



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

GEF ID:	9246		
Country/Region:	Regional (Guatemala, Honduras)		
Project Title:	Integrated Environmental Management of the Rio Motagua Watershed		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5714 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1 Program 1; IW-3 Program 6; CW-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,329,452
Co-financing:	\$28,027,876	Total Project Cost:	\$33,507,328
PIF Approval:	March 15, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 19, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Troya

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	6th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the project is aligned with the IW Strategic Objectives and results framework. However, please note that IW funding can not go to activities on solid waste (including plastic) management activities, as that is not eligible within the GEF6 IW strategy. Please explain why the project is proposing to formulate a watershed diagnostic analysis instead of	

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>following the TDA/SAP methodology.</p> <p>Motagua river drains from a large complex watershed, looking at the proposed demonstration pilots, they do only seem to suggest investments within point source pollution reduction, Please consider to include activities to deal with the non point sources from agriculture production as well (both from animals as well as agro chemicals.</p> <p>how will the demonstration projects be distributed in the countries, will they primarily be upstream, or will there also be demonstrations on the down stream course of the river, and at the mouth of the river??</p> <p>Aug 7, 2015 (asookdeo): The project is aligned with program 3 of the chemicals and waste strategy in relation to the reduction of UPOPs and improvements to waste management. The treatment and interventions related to liquid wastes are however not GEF relevant activities.</p> <p>13th of August 2015 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the	6th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes,	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	the proposed project is aligned with both Guatemala's and Honduras' national strategies Aug 7, 2015 (asookdeo): Yes	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	7th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF identifies the drivers of degradation within the Motagua River. The proposed WDA/SAP process will provide a framework for addressing these issues at different scales. It is essential that the Private Sector is included at the earliest possible stage of the project, in order for them part take in identifying and developing suitable solutions and methodologies to address the issues identified.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	7th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the incremental reasoning provided is fine.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	7th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the components offer sufficient detail at this time, however, please provide more quantifiable output indicators, including proposed reductions to UPOPs at the time of CEO Endorsement, both on stress reduction as well as process indicators.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements,	7th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the project include an extensive	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>matrix that outlines the foreseen role of a long range of stakeholders.</p> <p>However, please expand on the inclusion of indigenous people in the project, as well as make sure to include in para 32, that the project will be adopting and reporting on the GEF6 GENDER indicators.</p> <p>13th of August 2015 (cseverin); 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>7th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the IW portion of this proposed activity is available with in the IW funding window.</p> <p>Aug 7, 2015 (asookdeo): Yes</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 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>7th of August 2015 (cseverin):NO, please respond to the comments above and resubmit.</p> <p>13th of August 2015 (cseverin): The Program Manager recommends CEO</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		PIF clearance	
Review Date	Review	July 31, 2015	
	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?	11/10/17 (eswain) The project is similar to PIF stage and the minor changes have been justified.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	11/10/17 (eswain) Components 2 and 3 need to be adjusted to make it clear that CW funding is not being used for waste management of plastics into the water. GEF CW funding is limited to reductions of POPs and UPOPs, therefore management of plastic to prevent open burning and emissions of dioxins/ furans is eligible, but dumping of plastic into the watershed is not eligible for GEF	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>funding and should be supported by co-financing.</p> <p>1/25/18 (eswain) Justification has been provided (in the first bullet of the response document) that the plastics components are in like with SAICM provisions, however this project uses POPs funding only, therefore any use of GEF funding must only support reductions of POPs. Please confirm that GEF POPs funding will only be used towards the reduction of UPOPs.</p> <p>11/10- 2017 (cseverin): Same goes for IW funding, it can not be spend towards plastic or solid waste management.</p> <p>Please include quantitative indicators in the Results Framework and into Table B. Considering this project is to address land based pollution, there is an apparent lack of quantifiable stress reduction indicators and targets. The only land based pollution that has targets in this project is Plastic, that to a large extend is not eligible for funding.</p> <p>Please include the establishment of a transboundary data sharing mechanism supported by a</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>transboundary agreement.</p> <p>The Results framework (under outcome 2.2) mentions a MOU. It seems that the general idea behind the MOU is a central part the TDA/SAP process and hence question is if this is not already covered under outcome 1.1???</p> <p>Under component 4, please elaborate on the project's delivery of IWLEARN outputs. The text included seems generic and needs to be revised to include specific reference to IWLEARN.</p> <p>24th of January 2018 (cseverin): Partly, most the comments on the IW funding have been addressed. Please add specific wording that pertains to the establishment of a data sharing mechanism. the wording referred to in the responds matrix, does not mention a data sharing mechanisms. hence please include and resubmit.</p> <p>Please submit during the first year of implementation baseline data, to provide context to the reduction estimates included in the Results Framework.</p> <p>6th of April (cseverin): Above</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		comments adequately addressed	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	11/10/17 (eswain) Yes, the project demonstrates a cost-effective approach.	
	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)	11/10/17 (eswain) Yes, risks are taken into account.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	10th of November (cseverin): Please check the cofinancing letters and what has been listed in Table C, it seems that there may be discrepancies between these two sets of data. 24th of January 2018 (cseverin): Yes	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	11/10/17 (eswain) Yes, the CW tracking tool is provided. 10th of November (cseverin): Yes, IW Tracking tool filled in and attached.	
	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?	11/10/17 (eswain) The project should take into account the Stockholm Convention NIP. 1/25/18 (eswain) The NIP has been	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		considered. -Comment cleared	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	11/10/17 (eswain) Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	11/10/17 (eswain) Yes.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP	11/10/17 (eswain) STAP comments have been addressed.	
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	No at this time. The issues outlined above need to be addressed. 24th of January 2018 (cseverin): No, please address comments and resubmit. 6th of April 2018 (cseverin) yes, CEO endorsement recommended.	
Review Date	Review	November 10, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 25, 2018	
	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.