



# GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT  
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: <b>Integrated Environmental Management of the Río Motagua Watershed</b>			
Country(ies):	Guatemala, Honduras	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	9246
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5714
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN); Secretariat of Energy, Natural Resources, Environment, and Mines (Mi Ambiente+)	Submission Date:	16 Oct. 2017
		Resubmission Date:	1 March 2018
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of Parent Program	[if applicable]	Agency Fee (\$)	506,298

## A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IW-1 Program 1	Outcome 1.1: Political commitment/shared vision and improved governance demonstrated for joint, ecosystem-based management of transboundary water bodies.	GEFTF	2,000,000	10,518,108
IW-3 Program 6	Outcome 6.1: Coasts in globally most significant areas protected from further loss and degradation of coastal habitats while protecting and enhancing livelihoods	GEFTF	1,096,347	5,765,748
CW-2 Program 3	Outcome 3.1: Quantifiable and verifiable tonnes of POPs eliminated or reduced	GEFTF	2,233,105	11,744,020
<b>Total project costs</b>			<b>5,329,452</b>	<b>28,027,876</b>

## B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

<b>Project Objective:</b> Improve the integrated management of the Río Motagua watershed and reduce land-based sources of pollution and produced emissions from unintentional formed persistent organic pollutants (U-POPs) to mitigate impacts on coastal-marine ecosystems and the livelihoods of the local populations						
Project Components/Programs	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1. Diagnostic analysis of the Surface Water and Groundwater Resources of the Río Motagua watershed that is shared by	TA	1.1. Priority shared issues, including those that directly affect downstream coastal-marine ecosystems, the quality and quantity of water, and barriers for Integrated	1.1.1 A Watershed Diagnostic Analysis (WDA), following the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Programme (TDA/SAP) methodology identifying the main environmental	GEFTF	568,037 (IW)	3,154,626

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#) and [CBIT programming directions](#).

<sup>3</sup> Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

Guatemala and Honduras.		River Basin Management (IRBM) identified, agreed upon.	<p>and water resource issues in both countries, finalized and agreed upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A technical/scientific document identifying issues related to surface and groundwater pollution, (solid waste, sedimentation, wastewater, etc.) developed;</li> <li>- Baseline conditions and status indicators of environmental and socioeconomic conditions related to watershed surface and ground water resources determined (watershed hydrologic/land use maps, physiochemical parameters, pollution sources, economic valuation of ecosystems, stakeholder analyses and stakeholder's participation strategies –including private sector and communities as well as gender analysis);</li> <li>- WDA made available at the national (Guatemala and Honduras), sub-national, municipal, and community levels;</li> <li>- Guidelines for incorporating the principal findings of the WDA in the Municipal Development Plans and/or Investment Plans for both countries developed.</li> </ul>			
2. Binational Strategic Action Program (SAP) for the integrated management of the Río Motagua watershed (Guatemala and Honduras) is	TA	2.1. Key priority actions for the management of the Río Motagua watershed defined and incorporated as part of the environmental management	<p>2.1.1. Binational SAP completed and endorsed at the highest (ministerial) level in each country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Strategic Action Plans (NSAP) for sustainable integrated management of the Río Motagua</li> </ul>	GEFTF	1,317,676 833,281 (IW) 484,395 (CW)	6,881,662



		<p>the IRBM of the Río Motagua watershed.</p> <p>2.3. Improved national and local capacities for IRBM and monitoring and control of water quality, including reducing pollution from land-based sources (solid waste, U-POPs, and plastics) (1,808 people from national government institutions, municipalities, and members of civil society organizations [COMUDES in Guatemala and Watershed Councils in Honduras] improve their knowledge and skills in managing sources of coastal-marine pollution that originate from Río Motagua)</p>	<p>Binational Framework Agreement between Guatemala and Honduras.</p> <p>2.2.2 Memorandum of Understanding between the countries for the implementation of the IRBM.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical and legal guidelines in place;</li> <li>- Work protocols agreed upon and in operation (guidelines for solid wastes and wastewater management, etc.);</li> <li>- Guidelines for reducing land-based water pollution and conducting technical studies in three (3) prioritized municipalities considering the regulatory frameworks of the municipalities in both countries are developed.</li> </ul> <p>2.3.1 Targeted institutional capacity building programs for IRBM and reduce land-based pollution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Information Systems of the MARN (Guatemala) and Mi Ambiente + (Honduras) with capability for using remote-sensing technology to monitor water quality and share information (reduction of solid wastes, harmful chemicals and wastes<sup>4</sup>, sedimentation, wastewater, etc.);</li> <li>- Training program strengthens national-, subnational-, and municipal-level capacities for IRBM (Guatemala and Honduras) and the sound environmental</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

<sup>4</sup> Harmful wastes: liquid, solid, or gaseous wastes that possess characteristics such as corrosivity, reactivity, explosivity, toxicity, inflammability, as well as the containers, receptacles, packaging, and soils that have been contaminated when they are transferred to another site.

