



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

GEF ID:	9767		
Country/Region:	Regional (Belarus, Ukraine)		
Project Title:	Fostering Multi-country Cooperation over Conjunctive Surface and Groundwater Management in the Bug and Neman Transboundary River Basins and the Underlying Aquifer Systems		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5876 (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:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,731,050
Co-financing:	\$9,450,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,181,050
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2017
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 (3.14.17): Yes, with activities spanning across TDA/SAP development and identification of strategic options for conjunctive management the project is well aligned with IW objective 1 (program 1) and objective 2 (program 3 and 3).	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Shansen (3.14.17): - Please correct the below text so that it references the correct year:	

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
		<p>"Currently two RBMPs are under development: for Dnieper Basin and for Western Bug Basin. Both are in the process of formal adoption and it is expected that implementation of these plans will start in the end of 2016."</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>SHansen (3.14.17):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please look at the "sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation" section and explain how the "Ecohydrology" paragraph fits into the overall narrative? <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the "sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation" section, please specify the envisioned structure of the inter-ministerial councils and if they are likely to be financially sustainability beyond the lifespan of the project? - note that the GEF sees high level representation from ministry of planning, finance, energy and agriculture as desirable, contributing towards strong TDA/SAPs and a 	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>subsequent fruitful dialogue with IFIs towards identifying investments for priority infrastructure projects.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): addressed.</p> <p>- Please specify if the project will work towards securing financial resources from relevant line ministries towards the long-term functioning of the two envisioned river basin commissions?</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed sufficiently at PIF stage, however, by CEO endorsement more detail should be provided describing how the basin commissions will work towards becoming financially sustainable. Also, to the extent possible this work should link logically to component 5 and the sweep of Communication, Dissemination and Replication Activities.</p> <p>- GEF notes that previously a partnership conference was envisioned by end of project, with the aim of attracting investment towards implementing SAP priorities. While this activity no longer features in table B, please consider incorporating text in the "sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>innovation" section specifying that the project, at the earliest possible stage, will advance a dialogue with IFIs towards identifying potential bankable projects in alignment with identified SAP priorities.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed</p> <p>- With reference to table B output xi: please consider using selective media events as an opportunity to involve and update key legislative national stakeholders (ministry of planning, finance etc.) on project outputs and envisioned benefits.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>Shansen (3.14.17): Yes</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>Shansen (3.14.17):</p> <p>- Table B project output (i): to the extent possible please consider shortening the text keeping in mind that the information also features in the PIF project document.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed</p> <p>- Table B project output (ii): please strengthen the flow of the text so that the meaning is more apparent</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>to the reader.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please specify if the project will assist countries align with the EU flood risk directive? If yes, please make reference to this in table B. <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PIF text states that two separate Strategic Action Programs (one for each basin) will be developed and elaborated by the countries for endorsement at high ministerial level. Please add text specifying that the two SAPs will be signed by all GEF eligible/non-GEF eligible countries within the geographic scope of the respective river basins. Also, please add text speaking to proper coordination between the two envisioned river basin commissions, including necessary alignment between status indicators. <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the sub-section titled "The Neman River Basin and Related Aquifers", please 1) specify the total surface area of basin (thousand km²) and 2) elaborate on the geographic 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>overlap between the river basin and that of various aquifers, from shallow unconfined to deeper largely confined ones. While it is clear that the groundwater contribution to base flow of the two rivers is high, the PIF needs to better explain why the Neman river basin approach provides a good spatial basis for the formulation of water management strategies across surface and aquifer resources.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed</p> <p>- Please explain if the PIF will aim at facilitating agreements and subsequent implementation of data sharing protocols/mechanisms spanning across the two basins? If yes, the PIF should include a minimum amount of information elaborating on the envisioned geographic location and projected financial sustainability of such a mechanism.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17):Addressed sufficiently at PIF stage, however, by CEO endorsement the project will need to include activities to support, establish and implement a joint data sharing mechanism for the Bug Basin. Please also reflect on the different</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>options for obtaining financial sustainability of such a mechanism.</p> <p>- in the PIF text, please be more specific in relation to IW:LEARN activities supported by the project. Also, please mention that 1 % of the GEF grant will be dedicated towards IW:LEARN activities.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>Shansen (3.14.17): Yes, however, please include language stating that the project commits to being in line with the GEF Gender Equality Action Plan.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Addressed</p>	
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>Shansen (3.14.17):</p> <p>The FA allocation is subject to the projected shortfall of the GEF Trust Fund. Availability of the FA allocation will have to reviewed at the time of potential future work program inclusion.</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 		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	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>Shansen (3.14.17): No, please address comments and resubmit.</p> <p>SHansen (5.30.17): Yes, the PM recommends CEO 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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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 monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review

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