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

GEF ID:	**9919**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro)**		
Project Title:	**Implementation of the SAP of the Dinaric Karst Aquifer System: Improving Groundwater Governance and Sustainability of Related Ecosystems**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5776 (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; IW-2 Program 3; IW-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$5,145,000**
Co-financing:	**$14,850,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$19,995,000**
PIF Approval:		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]	Shansen (10.3.17): Yes, the project deals with a set of interrelated issues pertaining to both the facilitation of increased cooperation, conjunctive management of surface and groundwater resources along with a set of nexus considerations. Funding is drawn form the IW-1 and IW-2 objectives (program 1, 3 and 4).	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies	Shansen (10.3.17): Yes, the project seeks to implement the Dinaric Karst	

[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
	and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Strategic Action Program, which is signed on ministerial level and remains consistent with national level strategies and plans. Shansen (10.3.17): GEF notes that Montenegro currently has no OFP. On an interim basis the GEF will accept the signature of the PFP, who is the Minister of the Ministry where the OFP was working. Note that the LoE must be signed by the official OFP by the time of CEO Endorsement. SHansen (10.3.17): Please note that all SAPs must be signed off on the highest political level. Note that in the case of Albania the SAP is signed at the level of the Secretary General, Ministry of Environment. UNDP has informed the GEF that in this specific case authority is delegated from the Minister level to that of the SG level. Note that while the GEF is willing to make a one-time only exception and accept the SG level SAP signature at PIF stage, the participation of Albania in the project is conditioned upon the attainment by UNDP of a SAP Ministry level signature letter by the time of CEO endorsement stage.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	Shansen (10.3.17): Yes	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Druivers: The PIF speaks both to national and transboundary issues/drivers, while describing the main industries and pollution sources across the PIF intervention area. Sustainability will be addressed at multiple levels: National: The involvement in all project activities of the Thematic Expert Groups, formed by national experts, will ensure country ownership and overall reinforced capacity in the countries. The Thematic Expert Groups will participate and/or provide advice to all project activities, in particular to the harmonization of national sectorial strategies (Output 2.2). Regional: The project will foster a Multilateral Agreement on the establishment of a Consultation and Information Exchange body, including permament technical support from the "multi-disciplinary thematic expert groups" established by the project, and the long term sustainability of the information exchange mechanism.	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Innovation: Amongst other things the project introduces innovation via a state of the art monitoring system, which will enable real-time data flow and more robust decision making at both the national and regional scales.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Shansen (10.3.17): Yes, the project activities and subsequent outcomes, such as a Multilateral Agreement on the establishment of a Consultation and Information Exchange body, including permanent technical support from the "multi-disciplinary thematic expert groups" , and the long term sustainability of the information exchange mechanism, are key contributions towards the long term health of the aquifer system(s) and its contribution to region wide economic growth.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Shansen (10.3.17): Yes, well written and clear.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Shansen (10.3.17): Yes, relevant CSOs and NGOs will take part in the project. The project will produce a gender mainstreaming strategy as part of the Public Participation and Stakeholders Involvement plan, which will be submitted to the countries for	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		approval at End stage.	
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 (10.3.17): 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?	Shansen (15.9.17): GEF understands that a revised proposal will be submitted shortly. Shansen (10.3.17): Yes, the PM recommends 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?		
	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.