		<p>2.4. Key institutions in Guatemala incorporate the sound environmental management of chemicals and wastes (U-POPs and plastics) into their management strategies for the Rio Motagua watershed and into monitoring and control activities.</p>	<p>management and reduction of harmful chemicals and waste (Guatemala: staff from the Department of Water Resources and Watersheds [DRHyC] and from eight [8] departmental delegations);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Knowledge exchange program in integrated watershed management to reduce land-based sources of coastal-marine pollution (South-South cooperation);</li> <li>- Binational environmental education program builds awareness and contributes to the reduction of environmental pressures on the Río Motagua watershed, including water pollution sources.</li> </ul> <p>2.4.1. Program for the sound environmental management of harmful wastes (U-POPs emissions reduction alongside the river and plastics disposed near and on surface water bodies) by key institutions in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Departmental (8) and municipal (3) development plans incorporate the sound environmental management of harmful chemicals and waste;</li> <li>- Information systems and databases of the locations and characteristics of dump sites near surface water bodies that produce U-POPs through open burning and store plastic wastes (public and private sector).</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>2.4.2. Technical guidelines for the handling, transport, storage, and disposal of wastes.</p> <p>2.4.3. Monitoring program of human and environmental health effects of U-POPs emissions and plastic wastes disposal, including improved laboratory and analytical competencies developed.</p>			
<p>3. Innovative pilot initiatives for the IRBM of the Río Motagua watershed (Guatemala and Honduras) generate knowledge and lessons learned allowing the replication and scaling-up of successful experiences</p>	TA	<p>3.1. Sustainable integrated management of water and soil resources reduces pollution of the Río Motagua watershed through pilot projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction of nitrogen concentrations by 20 mg/L in wastewater (two pilot projects in Guatemala and two pilot projects in Honduras)</li> <li>- Reduction of BOD by 100 mg/L due to wastewater treatment (two pilot projects in Guatemala and two pilot projects in Honduras)</li> <li>- Reduction of 20 tons/ha/year of soil loss due to reforestation of degraded areas to reduce contamination through runoff (one pilot project in the municipality of Nueva Frontera, Honduras)</li> <li>- Change in the recharge rate of the aquifer from 475 mm/year to 558 mm/year (one pilot project in Guatemala)</li> </ul>	<p>3.1.1 Innovative investments to reduce Río Motagua water and coastal pollution from land-based sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Six (6) pilot projects with low-cost technology to reduce land-based pollution of water resources (e.g., biodigestors, oxidation ponds, control of soil erosion)</li> <li>Eight (8) pre-investment studies for the implementation of large-scale infrastructure and equipment for the handling and disposal of land-based pollutants affecting hydrological resources (e.g., solid waste [with cofinancing funds] and plastics [with C&amp;W GEF funds and cofinancing]);</li> <li>Incentives available (environmental certifications, tax incentives, cash payments) for businesses that implement clean technologies and agriculture producers that adopt sustainable production practices.</li> </ul>	GEFTF	<p>2,719,707 1,246,370 (IW) 1,473,337 (CW)</p>	14,200,670

		<p>(Baseline data missing related to the pilot projects will be determined during the first year of and submitted to the GEF)</p> <p>3.2. 56 municipal landfills in Guatemala using sustainable solid waste management schemes (reduction in open-air burning).</p> <p>3.3. Reduced production of plastic wastes (from 109,500 MT/year to 87,600 MT/year) and of emissions of U-POPs (from 225.6 gTEQ/year to 180.5 gTEQ/year) that result from open burning of solid wastes from dumpsites and other waste-burning activities.</p>	<p>3.2.1. Municipal solid waste management practices improved (with cofinancing and C&amp;W GEF funds):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inventory of domestic waste dumpsites and current practice of open burning;</li> <li>- Guidelines and technical support provided to municipalities for the sustainable management of solid wastes.</li> <li>- Program to implement best management practices (BMPs) of residues, including the reduction of open burning from households in place.</li> </ul> <p>3.3.1. Three (3) pilot projects for the reduction of solid wastes and proper handling and disposal of domestic waste, including elimination of open air burning, contribute to the reduction of dioxin/furan emissions and plastic wastes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Baseline of disposed plastic wastes and U-POPs emissions in the Río Motagua watershed established.</li> <li>- Protocols for best environmental practices (BEPs) and best available techniques (BATs) to reduce dioxin/furan emissions and plastic wastes;</li> <li>- Cleanup/closure of open air and illegal</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

		3.4. Structure and functionality of key ecosystems strengthened.	<p>dumpsites near surface water bodies that are a source of U-POP emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Waste separation and plastic recycling program for households and solid waste management facilities;</li> <li>– Strategy for development of new facilities for sound solid waste management and the reduction in U-POPs emissions and other chemical wastes.</li> </ul> <p>3.4.1 Rehabilitation (conservation and protection, reforestation, natural regeneration, remediation) of 250 hectares (ha) of riparian ecosystems in the watershed in Honduras.</p>			
4. Knowledge Management and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	TA	4.1. Improved experience and knowledge about the management and sustainable use of surface water including determining the investment needs for the IRBM of the Río Motagua watershed.	<p>4.1.1. Best practices documented and experiences shared (media, short videos, etc.) with other IW and CW projects using existing information-exchange platforms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Systematization of South-South experiences (Honduras-Guatemala) for IRBM of the Río Motagua watershed, including the management of harmful wastes, U-POPs, and plastics</li> <li>– Plan for scaling-up best practices for managing domestic waste disposal sites in place</li> <li>– Lessons learned documented and shared, highlighting the role of women in the project</li> </ul>	GEFTF	470,250 301,215 (IW) 169,035 (CW)	2,455,918
Subtotal					5,075,670	26,692,876

Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>5</sup> (Including Direct Project Costs: USD\$101,513)	GEFTF	253,782	1,335,000
<b>Total project costs</b>		<b>5,329,452</b>	<b>28,027,876</b>

