



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5739		
Country/Region:	Regional (Kazakhstan, Russian Federation)		
Project Title:	Enabling Transboundary Cooperation and Integrated Natural Resources Management in the Ural River Basin		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4484 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3; LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$140,000	Project Grant:	\$4,243,562
Co-financing:	\$14,050,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,433,562
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Vladimir Mamaev

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	11th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, both countries are eligible.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	11th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	11th of March 2014 (IW): Yes, the funds requested is available under the IW focal area.  UAPEL: Yes, LD funds are available.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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>	<p>11th of March 2014 (IW): Yes, the Project is fully aligned with objective 3 and its results framework under the IW focal area.</p> <p>UAPEL: The project is not aligned with the LDFA. The described project does not fit with objective LD-2 and the stated outcome 2.1: An enhanced enabling environment within the forest sector in drylands.</p> <p>Please revise.</p> <p>03/24/2014 (UAPEL) Has been addressed. The project is aligned with LD-3.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>11th of March 2014 (IW): Yes, the proposed activities in this project is fully in line with the two countries national strategies and plans.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>11th of March 2014 (IW): Please expand the baseline with other initiatives that have been undertaken in the region. It is seems unlikely that UNDP and its partners are the only ones that have been investing within INRM and IWRM in the region. Please explore further and include these.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		24th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>11th of March 2014 (IW): For most of the components the outcomes and output indicators are clear. The component text is rather generic and could use more specificity.</p> <p>The PIF background/rational and its activities is surprisingly quiet on addressing/mentioning bird and fish habitats. Given the described sources of pollution and the importance for fish spawning of the Ural river and fishing activities in the river and delta in Kazakhstan this seems surprising. Component 3 mentions a few words for possibly considered funding of activities only. Please explain.</p> <p>Components:</p> <p>1.5: Please add civil society participation - besides only private sector - in TDA/SAP process.</p> <p>2: Further, component 2 supports the establishment of an intergovernmental commission and legal framework. Please capture in the outcomes and outputs in the project framework. - Given the intersectoral relevance of many of the threats, establishment of intersectoral committees on national and possibly even regional level would</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>greatly facilitate the TDA/SAP process as well as informing the transboundary legal and institutional framework (and expanding the scope of previous commissions among both countries to address spectrum of needs and trade-offs with the water-food-energy-ecosystems nexus).</p> <p>Section B1 on 'consistency with national strategies' is well written and not very well reflected adequate in the background and baseline.</p> <p>3: However, please include more detail into component three and its suggested outputs. Afterall this component is a major part of the project, that will inform not only the TDA/SAP process but also the long term sustainability of the collaboration on the Ural River Basin. Preliminary selection criteria to determine the basis for activity selection should be included and provide justification for GEF finance.</p> <p>4: - What is the aim and nature of the proposed PPP in comp. 4.3? - Why is the "shared vision" for the Ural river not mentioned as an important result of the TDA/SAP process ? It seems strange to see this only mentioned within a communication strategy.</p> <p>24th of March (cseverin): Addressed</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>11th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the description includes a number of GEBs, water and land resource constraints that are under potential increase due to current management practices. Yet, some important issues appear to not be addressed - see comment 7 and questions therein above.</p> <p>UAPEL: For LD, there are no agreed GEBs specified. Please elaborate which agreed GEBs the project will create and how. Please refer to the LDFA strategy for a list of agreed GEBs.</p> <p>24th of March (cseverin): The IW issue at top of section has been addressed. 03/27/2014 (UAPEL): GEBs are still very generic. By CEO endorsement, it will be required to specify LD related GEBs and to quantify them in the LD tracking Tool.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>11th of March 2014 (IW): Public participation is planned. However the description does not include details on how the project is planning to reach out to the CSO community and national academic community (.e.g in the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>TDA?SAP formulation process); further the description lacks details on the gender dimension of the investment. Please add.</p> <p>24th of March (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<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., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>11th of March 2014 (IW): Yes, the proposed project includes a matrix outlining potential risks and associated mitigation strategies and actions.</p> <p>Furthermore, UNDP is financing in parallel a project in Climate Risk Management in Kazakhstan which will be relevant and ifrom the proposed project.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>11th of March 2014 (cseverin): The description includes a couple of activities that the project will be coordinated with, however, the list of these initiatives seems to be meager. Please expand.</p> <p>24th of March (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>11th of March 2014 (IW): The project will be introducing innovative management approaches to the region, that have traditionally been managing their natural resources in a more sectoral approach. The proposed methodologes will be a more sustainable way to manage the natural resources, while also offering good opportunities for scaling up the demonstrations through SAP implementation of the identified priorities.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	<p>11th of March 2014 (cseverin): The proposed level of GEF funding seems appropriate for the suggested activities, as well as the indicated amounts of co-financing.</p> <p>24th of March (cseverin): The Co-financing has been further described, however, please make sure to continue focusing during the ppg phase to work towards attracting co-financing.</p>	
	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?	<p>11th of March 2014 (cseverin): The amount of the co-financing is adequate.</p> <p>Please explain how the national co-financing is compositioned.</p> <p>24th of March (cseverin): The Co-financing has been further described, please continue to focus on developing a strong co-financing towards the project during the PPG period.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	11th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the PM budget is in coherent with the GEF guidance.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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 PPG fund?</p>	<p>11th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, PPG has been requested and is within the norm</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>11th of March 2014 (cseverin): NA</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
Agency Responses	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>11th of March 2014 (cseverin): No the PIF is not being recommended for clearance, please do address above points and resubmit.</p> <p>24th of March 2014 (cseverin &amp; UAPEL): Yes, the PIF is technically cleared and maybe included into an</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		upcoming work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	By CEO endorsement, it will be required to specify LD related GEBs and to quantify them in the LD Tracking Tool.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	March 11, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 24, 2014	
	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.**