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

GEF ID:	**9912**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda)**		
Project Title:	**Enhancing conjunctive management of surface and groundwater resources in selected transboundary aquifers: Case study for selected shared groundwater bodies in the Nile Basin**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5783 (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:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$5,329,452**
Co-financing:	**$24,850,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$30,179,452**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Astrid Hillers**	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]	(9/7/2017) Yes, the project is aligned with IW objectives 1 and 2 and advancing the foundational knowledge and information on selected, shared aquifers as well as promoting conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in the respective sub-regions (shared by a sub-set of countries within the NEL and EN regions).	

[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
		Comment: Please provide the remaining LOEs to secure country/OFP support for the proposed project. (9/29/2017) Thanks for submitting additional LOEs. Please submit the one remaining LOE as soon as possible.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	(9/7/2017) Yes, the project is aligned with the national priorities and strategies of the countries. Furthermore, groundwater has increasingly gained attention as a strategic resource for countries to supplement available surface water resources and hence has entered as a new area of shared interest in the NBI Strategic Plan.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	(9/7/2017) The PIF is outlining the root causes of the lack of sustainable groundwater management and builds on previous knowledge and work in the selected countries as well as via previous and ongoing regional activities. During project design and implementation added attention should be to address climate change dimensions and impacts on recharge and sustainable use of groundwater resources in the selected areas.	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		The activities in the proposed project represent a step-wise and initial effort to start addressing the knowledge gaps on shared aquifers in the region and lack of experience on the conjunctive management of surface and groundwater resources. As such the project is an essential starting point to gather experience in a limited set of shared aquifers of manageable size and complexity underlying parts of the Nile Basin watershed area. Lessons and experience gathered in the project will build a base for possible future scale-up in other shared aquifers n the region and expansion to more complex systems of surface and groundwater interaction such as e.g. in the Sudd wetlands, Baro-Akobo-Sobat and other areas. The project will pilot management approaches which are to a large extent novel in the respective countries involved and will provide a base for replication and upscaling experiences gained across a wider geographical range in future. Comment: Please eliminate wording of "sub-sequent phases of the project" which appears a couple of times in the PIF. GEF support is requested for the distinct project presented here and it cannot be assumed to secure future	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		financing phases. Delete the words "....of the project" to avoid any possible confusion/misunderstanding. (9/29/2017) Comment addressed. Cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	(9/7/2017) Yes, the incremental reasoning for GEF support for regional assessment and advancing the knowledge on shared groundwater resources to support sustainable management of these vital resources to the livelihoods and resilience of people and ecosystems is described in sufficient clarity at this stage and aligns with the IW-1 and IW 2 objectives.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	(9/7/2017) The project structure is overall logical and well presented. Given the available envelope of resources and lack of solid knowledge of available groundwater resources and limited experience to manage shared aquifers the approach to start in a limited sub-set off shared aquifers appears well placed. Please address a few comments: - Component 2 : Please align the component title in table B with the component title in the text (page 19). As the project is focused on selected sub-basins the formulation in table B should be revised accordingly and not	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		refer to "basin-wide" frameworks. - Component 2, output 3.1: Please align table B scope of activities with the text (page 21) with a view that larger wetlands are not covered by this project. Similarly the experience on groundwater and surface water interaction will advance the knowledge and lessons for larger regional wetlands but not directly address the Sudd and Baro-Akobo-Sobat related wetlands (while these ARE addressed by GIZ finance on Nile Basin wetlands). - Editorial: Please check throughout and assure that acronyms are spelled out he first time they are uses (e.g. NSAS, TWAP and TWAP level 2..) and/or footnoted. - GEBs/table F: Please reconsider if it is truly applicable to enter a # for Corporate Result # 6 in table F of the GEF data sheet. The planning frameworks referred to here are to support implementation of major Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) (e.g. with re. to BD, LD, CC related MEAs). (9/29/2017) The above comments have been addressed. Cleared.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	(9/7/2017) Gender dimensions are outlined sufficiently at PIF stage. Comment: Please strengthen a description on how NGOs/CSOs will be consulted in project design - including distinct groups of small scale groundwater users such as small scale sedentary farmers and pastoralist groups and related stock routes with watering points with high dependence on groundwater (e.g. in the Gedaref region). (9/29/2017) Comment addressed. Cleared. AT ENDORSEMENT: for the pilots please assure that CSOs/NGOs and specific user groups are addressed in the design of pilots and gender dimensions are explicitly considered in the design and within the implementation of the pilots.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• The focal area allocation?	(9/7/2017) Yes, at the present point, requested resources are within envelope of available focal area resources.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	(9/7/2017) The PIF is not yet recommended . Please provide missing LOEs and address above comments. Please also indicate/re-examine if all co-finance is truly in-kind. It appears that some of the co-finance are parallel grant and in-kind co-finance. Please update/clarify the date of the last review of the project proposal by TAC of the project. Please do not hesitate to contact us if any clarification is needed. (9/29/2017) All technical comments have been addressed. Please submit the one remaining LOE from Burundi. (10/6/2017) The LOE from Burundi has been submitted. The project is technically cleared and recommended for inclusion in a future work program.	
Review Date	Review	September 07, 2017	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 29, 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)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		
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)		

[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.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		