**C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE**

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)*
Recipient Government	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), Guatemala	Grants	212,585
Recipient Government	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), Guatemala	In-kind	841,544
CSO	Asociación Sotz'il, Guatemala	Grants	175,000
CSO	Asociación Sotz'il, Guatemala	In-kind	25,000
Donor Agency	Wetlands International, Guatemala	In-kind	50,576
Donor Agency	Mesoamerican Reef Fund (MARFUND), Guatemala	Grants	225,453
CSO	Foundation for Ecodevelopment and Conservation (FUNDAECO), Guatemala	Grants	150,000
CSO	Foundation for Ecodevelopment and Conservation (FUNDAECO), Guatemala	In-kind	650,000
Donor Agency	Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), Guatemala	Grants	15,000,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Pachalum, Guatemala	Grants	62,315
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Pachalum, Guatemala	In-kind	100,687
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Estanzuela, Guatemala	Grants	580,658
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Los Amates, Guatemala	Grants	119,620
Recipient Government	Directorate General of the Merchant Marine, Honduras	Grants	29,380
Recipient Government	Secretariat of Agriculture and Livestock (SAG), Honduras	In-kind	1,514,350
Private Sector	Gas del Caribe Honduras	Grants	2,194,395
Recipient Government	National Institute of Forest Conservation and Development, Protected Areas, and Wildlife of Honduras (ICF)	In-kind	487,003
Recipient Government	Secretariat of Energy, Natural Resources, Environment, and Mines (Mi Ambiente+), Honduras	In-kind	2,500,000
Donor Agency	GOAL, Honduras	Grants	1,000,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Nueva Frontera, Honduras	Grants	8,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Nueva Frontera, Honduras	In-kind	2,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Omoa, Honduras	In-kind	69,310
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Santa Rita, Honduras	Grants	30,000
GEF Agency	UNDP, Honduras	Grants	1,500,000
GEF Agency	UNDP Cap-Net	Grants	500,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>28,027,876</b>

<sup>5</sup> For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

\* 1 USD = 7.34 Guatemalan quetzals; 1 USD = 23.4 Honduran lempiras

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS**

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee <sup>a)</sup> (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEFTF	Regional (Guatemala, Honduras)	International Waters		3,096,347	294,153	3,390,500
UNDP	GEFTF	Guatemala	Chemicals and Wastes		2,233,105	212,145	2,445,250
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>					<b>5,329,452</b>	<b>506,298</b>	<b>5,835,750</b>

a ) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

**E. PROJECT’S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS<sup>6</sup>**

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	<i>One (1) freshwater basin</i>
2. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	<i>U-POP emissions: 180.5 gTEQ/year</i>

**F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO**

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>7</sup>**

*A.1. Project Description.*

1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed.

NA

2) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.

NA

3) The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area<sup>8</sup> strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.

NA

1. A description of the project’s outputs and activities is included in Section III. Results and Partnerships of the GEF-UNDP project document.

4) [Incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and [co-financing](#);

2. The project design is closely aligned with the original PIF. The structure of the project components closely resembles the PIF that was approved by the GEF. However, as per UNDP guidelines regarding Knowledge Management and M&E, a standalone Component 4 was included in the project results framework and in the total budget and work plan. This component outlines the knowledge management strategy of the project focusing on the production of knowledge products and the wider communication and dissemination of project lessons and experiences to support the replication and scaling-up of project results. In addition, minor changes were made to the project’s outputs—these changes do not represent a departure from the project’s strategy as defined originally in the PIF, nor will they have an impact on the funds originally budgeted. These change can be observed below:

<sup>6</sup> Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

<sup>7</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF , no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

<sup>8</sup> For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project’s consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving.

PIF Outputs (Component 1)	CEO Endorsement Outputs (Component 1)
1.1.1 A Watershed Diagnostic Analysis (WDA), following the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Programme (TDA/SAP) methodology identifying the main shared environmental and water resource issues, finalized and agreed upon	1.1.1 A Watershed Diagnostic Analysis (WDA), following the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Programme (TDA/SAP) methodology identifying the main environmental and water resource issues in both countries, finalized and agreed upon
1.2.1. Two (2) national-level proposals for updating the regulatory framework allow synergies for surface water management, including reducing pollution (solid waste, sedimentation, wastewater, etc.) taking into account the regulations and international conventions to which both countries are parties	This output was moved to Component 2 (now Output 2.1.3 in the Project Description Summary) as the national-level proposals for updating the regulatory framework as part of the SAP.
PIF Outputs (Component 2)	CEO Endorsement Outputs (Component 2)
2.1.1. Binational SAP completed and endorsed at the highest (ministerial) level in each country: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Action Plans and proposal for long-term monitoring system including environmental and socioeconomic indicators for tracking the implementation of the SAP and NSAPs prepared.</li> </ul>	2.1.1. Binational SAP completed and endorsed at the highest (ministerial) level in each country: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protocols for Local Action Plans and proposal for long-term monitoring system including environmental and socioeconomic indicators for tracking the implementation of the SAP and NSAPs prepared.</li> </ul>
PIF Outputs (Component 3)	CEO Endorsement Outputs (Component 3)
3.1.1 Innovative investments to reduce Rio Motagua water and coastal pollution from land-based sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program for the sustainable management of contaminated waste in beaches in the Rio Motagua delta/estuary</li> </ul>	The program for the sustainable management of contaminated waste in beaches along the Rio Motagua delta/estuary will be developed through one of the pilot projects in Honduras (Output 3.1.1).
3.1.1 Innovative investments to reduce Rio Motagua water and coastal pollution from land-based sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incentives available (environmental certifications, access to microcredits, accreditation for quality of beaches) for businesses that implement clean technologies and agriculture producers that adopt sustainable production practices</li> </ul>	3.1.1 Innovative investments to reduce Rio Motagua water and coastal pollution from land-based sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incentives available (environmental certifications, tax incentives, cash payments) for businesses that implement clean technologies and agriculture producers that adopt sustainable production practices.</li> </ul>
3.4.1 Rehabilitation (conservation and protection, reforestation, natural regeneration, remediation) of 25 kilometers (km) of riparian ecosystems and 100 hectares (ha) of coastal ecosystems in the watershed in Honduras.	3.4.1 Rehabilitation (conservation and protection, reforestation, natural regeneration, remediation) of 250 hectares (ha) of riparian ecosystems in the watershed in Honduras: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coastal ecosystems will be restored through one of the pilot projects in Honduras (Output 3.1.1): 150 ha of beaches, and 100 ha of mangroves.</li> </ul>
3.5.1. Best practices documented and experiences shared (media, short videos, etc.) with other IW and CW projects using existing information-exchange platforms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Systematization of South-South experiences (Honduras-Guatemala) for IRBM of the Río Motagua watershed, including the management of harmful wastes, U-POPs, and plastics;</li> <li>Plan for scaling-up best practices for managing domestic waste disposal sites in place;</li> <li>Lessons learned documented and shared.</li> </ul>	This output is now included in Component 4: Knowledge Management and M&E.

