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

GEF ID:	**9165**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Egypt, Libya, Sudan, Chad)**		
Project Title:	**Enabling implementation of the Regional SAP for the rational and equitable management of the Nubian Sandstone Aquifer System (NSAS).**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**4736 (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;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,990,000**
Co-financing:	**$22,300,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$26,290,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**October 01, 2015**
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]	The project is aligned with the GEF IW objectives 1 and 2 and addressing increased cooperation between countries to address the shared groundwater resources AND conjunctive management of surface and groundwater.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, the project is consistent with national policies and plans. During project preparation/design please expand on the alignment with NAPAs	

[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
		and with specific policies in the agriculture, water resources and water supply side in more detail including the link to national development and poverty reduction strategies.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Overall yes. The project is addressing the management of a massive fossil aquifer in the region. While the transboundary impacts of withdrawals at this point are negligible, the low transmissivity of the aquifer leads to some local significant to severe drawdowns that can lead to local depletion of the aquifer along with predicted increase in its use for e.g. irrigation and development. The project is therefore aiming at strengthening the joint regional institution, support better understanding of the aquifer behavior and devising strategies for wise water use and reuse and understanding impacts of drawdown e.g. on oasis ecosystems. Please explain more clearly the emphasis of impacts of climate change on the NSAS which effectively has extremely low recharge in very limited edges of the aquifer. The impacts of climate change are therefore to be seen as	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		indirect due to expected increase in the use of groundwater to make up for expanded water uses and limitation of surface water in futures. Please expand. (8/13/2015): Comment addressed and emphasis on indirect impacts (i.e. though greater expected use of groundwater in future) confirmed.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes, the project addresses the incremental reasoning for GEF support for transboundary cooperation in this context (see 3 above).	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Component 1: - Study of climate impacts on oasis ecosystems: as mentioned earlier, please expand on the projected climate change impacts on NSAS. The project now seems to focus efforts on projected impacts of climate change on the biodiversity oasis ecosystems. Given the limited data both on the NSAS systems and limited hydromet information in the involved countries to assess climate change impacts the rational for this effort in this specific project seems weak. An emphasis to study the impact of aquifer drawdown/overuse on oasis ecosystems appears to be the more logical link to the project objectives.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- National monitoring stations: GEF resources should be incremental to national efforts and are well placed in designing a regional monitoring network and supporting modeling of the shared aquifer system. In order to assure sustainability national budget provisions and national co-finance should be provided to support the long time operation of national monitoring stations. Please confirm. Component 2: - During project preparation and implementation a strategy for future finance of the envisioned joint modeling centre needs to be devised. Please confirm/mention in PIF. - Can you please confirm that the 'Data$ Information Protocols' mentioned include a protocol for the sharing of information to underpin the joint modeling efforts. Component 3: Groundwater is largely a hidden resource and its governance often lags far behind surface water resources. In the project's aim to be 'ahead of the curve' and take preemptive	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		approaches, we recommend that the project should designate some resources and efforts to sensitize policy makers and the public, including the private sector (incl. e.g. privately operated agricultural schemes), of the extend and benefits of uses of groundwater in their country and the impacts of the overuse of groundwater. It therefore should also aim to analyze the framework for groundwater governance and management in each country and strengthen national policy provisions and capacities. The GEF Global Groundwater Governance Project Framework for Action provides a valuable basis to guide action. The respective output (bullet 2 (of 3) page 14) needs more specific commitments what the project is expected to achieve in this regard. Component 4: Please include clearer criteria for selection of pilot interventions. While most can be found in the SAP, criteria should be clear in linking the expected impacts of the selected pilots to the sustainable use and/or	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		protection of NSAS resources. The use of the 'proof of concept' terminology so loosely is unclear unless criteria for the selection of pilots are clearly aiming for innovative measures in the specific country context. Component 5: Suggest to consider hosting a donor meeting towards the end of the project to raise awareness of progress on transboundary cooperation on NSAS and the work of the JA and with the aim for raising finance for the implementation of priority actions. Some limited funds would need to be set aside for this from project side combined with national co-finance. Comments above addressed at PIF stage. During project design please: - expand on the CSO and private sector/agriculture sector inclusion (PIF mentions that a strategy will be developed during project design) and mainstream such interaction throughout the component designs. - During project design, please specify the targeted national policy reforms and other SAP targets listed	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		under component 3 which are to be achieved by the project and how and when these will be achieved (see comment above). - Include under criteria for selection of pilots (component 4) the clear link of expected impacts of the selected pilots to the sustainable use and/or protection of NSAS resources. -	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Overall yes and the PIF outlines the importance of NSAS resources on national development. There is no mention though on outreach to the public including CSOS and the private sector on the significance and need for cooperation and action on sustainable and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. Gender aspects are outlined in the specific section and the use of the WWAP gender indicators is appreciated. Please more clearly mainstream gender aspects in the relevant components during project design. Page 11 mentions indigenous people - please clarify what indigenous groups are in the area and how the specific needs of such indigenous people will be addressed by the project.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		(8/13/2015). Addressed. Agency clarified that PPG phase will see the development of a draft communication / outreach strategy and plan to actively engage all relevant stakeholder groups (including CSOs, NGOs, farmers associations, nomadic representatives, institutes, government representatives, etc.). It was also clarified that the mention of 'indigenous populations' does not imply the strict definition of 'indigenous people' , but refers to groups such as pastoralists common to these countries.	
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?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	Yes, the resources are within FA resources for IW. Please note that Table A needs revision. Please fold project management costs proportionally into IW 1 and IW 2. Thank you.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		(8/13/2015): The comment above has been addressed.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not yet. Please address comments above and resubmit. (8/13/2015): The comments have been addressed. The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review		
	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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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. *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:		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	• 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.