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]	SHansen (3.9.17): Yes, the project is well aligned with IW-2 Program 3: Advance Conjunctive Management of Surface and Groundwater Resources (Outcome 3.1 & 3.2)	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	SHansen (3.9.17): Yes, using the ICPDR as a platform and by demand from countries the project provides a valuable contribution helping the non-EU Member States in the Danube basin translate the EU Flood Directive into country level	

[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
		legislation/increased capacity, while optimizing synergies with the WFD. The Bosnia-Herzegovina LOE is missing. Please submit the LOE. Shansen(3.28.17): Addressed	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	SHansen (3.9.17): Please read though the "sustainability and potential for scaling up" PIF section and make more clear the point made in the following lines: "As these EU laws require trans-basin cooperation and form the legal basis for country-level water laws not only for EU countries but also for non-EU countries in the GEF-6 PIF Template-August2016 16 process of accession to the EU. This will ensure that results of this GEF project generated by the ICPDR and its partners will be embedded in ICPDR plans and programmes, guaranteeing sustainability." Shansen(3.28.17): Addressed Overall yes, utilizing the ICPDR and Sava River Basin commission as a platform ensures strong sustainability, as does country commitments further	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		advanced by the building of capacity of the external expert community, e.g. at universities, for hydromorphological monitoring, assessment and design of measures etc. Scaling and market transformation is addressed though the targeted involvement of national stakeholders and clear links to i.e. EU donors and by virtue of a donor conference scheduled to take place by the end of the project - aimed at consolidating broad international support.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	SHansen (3.9.17): Yes, the GEF increment is clear and well articulated.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	SHansen (3.9.17): Yes, table B is well structured and appropriate towards achieving objectives/GEBs. However, please note that: - Outcome 1.1 states: "â€¦EU Water Framework and Floor Risk Directives". please correct to "flood". Shansen(3.28.17): Addressed - Output 1.1.1 states: "â€¦harmonised regional river basin and flood risk management plans and measures in alignment with EU Water Framework and Floor Risk Directives". Please correct to "flood".	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Shansen(3.28.17): Addressed In addition to the above two points, please look at table E and make sure that the agency fee does not surpass 9.5 % of the requested PPG amount. Shansen(3.28.17): Addressed	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	SHansen (3.9.17): Yes, the stakeholder engagement list is detailed and includes a wide selection of stakeholders relevant to the success of the project and beyond. Please note however that the PPG phase should explore a targeted strategic engagement with the agri sectors (both top donw and bottom up). The relevance of such a partnership is apparent as restored wetlands might require significant land-use changes. Gender is well described and reference is made to the GEF gender strategic action plan.	
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?	SHansen (3.9.17): Yes Shansen(3.28.17): The FA allocation is subject to the projected shortfall of the GEF Trust Fund. Availability of	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the FA allocation will have to reviewed at the time of potential future work program inclusion.	
	• 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?	SHansen (3.9.17): No, please incorporate changes and resubmit. Note that the B&H LOE is missing. The LOE must be submitted prior to tech clearance of the project. Shansen(3.28.17): Addressed: the LOE has been submitted. Shansen(3.28.17): The PM recommends project for CEO clearance.	
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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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.