*Baseline Scenario:*

2. The baseline scenario for the project remains the same as in the PIF, except for a USD \$500,000 investment from The Nature Conservancy through the ResCA (Resilient Central America) regional project. In the upper part of the Río Motagua watershed, this investment will improve food security through the adoption of climate-smart agriculture practices and using an ecosystem-based approach that will contribute to the conservation of forests and water and soil resources. Accordingly, the existing and planned investments for baseline programs are estimated at USD \$19,953,792.

*GEF Increment to Generate Global Benefits:*

3. **Component 1:** The alternative GEF scenario will allow a **diagnostic analysis for the IRBM of the Río Motagua watershed that is shared by Guatemala and Honduras**. Incremental financing will be in the amount of USD \$3,722,663; USD \$568,037 will be provided by the GEF and USD \$3,154,626 will be provided by co-financing sources. The GEF alternative will include investments from the MARN and IADB in Guatemala; in Honduras the GEF alternative will include investments from SAG, ICF, Mi Ambiente+, GOAL, and UNDP.

4. **Component 2:** The alternative GEF scenario will allow the development of a **binational SAP for the integrated management of the Río Motagua watershed that is agreed upon for implementation**. The incremental financing expected for this component is USD \$8,199,338; USD \$1,317,676 will be provided by the GEF and USD \$6,881,662 will be provided by co-financing sources. The GEF alternative will include investments from the MARN and the IADB in Guatemala; in Honduras the GEF alternative will include investments from SAG, ICF, Mi Ambiente+, GOAL, and UNDP; and UNDP Cap-Net in both countries.

5. **Component 3:** In addition, the alternative GEF scenario will also allow the implementation of **innovative initiatives for the IRBM of the Río Motagua watershed and generation of knowledge and lessons learned for the replication and scaling-up of successful experiences**. The incremental financing expected for this component is USD \$16,920,377; USD \$2,719,707 will be provided by the GEF and USD \$14,200,670 will be provided by co-financing sources. The GEF alternative will include investments from the Directorate General of the Merchant Marine, Gas del Caribe, SAG, ICF, Mi Ambiente+, GOAL, the Municipality of Nueva Frontera, Municipality of Omoa, Municipality of Santa Rita, and UNDP in Honduras; in Guatemala the GEF alternative will include investments from the IADB, Asociación Sotz'il, Wetlands International, MARFUND, FUNDAECO, the Municipality of Pachalum, the Municipality of Estanzuela, and the Municipality of Los Amates; and UNDP Cap-Net in both countries.

6. **Component 4: Knowledge management and M&E.** The knowledge management approach for the project is outlined in this component, which has a total cost of USD \$2,926,168, out of which GEF will provide USD \$470,250 and the co-financing sources will provide USD \$2,455,918. The GEF alternative will include investments from the MARN and IADB in Guatemala; in Honduras the GEF alternative will include investments from SAG, Mi Ambiente+, and UNDP; and UNDP Cap-Net in both countries.

7. The costs of managing the project will total USD \$1,588,782, USD \$253,782 of which GEF will provide and co-financing source will provide USD \$1,335,000. The GEF alternative has a total cost of USD \$53,311,120, 10% of this will be provided by GEF.

5) [Global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF).

8. The proposed project includes actions that will deliver global environmental benefits related to the maintenance of water resources and regulation of the Río Motagua watershed shared by Guatemala and Honduras. In particular, the project will contribute to reducing transboundary water pollution that negatively impacts downstream ecosystems and livelihoods. The integrated management of water and soil resources will also contribute to maintaining the integrity of key terrestrial and coastal ecosystems (oak-pine mountain forests, rainforest and tropical dry and subtropical forests, mangroves, riparian forests, and beaches). The project's global environmental benefits include:

- 1,799,080 ha under the IRBM approach in the Río Motagua watershed in Guatemala and Honduras
- Binational SAP for the Río Motagua watershed and aquifers (Chiquimula, Copán Ruinas, Zacapa, Departments of Copán, Cortés, and Santa Bárbara)
- Reduction from 109,500 MT/year to 87,600 MT/year of plastic wastes (20% reduction)

