



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:	\$20,483,600	Total Project Cost:	\$24,743,600
PIF Approval:	February 21, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 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	30th of October 2014 (cseverin): yes, the countries are eligible.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the OFP has endorsed the PIF.	30th of October 2014 (cseverin): yes the OFPs endorsed at time of 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.	30th of October 2014 (cseverin): Yes the funds are still available from 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.	30th of October 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project is fully aligned with the IW focal area strategy for GEF5, 3rd objective on supporting foundational capacity building towards a TDA/SAP process in the river basins.
	<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	30th of October 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project was mutually requested by both countries and is furthermore fully inline with both countries policies and strategies.
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.	11th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes the baseline is sufficiently described and is indeed relevant to the issues that the project will be addressing.
	<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. especially 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	<p>30th of October 2014 (cseverin): The description on pp 18 of the Request for CEo End, on Learning and Knowledge management does not mention IWLEARN, please amend to this section.</p> <p>Please include setting up a data sharing mechanism between the two countries,</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		towards supporting IWLEARN activities.	<p>as a direct effect of having a joint/binational monitoring work plan. Such mechanism should preferable be hosted by a joint basin organisation or the like.</p> <p>The Project framework, mentions SAP endorsed at the highest level by both countries. Is that referring to presidential Endorsement, or is it Endorsement at Minister of Environment Level??</p> <p>The project lacks activities to involve the private sector stakeholders. Private sector has been identified as a stakeholder group, but no activities seems to be targetted towards the inclusion of the private sector, which will be essential towards sustainable management of the ecosystem. It seems to be particular important to have private sector being part of the TDA/SAP formulation process if threats such as sewage, solid waste, mininng related effluents and agro chemicals are to be targeted.</p> <p>Please provide more quantifiable output indicators for the pilot projects. In general the outputs included will be very hard to measure when achieved. Words/ formulations such as Strengthened, Support, Providing updated information, Pilot projects estabilished etc etc. are not good indicators, please revise and be MUCH more specific on what is to be acheived.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Please take a good look at the output 2.4 and the two "indicators" included. They seem to be more descriptors than actual indicators.</p> <p>4th of December 2014 (cseverin): Cleared</p>
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is 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.	11th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes the GEFs have been identified and are considered to be 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 the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): yes, however, please do provide more detailed information on their engagement in the project at the time of CEO Endorsement.	<p>11th of November 2014 (cseverin): Public Participation have been touched upon, however, the proposal lack information on how the project will involve and consider gender aspects in the project. Please expand on this (maybe even consider to include reporting on the GEF GENDER indicators) and resubmit.</p> <p>4th of December 2014 (cseverin): Cleared</p>
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g.,	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the proposal includes a matrix outlining potential risk (including Climatic variability and change) and associated mitigation measures.	11th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the project includes a risk matrix, including mitigation measures.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	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.	11th of November 2014 (cseverin): No, The project document solely mentions coordination with other "UNDP Initiatives" Please expand this to include other relevant investments as well. Among others IUCN (working on an IWRM plan) and World Bank (Water and Sanitation Program) have been active there. 4th of December 2014 (cseverin): Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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 strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	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 guide the regional management of these shared resources.	11th of November 2014 (cseverin): The project will set the foundation for potential implementation of the ministerial Endorsed Strategic Action Programme, which will lead to long term sustainable management of the basins.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		11th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the concept is similar to what was presented at PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		11th of November 2014 (cseverin): YES, The TDA/SAP approach proposed in this project is much more cost efficient than trying to deal with the transboundary issues in separate investment in the respective countries.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes.	11th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes the amount that UNDP is bringing to the project is inline its role.	11th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes, cofinancing have been confirmed, however, there are a number of differences, between the amounts stated in the letters and what has been included in the matrix. Please correct and resubmit. 4th of December 2014 (cseverin): Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PM costs are appropriate.	10th of November 2014 (cseverin): The PM costs are appropriate, as this project is a multi national projects between Ecuador and Peru, hence the management of the project will be more complex and costly, compared to a single country project.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the	yes PPG is requested	10th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes, a report on the commitment of the PPG resources has been included.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): NA	10th of November 2014 (cseverin): NA
	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>10th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the project submission includes the IW tracking tool, however, the stress reduction indicators are a bit wrong, please make following changes:</p> <p>1st local investment, will deliver on Indicator 5 and 3, not 16 and 3</p> <p>2nd Local investment, will deliver on indicator 5 and 8, not 16 and 8</p> <p>3rd local investment, will deliver on indicator 1, 3, 1 and 16 not 16, 16, 16 and 16.</p> <p>Please make these changes and resubmit.</p> <p>Further, please include a target (in % or an exact numeric value) in the stress reduction column, only having the baseline is not enough.</p> <p>4th of December 2014 (cseverin): Cleared</p>
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		10th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes a budgeted M&E table have been included and it includes types of activities as well as timeframes for reaching these. More specific Project results indicators have been included in

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			the Project framework.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	11th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PIF clearance is being recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		11th of November 2014 (cseverin): No CEO endorsement is not being recommended, please address comments and resubmit. 4th of December 2014 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is being recommended.
	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
Review Date (s)	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.