



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

GEF ID:	9654		
Country/Region:	Regional (Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Malaysia, Philippines, Vietnam)		
Project Title:	Reducing Pollution and Preserving Environmental Flows in the East Asian Seas through the Implementation of Integrated River Basin Management in ASEAN Countries		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5635 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3 Program 5; IW-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$288,000	Project Grant:	\$8,479,123
Co-financing:	\$29,110,000	Total Project Cost:	\$37,589,123
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Erez Padilla

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	December 3, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	December 3, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	December 3, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.	

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>December 3, 2016 (lkarrer): No. Please address the following points:</p> <p>1) The focus of the project is in developing improved river basin management in the 8 basins in the 8 countries. Consequently, current relevant national and local IRBM initiatives in each of the countries, particularly related to these river basins, need to be explained. This information is important to understanding how GEF funding will build on existing work. Understanding existing initiatives may also elucidate potential co-financing to address the note below regarding the need for more co-financing.</p> <p>2) In addition, please explain how the river basins were selected.</p> <p>3) Once the existing initiatives have been explained, please also explain how the GEF funding will build on these efforts for greater impact.</p> <p>March 14, 2017 (lkarrer): Yes, addressed. However, during PPG more information will be collected and analyzed regarding existing</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>initiatives in the selected river basins and how this project will build on these initiatives. A clear explanation of the basis for selecting the river basins also needs to be thought through during PPG and agreed with the countries. The current explanation is limited to "source-to-sea considerations", which is unclear. This is particularly important to ensure the countries are using these agreed criteria as the basis for considering sites.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>December 3, 2016 (Ikarrer): No. Please address the following points:</p> <p>1) The focus of Component 1 is not clear and seems duplicative with Component 2. While 3 of the 5 outputs in Component 1 are assessments or analyses; the remaining two are actually developing and adopting management plans in all 8 river basins and then scaling up. Developing and adopting the plans seems duplicative with Component 2, which is focused on improving IRBM governance, including both institutional frameworks as well as actual policies and regulations for IRBM. It is not clear how the Component 1 8 IRBM plans would relate to what is described for Component 2 as "put in</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>place innovative policies and regulations for IRBM at the national level by providing the enabling policy and governance for the learning site" We would suggest to revise so that Component 1 is clearly focused on assessments, including pulling in the Output 2.1.1 socioeconomic and governance assessment. And then revise Component 2 to focus on governance, including both institutional frameworks as well as management plans and policies and pull in Output 1.1.4 to merge with Output 2.1.3 and clarify the related text. The titles will need to be revised</p> <p>2) For Component 1, Output 1.1.3. Please clarify what is meant by "decision support models for water allocation initiated". Does this mean you'll model/assess water allocation options or you will actually start allocating water? If the former, then fine in this component; if the latter then relates to Component 2 on Governance so please move there.</p> <p>3) For Component 1, Output 1.1.5 focuses on sharing lessons, which seems appropriate to Component 3. Could this be moved or merged?</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>4) Component 1 needs to clarify where the assessments will be conducted. Output 1.1.4 notes 8 plans. Will the assessments in Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 be conducted in the same 8 rivers? Please clarify for all outputs.</p> <p>5) Component 2 is focused on improving governance; yet, Output 2.1.1 is focused on conducting socioeconomic and governance assessments. Please move Output 2.1.1 into Component 1.</p> <p>6) Component 3 in the table and text well explains knowledge management plans in terms of monitoring progress (indicators identified, monitoring conducted, databases established and linked to project websites). The other piece of this component ‘ sharing lessons learned ‘ needs strengthening. In particular it seems it would warrant an outcome since different from Outcome 3.1 focused on indicators. Knowledge sharing in the text and table is weak. It needs to discuss the target audiences for sharing lessons and also plans for drawing out lessons from the 8 river basin experiences, creating appropriate knowledge products specific to the basins or across basins</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(e.g. posters, presentations, one pagers, radio pieces, twinning across sites, blogs, listserv exchanges, social media, etc) and sharing these lessons in appropriate fora (national stakeholder meetings, workshops, community meetings, etc) to reach the target audiences at local, national and regional levels. Specifics will need to be developed during PPG, but at least the concepts need to be in the PIF.</p> <p>7) Given this project is intended as a regional initiative, it would seem appropriate to work toward agreed standards for all the rivers in the region, such as levels of pollutants.</p> <p>March 14, 2017 (Ikarrer): Yes, addressed. However, Project Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.2.2 seem to be duplicative, which needs to be resolved during PPG. If 2.2.2 is intended to be the implementation of the IRBM plans developed through 2.1.1, then that needs to be clear. Also for the indicators developed as part of output 3.2.1 please be sure to include socioeconomic and governance indicators as well as ecological indicators.</p> <p>In addition during PPG it needs to be clarified that the river basin</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>investment will be fully aligned with the mission of the SDS-SEA 2015 strategy's mission to foster and sustain healthy and resilient oceans, coasts, communities and economies across the Seas of East Asia through integrated management solutions and partnerships. The Strategy specifically notes the importance of, "... Extending the implementation of integrated watershed development and management programmes to all major river basins, lakes, and international water systems in the region..."</p> <p>Finally, in the Pro Doc it needs to be clarified that the "8 IRBM plans will be submitted to responsible government authorities for review and signature by ministers to ensure national support at sufficient levels." (Output 2.1.2)</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	December 3, 2016 (Ikarrer): Yes.	
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? 	December 3, 2016 (Ikarrer): No. GEF funding is lower than anticipated. The requested \$11.5M cannot be supported by IW.	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>The co-financing is only 2:1 which does not indicate sufficient commitment to the initiatives. Further, given interest in ensuring the sustainability of the IRBM activities, it is important to have other investors.</p> <p>March 14, 2017 (Ikarrer): Addressed.</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>December 3, 2016 (Ikarrer): No. Please address the above points, including submitting new LOEs for the noted amount.</p> <p>April 10, 2017 (Ikarrer): Yes. Please note that the Malaysia OFP Endorsement letter which was signed by the previous OFP needs to be updated as soon as possible at latest by CEO endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	December 03, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 14, 2017	
	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?		
	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		

CEO endorsement Review

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