- Reduction from 225.6 gTEQ/year to 180.5 gTEQ/year of U-POP emissions (20% reduction)
- At least 56 municipal landfills in Guatemala using sustainable solid waste management schemes (reduction in open-air burning)
- Improved habitat in 100 ha of coastal ecosystems and 25 km of riparian forests for protecting water resources with equal participation by men and women

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

NA

A.2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

NA

A.3. *Stakeholders.* Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes  /no )? and indigenous peoples (yes  /no )?<sup>9</sup>

9. The successful implementation of the project will largely depend on effective communication and coordination with the multiple project stakeholders and the implementation of mechanisms to ensure these stakeholders' participation. The key national stakeholders in Guatemala include the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food (MAGA), the Municipal Development Institute (INFOM), Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), the Ministry of Public Health and Social Welfare (MSPAS), and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, among others; the key national stakeholders in Honduras include the Ministry of Energy, Natural Resources, Environment, and Mines (Mi Ambiente+), the National Institute of Forest, Protected Areas, Wildlife Conservation and Development (ICF), the Secretariat of Agriculture and Livestock (SAG), and the Secretariat of Foreign Relations (SRECI), among others. At the local level, the most relevant stakeholders are the municipalities and local communities. During the project preparation stage, a stakeholder analysis was performed to identify key stakeholders at the national and local levels in both countries, assess stakeholders' interests in the project, to conduct capacity assessments and assess training needs, and define their roles and responsibilities for project implementation. As a result of this effort, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the project was developed where the roles and responsibilities of the main participants in the Project are clearly identified; the Plan is included in Annex K of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

A.4. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.* Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes  /no )?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes  /no )?; and 3) the share of women and men direct beneficiaries is: women 51.6%, men 48.4%.<sup>10</sup>

10. According to the project objective and the proposed actions, it is categorized as *Gender responsive: results addressed differential needs of men or women and equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status and rights but do not address root causes of inequalities in their lives.*

11. The project will incorporate gender considerations into all phases of its life cycle, using the Gender Strategy and Action Plan designed specifically to ensure that the concerns and experiences of women as well as men are an integral part of the development, implementation, and M&E of the project. The project conducted a gender analysis during project preparation and developed a Gender Strategy and Action Plan to ensure gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring. The Gender Strategy and Action Plan is included as Annex L of the GEF-UNDP project document.

A.5 *Risk.* Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

<sup>9</sup> As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.

<sup>10</sup> Same as footnote 8 above.

12. As per standard UNDP requirements, the Principal Advisor will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. when impact is rated as 5, and when impact is rated as 4 and probability is rated at 3 or higher). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual Project Implementation Report (PIR). The updated risk management strategy for the project is included in Annex H of the GEF-UNDP project document.

*A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.* Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

13. Institutional arrangements are described in Section VII: Governance and Management Arrangements of the GEF-UNDP project document. Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives remains the same as at the PIF stage.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

*A.7 Benefits.* Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

14. The project will facilitate the direct, free, and equal participation of all national, subnational, and local stakeholders in the planning and implementation of measures to improve the integrated management of the Río Motagua watershed and reduce land-based sources of pollution and produced emissions from U-POPs to mitigate impacts to coastal-marine ecosystems and the livelihoods of the local populations. The project will train local community members, including indigenous peoples, CSOs and women's groups, and municipal officials so that they become the principal facilitators and decision makers for the IRBM of the Río Motagua watershed to reduce land-based sources of coastal-marine pollution. The training program will benefit 1,808 people: 212 technical staff and 1,596 members of the general public. Of this total, 1,140 (63%) are men and 668 (37%) are women. In addition, the project will provide monetary and non-monetary benefits equally to the local stakeholders independently of their condition, which will result in the following: a) direct participation by local community members, community organizations, and local governments in planning and implementing innovative investments to reduce Río Motagua water and coastal pollution from land-based sources; this will include six pilot projects in selected municipalities of Guatemala (3) and Honduras (3), and three pilot projects three (3) pilot projects for the reduction of solid waste and proper handling and disposal of domestic waste in three prioritized municipalities in Guatemala; b) access to economic and other incentives available (e.g., environmental certifications, tax incentives, and cash payments) for businesses that implement clean technologies and agricultural producers that adopt sustainable production practices to reduce land-based pollution; c) the municipalities that improve and implement pilot projects for solid waste management and pilot projects for wastewater treatment will benefit from the generation of income from the improved supply of related services to the public; d) through the reduction of pollution from land-based sources and implementation of BMPs for solid waste, including the reduction of open burning by households and plastics, the project will improve local environmental conditions of surface and groundwater, benefiting all local stakeholders by providing a healthier environment and contributing to improved local economies related to agricultural production, recycling and waste management, and tourism, among others.

*A.8 Knowledge Management.* Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

15. Project Component 4: Knowledge management and M&E outlines the knowledge management approach for the project. It includes a specific output regarding how best practices will be documented and experiences will be shared with other IW and CW projects using existing information-exchange platforms. This will include: a) the development of ten (10) media productions that document and disseminate the successful experiences regarding use and management of surface water and groundwater (IW), as well as hazardous waste management (i.e., U-POPs and plastics) (CW); an b)

assessment of investment needs for the IRBM of the Río Motagua and the management of hazardous wastes (U-POPs and plastics). In addition, the results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through a number of existing information-sharing networks and forums. In particular, the project will participate in and contribute to the GEF's IW:LEARN program, including via participation in biennial GEF IW conferences and relevant regional and/or thematic activities under IW:LEARN. A description of the knowledge management approach for the project is provided in Section III Results and Partnerships of the GEF-UNDP project document.

