



## 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:	\$25,774,288	Total Project Cost:	\$31,253,740
PIF Approval:	March 15, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Vicente Troya â€ Regional

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	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	

<sup>1</sup> 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	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> 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	

<sup>2</sup> 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>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<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"> <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>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	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>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		PIF clearance	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	July 31, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<sup>3</sup> 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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		