**B. Description of the consistency of the project with:**

**B.1 *Consistency with National Priorities.*** Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.:

*16.* The project presented herein contributes to Guatemala's compliance with the following strategies: a) measures to reduce emissions from existing deposits and wastes and b) measures to reduce unintentionally produced POPs. The Government of Guatemala signed the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants on January 29, 2002, and it was subsequently ratified on July 30, 2008.

**C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:** The budgeted M&E plan is included in Section VI: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

**PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)**

**A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

**This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies<sup>11</sup> and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.**

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (MM/dd/yyyy)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Adriana Dinu - UNDP GEF Executive Coordinator		16 Oct. 2017	Jose Vicente Troya – Regional Technical Advisor (Waters & Oceans)	(507)302- 4753	Jose.troya@undp.org

<sup>11</sup> GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT  
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please refer to Section V. Project Results Framework of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference in CEO Endorsement Document
<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement (FSP)/Approval (MSP): March 16, 2016</b>		
<p>5. <i>Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The following output indicators for the reduction of U-POPs were included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction from 225.6 gTEQ/year to 180.5 gTEQ/year (20% reduction) in the production of U-POPs that result from open burning of solid wastes in informal dumpsites and other waste-burning activities.</li> <li>• Reduction from 109,500 metric tons (MT)/year to 87,600 MT/year (20% reduction) in production of plastics waste.</li> <li>• At least 56 municipal landfills in Guatemala using sustainable solid waste management schemes (reduction of open-air burning).</li> <li>• Elimination of at least 15% of illegal dumpsites with solid wastes in three municipalities (through pilot projects).</li> </ul>	<p>Section V. Project Results Framework of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>
<b>STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF): March 14, 2016</b>		
<p>1. The project lacks, however, a clear theory of change considering that this is a multi-focal area project that should address both, International Waters (IW) issues from the Source to Sea perspective by connecting the project to the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem (CLME) and Chemicals and Waste issues targeting specific innovative investments into pollution control. Such an approach would need a clear theory of change outlining agreed objectives and monitoring and evaluation framework with specific indicators to test whether each focal area contributes effectively to the project's objective which is stated as: " Improve the integrated management of the RÁ-o Motagua watershed and reduce land-based sources of pollution and produced emissions from unintentionally formed persistent organic pollutants (U-POPs) to mitigate impacts on coastal-marine ecosystems and the livelihoods of the local populations".</p>	<p>The project includes a clear theory of change as well as a robust number of indicators related to the IW and CW focal areas. In addition to the watershed approach of the project (i.e., IRBM for the Río Motagua watershed), the project includes the implementation of nine pilot projects (6 for IW and 3 for CW) whose site selection was done considering their strategic positions within the watershed (upper, middle, land lower/coastal areas) with a source-to-sea perspective. In addition, a threats assessment was conducted to better describe the transboundary environmental problem and the relationship between land-based sources of pollution, including solid wastes, and how these affect surface, groundwater, and coastal waters. The threats assessment was also used as part of a multi-criteria evaluation to select pilot project sites that will allow the implementation of innovative solutions to reduce Río Motagua water and coastal pollution from land-based sources, as well as for the reduction of solid wastes and proper handling and disposal of domestic waste (reduction of U-POP emissions and plastic wastes).</p>	<p>Section II. Strategy of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>

<p>2. Nevertheless, the STAP finds strong merits in the proposed project considering that the identified pollution control issues are well documented and the project builds on the ongoing activities to improve the institutions and change behavior towards improved waste management and pollution control, including at the municipal levels. From a "Source to Sea" perspective (mentioned in the PIF), the topic of combating pollution at the municipal level has already been identified as a critical and urgent issue. The IW framework (TDA/SAP) would thereby enhance knowledge and cooperative action between the two countries to move towards improved water management and pollution control for the benefits of both nations and the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem benefiting multiple nations and providing global public good benefits. This year STAP will present a framework addressing Source to Sea Governance and Management in a forthcoming Information Paper for the GEF Council that could be used to support building a strong theory of change for this project.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please refer to the response of Comment No.1, which describes how the source-to-sea perspective of the project was considered.</p>	<p>Section II. Strategy of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>
<p>3. STAP recommends that the team during the project design phase clarifies the links between pollution control activities and the overall cooperative framework on water management. Typically, a TDA/SAP approach would have preceded an approach to tackle pollution control but as there is an adequate knowledge in the region, pollution reduction activities could be fast tracked in the proposed project to ensure that the proposed measures are indeed incremental and add to the ongoing baseline activities.</p>	<p>Specific pollution control activities, such as pilot projects to reduce land-based sources of pollution and management of solid waste at the municipal level, were identified considering the ongoing baseline activities and considering specific needs at the local level. As mentioned in the comment, this allowed to fast-track activities as part of the final project design prior to having the TDA/SAP results. This pilot and other innovative investments (e.g., pre-investment studies for the implementation of infrastructure and equipment for the handling and disposal of land-based pollutants affecting hydrological resources; incentives available for businesses that implement clean technologies and agricultural producers who adopt sustainable production practices; and programs to implement BMPs of residues, including the reduction of open burning from households in place) will be implemented during the earlier stages of the project and will provide valuable lessons learned and knowledge that will feed into the TDA/SAP development.</p>	<p>Section III. Results and Partnerships of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>
<p>4. Component 1. The omission of groundwater-focused studies and pollution reduction activities is of</p>	<p>As suggested, groundwater was included with surface water issues in the diagnostic analysis (Component 1).</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: PART I - Project Information,</p>

<p>concern, given that the problem statement mentions leachates affecting groundwater. In Component 1 STAP advises the proponents to include groundwater together with surface water issues in the diagnostic analysis, because of the concerns about pollution from POPs and other contaminants.</p>		<p>Section B. Project Description Summary</p> <p>Section II. Strategy of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>
<p>5. Component 2. STAP understands the work is proposed to support SAP formulation and adoption. Continued stakeholder sensitization and capacity building at the level of municipalities will be critical to build project ownership beyond the national authorities. The pollution control activities proposed all take place at the local level.</p>	<p>Continued stakeholder sensitization and capacity building at the level of municipalities are important components of the final project design and implementation. A stakeholder analysis was conducted during the project to identify key stakeholders at the national and local levels in both countries to assess stakeholders' interests in the project, conduct capacity assessments and identify training needs, and define their roles and responsibilities for project implementation. As a result of this effort, a detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the project was developed where the needs, roles, and responsibilities of the main participants in the project are clearly identified. The implementation of this plan will be instrumental to build project ownership at the local level. In addition, all pilot projects for the implementation of innovative solutions to reduce Río Motagua water and coastal pollution from land-based sources, as well as for the reduction of solid wastes and proper handling and disposal of domestic waste, have a strong local focus (i.e., will be implemented under the leadership of municipal authorities and with the active participation local communities and organizations and the local private sector), which will ensure pilot project ownership during project implementation and after completion. Municipal authorities and local groups were actively consulted and participated in the design of the pilot projects, which respond to their needs and expectations to reduce land-base pollution sources and solid waste locally.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: PART II – Project Justification; Section A3. Stakeholders.</p> <p>Annex K. Stakeholder Engagement Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document</p>
<p>6. Although considerable resources are proposed towards building the institutional and decision making capacity, the concept of benefit-sharing in the context of watershed management is not mentioned. The latter could be a potential driver for the improved water quality and enhanced environmental services. Please consider these issues during project design and building project's theory of change.</p>	<p>The project will build collaborative efforts at different levels that will result in multiple benefits, including the more effective management of surface, ground, and coastal waters by reducing land-based sources of pollution. Shared benefits from an upstream-downstream perspective include the reduction of pollution and wastes, which contributes to improving water quality and soil conservation upstream (benefiting agricultural production and urban water supply). This also will generate benefits downstream, particularly in the delta/estuary and beaches, by reducing the amount of solid and other wastes, and sedimentation, bringing benefits to the tourism and coastal fisheries. Benefit-sharing also includes a policy shift for the management of the Río Motagua watershed, bringing together institutions from Guatemala and Honduras at the national and local levels and promoting their collaboration for the IRBM of the watershed. Similarly, the project will deliver multiple ecosystems benefits along the gradient of the Río Motagua, which includes oak-pine mountain forests in the upper waters, rainforest and tropical dry and subtropical forests in the middle and lower parts of the watershed, and mangroves, beaches, and reefs in the coastal-marine areas. Along this gradient multiple riparian forests will also benefit from the</p>	<p>Section II. Strategy of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>

	<p>project, including restoration and conservation. Altogether, these benefits will contribute to improve the livelihoods of the communities of Guatemala and Honduras and the delivery of multiple global environmental benefits.</p>	
<p>7. Component 3. As mentioned above, the long list of potential pilots and technologies is interesting and impressive, yet criteria for prioritization are not provided and would normally be guided by the evidence base of the WDA/TDA/SAP outcomes. The proposal should consider the different institutional arrangements for addressing the waste management issues along both sides of the river. The network of stakeholders is complex and as the project correctly stated includes civil society organizations and municipalities. Proper consideration and implementation of technology solutions should be accompanied by a thorough process of human resources training and consider a longer-term sustainability of investments proposed in the project. The innovation component envisaged such as recycling of waste should involve the development of market based incentives to be developed carefully during project preparation. Complementarity of project activities with other ongoing pollution reduction efforts in the region should be assured (i.e., with efforts of global and local NGOs and other entities to protect Mezoamerican Reef against pollution).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prioritization of the pilot projects was achieved using a multi-criteria evaluation, which included a threat assessment (hydrologic, human, and climatic impacts), local interest, and opportunities for success. In addition, pilot site selection considered their strategic position within the watershed (upper, middle, land lower/coastal areas) with a source-to-sea perspective.</li> <li>• The institutional arrangements for waste management along both sides of Río Motagua was taken into account in the final project design. This was considered as part of the stakeholder analysis: a) during consultations with municipal authorities to identify pilot sites for the implementation of innovative solutions to reduce Río Motagua water and coastal pollution from land-based sources, in particular wastewater management; and b) as part of the project's overall governance and management arrangements whereby experts from the institutions responsible in both countries (MARN in Guatemala and Mi Ambiente + in Honduras) will provide strategic input for guiding the technical aspects of project implementation regarding waste management through their participation as members of the project's Technical Advisory Committees (TACs). The TACs will also operate as the Technical Committee for the High Level Commission that will be created to promote permanent dialogue and coordination regarding the IRBM of the Río Motagua watershed.</li> <li>• Proper consideration and implementation of technology solutions will be accompanied by a thorough process of human resources training and considering the longer-term sustainability of investments proposed. Each of the pilot projects includes training activities according to the specific needs of each project, which include aspects such as: a) biodegestion treatment and use of treated wastewater by local farmers for irrigation purposes; b) restoration and conservation of water recharge areas; c) reduction of contamination produced by organic matter in wastewater through bioremediation treatment and reuse of treated water for agricultural purposes; d) solid waste management to reduce U-POPs (dioxins and furans) emissions and plastic wastes; e) improving the quality of water resources and the health of aquatic ecosystems through the construction and operation of a domestic wastewater treatment plant; f) restoration of critical ecosystems through the sustainable management of coastal marine resources and strengthening of local governance; and g) reducing environmental contamination caused by soil erosion and increasing the capacity of water recharge areas through reforestation. In addition, as part of the sustainability strategy of each pilot project, consideration is given to the long-term sustainability of investments proposed.</li> <li>• During the project design phase, consideration was initially given to the introduction of a bottle</li> </ul>	<p>Section II. Strategy, Section III. Results and Partnerships, and Section VII. Governance and Management Arrangements of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>

	<p>bill/redeemable container initiative; however, the feasibility of this incentive to encourage recycling requires additional consideration to assess existing local technical limitations and the lack of national and local regulations to support initiatives of this kind. The project will use a “reduction, reuse, and recycling” approach in the implementation of simple and targeted practices for managing urban solid waste and plastics recycling programs for households and solid waste management facilities as part of pilot projects. This will include awareness-raising campaigns addressed to schools and the general public about sorting solid wastes at the source and the importance of recycling. As part of the development of technical guidelines for the handling, transport, storage, and disposal of wastes, other incentives to promote the recovery, recycling, and/or treatment of wastes will be explored, including the consideration of the bottle bill/redeemable container initiative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complementarity of project activities with other ongoing pollution reduction efforts in the region was considered. The project will build collaborative efforts with Wetlands International, the Mesoamerican Reef Fund (MARFUND), the Foundation for Ecodevelopment and Conservation (FUNDAECO; a Guatemalan NGO), and the Asociación Sotz'il in Guatemala, all of which will act as project co-financiers for the implementation of local initiatives for the reduction of pollution in the Río Motagua watershed.</li> </ul>	
<p>8. In the section on innovation, the PIF asserts that active involvement of various groups will ensure sustainability and potential for scaling-up. This could not necessarily be the case. The type of involvement of different stakeholders will be critical and the degree of control delegated to these groups will determine the extent of buy-in and ownership of the project.</p>	<p>As mentioned in the response to Comment No. 5, the project conducted a detailed stakeholder analysis and developed a Stakeholder Engagement Plan to ensure active participation and ownership of the project both at the national and local levels. In this sense the project is innovative as the needs and expectations of stakeholders were taken into account, in particular at the local level where municipalities and local communities will be the main players for implementing initiatives to reduce land-based sources of pollution and solid wastes.</p> <p>During project design, consultations with indigenous peoples' regarding their involvement in the implementation of pilot projects (Outcome 3) were carried out through meetings with the Municipal Councils in Guatemala, which represent their interests at the local level. In addition, an Indigenous Peoples Participation Plan will be developed during the first year of the project, which will allow for additional consultations with indigenous peoples in Guatemala regarding their involvement in the project.</p>	<p>Annex K. Stakeholder Engagement Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document</p>
<p>Coordination with other projects: This section is well-written and sets out the opportunities for contributing to and learning from the related projects cited.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	
<p><b>Comments submitted by council members on the GEF XX Work Program: Germany</b></p>		
<p>1. Germany especially supports the STAP suggestion to include groundwater together with surface water issues in the diagnostic</p>	<p>As suggested, groundwater was included with surface water issues in the diagnostic analysis.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: PART I - Project Information,</p>

<p>analysis, because of the concerns about pollution from POPs and other contaminants.</p>		<p>Section B. Project Description Summary</p> <p>Section II. Strategy of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>
<p>2. The institutional arrangements for waste management along both sides of river Motagua should be taken into account more explicitly in the further development of the proposal as a basic precondition for sustainability of project outcomes.</p>	<p>As suggested, the institutional arrangements for waste management along both sides of the Río Motagua were taken into account in the final project design. This was considered as part of the stakeholder analysis: a) during consultations with municipal authorities for the identification of pilot sites for the implementation of innovative solutions to reduce Río Motagua water and coastal pollution from land-based sources, in particular wastewater management; and b) as part of the project's overall governance and management arrangements whereby experts from the institutions responsible in both countries (MARN in Guatemala and Mi Ambiente + in Honduras) will provide strategic input for guiding the technical aspects of project implementation regarding waste management through their participation as members of the project's Technical Advisory Committees (TACs). The TACs will also operate as the Technical Committee for the High Level Commission that will be created to promote permanent dialogue and coordination for Río Motagua management between Guatemala and Honduras.</p>	<p>Section VII. Governance and Management Arrangements and Annex K. Stakeholder Engagement Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>
<p>3. In project component 3 (Innovative pilot initiatives) Germany suggests to assess the possibility of increasing the targets for project outcome 3.4.1 Rehabilitation (conservation and protection, reforestation, natural regeneration, remediation).</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion, it was considered during the final project design. However, after consultation with environmental authorities in Honduras and an assessment of costs versus financial resources available, it was determined that the targets for project outcome 3.4 could not be increased.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: PART I - Project Information, Section B. Project Description Summary</p>

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>12</sup>**

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Component A: Technical review	94,980	83,550	13,430
Component B: Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	21,750	15,750	6,000
Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments	19,250	11,311	8,190
Component D: Validation workshop	14,020	11,769	0
Component E: Completion of project documentation	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>122,380</b>	<b>27,620</b>

<sup>12</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA