



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4795		
Country/Region:	Russian Federation		
Project Title:	ARCTIC Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM) for Major Siberian Arctic Rivers to Achieving Comprehensive Benefits		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3; IW-3; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,743,162
Co-financing:	\$7,890,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,633,162
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ivan Zavadsky	Agency Contact Person:	Ampai Harakunarak

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, RF is eligible under both BD and IW Focal Areas.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	The RF OFP endorsed the project on Sep 02, 2011. The financial amounts in the endorement letter don't match the GEF funds requested in the PIF. The agency is asked to provide an endorsement letter with correct amounts. April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky); The PIF was revised in line with the amounts listed in the LoE. Cleared.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNEP has comparative advantage for this project, mainly based on succesful record in implementing IW and BD projects in Russian Arctic in the past.	

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N.A.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The UNEP office in Moscow has capacity and long standing working relationship with the Russian Government beneficiary agencies and civil society partners in the Russian Federation Arctic Zone.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N.A.	
	• focal area set-aside?	N.A.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Only partly. There is no justification for FA Outcome 3.3 under the IW-3 Objective. Please either provide a justification or drop the 3.3 Outcome. In addition, on page 7 of the PIF the IW 2.1 outcome is mentioned without any link to the IW-2 Objective in the entire document. Please clarify. With regard to listed BD-2 Objective Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2 there is no information so far on the way how the baseline, indicators and targets would be established prior the project endorsement. Plus, the Table A needs to provide at least indicative numbers	

		<p>provide.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): Corrections were made in the revised PIF; from the IW perspective cleared. From BD perspective: table A now provides indicative numerical values concerning FA outputs. However, the revised PIF made reference to establishment of the baseline within the PPG execution but no reference to indicators and targets was made. Since the revised PPG request was not submitted yet, it is not possible to clear this issue as stated above. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 18, 2012 (IZavadsky): The revised submission clarified the issue of developing indicators and targets during the PPG. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>For BD funding yes but for IW an issue with 3.3 outcome requires further clarification or correction.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): The revised PIF fully clarified the comment above, cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>From IW point of view the key national policy and strategy document is the Strategic Action Programme for the Protection of the Russian Arctic Environment adopted by the Maritime Board of the RF in 2009. However, from BD perspective the consistency with the RF NBSAP and NAP to support CBD is very vague; more specific link to targets and goals of those documents is needed.</p>	

		Revised PIF responded to this comment satisfactorily, cleared.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>There is very little information on the final use and follow up of the project results, particularly from the policy and regulation outputs point of view. In this respect, it will be very useful to elaborate on the faith of the previous BD projects results and outcomes implemented in the RFAZ, which are listed in the PIF.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): Despite the added text on SAP Arctic project and other clarifications mainly from the IW and climatic perspective there is still missing information how this project is going to build on the results of the GEF BD projects in RFAZ implemented earlier and listed in the PIF. Please explain.</p> <p>April 18, 2012 (IZavadsky): The revised PIF provided requested information on how this project would build on results of previous GEF project implemented in the RFAZ, including the BD ones. Cleared.</p>	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>Despite some information of the baseline situation a clearly understandable information on the baseline project(s) is entirely missing. This lack of this essential information limits further review and assessment of other features and characteristics of the proposed project.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): Additional information on the baseline and major threats to the RFAZ.</p>	

		<p>have been provided. But more specific information on the baseline project(s) to address the problems, which this project is going to address as an increment to them is still missing. Please provide sufficient information on baseline projects as requested above.</p> <p>April 18, 2012 (IZavadsky): Information on baseline projects and on incremental reasoning was provided in the revised PIF. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>In line with comment in the box #11 above the incremental reasoning is rather vague; there is significant lack of description of global environmental benefits to be delivered by the project, specifically the BD GEB are missing.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): From the IW perspective additional information provided were sufficient, cleared. From the BD perspective the description of the GEB, with respect to BD outcome 2.2, is still not sufficient. Whereas the description of the project baseline has been expanded and threats to the globally significant spots have been listed, in order to justify the project GEB, an information how this project would reduce those threats is not sufficient. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 18, 2012 (IZavadsky):</p>	

		revised PIF. Cleared.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>No. With the lack of clarity on the baseline project(s) the project framework is not very clear. In addition, it would be good if the project title will start with wording on Arctic programme.</p> <p>BD: The project proposal does not provide information how the baseline, indicators and targets for project interventions at national, regional and pilot sites levels will be determined, neither the PPG request does so. More information how this project will build upon the outcomes of previous GEF BD investments in RFAZ is needed.</p> <p>Sustainability of project interventions is unclear. More information on and description of BD related challenges in the river basins and estuaries under the project intervention is needed, too. For example, the proposed project outputs in the Component 1 does not support the listed outcomes in that project component. Please address.</p> <p>IW: In addition to the general comment of lack of details and clarity on the baseline project(s), the component 3 lacks a ny relation to the GEF IW TDA/SAP approach, the outputs and outcomes should reflect this. The PIF stated that the degradation of the permafrost area si associated with the change in hydrology in river basins and introduction of improved RBM would lead to mitigation of the GHG emissions. This critical but general</p>	

		<p>project design. No adaptation activities. outputs are eligible under the GEF Trust Fund funding, please address accordingly in the project design and expected outputs. The Component 1 requests all GEF funds from BD whereas most of the activities/outputs seem IW oriented, please clarify.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): The project framework in table B was revised and now better reflects the BD and IW GEF 5 FA Objectives listed in table A. However, two issues remained to be resolved: (i) the output 1.3.3 should not be part of a technical Component 1 but rather fits in the M&E part of the project, please delete from the Table B; (ii) Component 2 proposed to draw GEF resources under the BD 2 Objective but none of the outputs refer to BD. Please correct. The rest of the comments not addressed in the revised PIF remain, as reiterated in boxes ##7 and 11.</p> <p>April 18, 2012 (IZavadsky): All clarifications and corrections requested above were made. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>No, please see comments above.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): Revised PIF clarified this issue to a large extent. Once comment above addressed, this comment would be cleared.</p> <p>April 18, 2012 (IZavadsky): Requested clarifications were provided, cleared.</p>	

	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>In principle yes but rather general description of the project activities and outputs in this regard would require more specific expression in terms of project outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): Revisions made in the resubmitted PIF, cleared.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Please see comment above, the role of indigenous people is emphasised in the PIF, however more specificity of project activities in this direction, based on appropriate consultation, is needed.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): Additional information provided, cleared.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>The risks table addressed the known potential risks of this project according to lelel of details provided. The agency is reminded to re-visit this issue once more specific project framework would be developed.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): PIF revised, cleared.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>The PIF listed comprehensive list of projects in its intervention area, however more specific information how coordination and use of results of those project would be used is missing. Please address.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): The coordination with/utilisation of the results of BD projects in RF is still missing, as requested in the box above.</p> <p>April 18. 2012 (IZavadskv):</p>	

		and coordination with previous/existing GEF BD projects were provided, cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	No relevant information is available, please provide. April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): Additional information provided, more elaborated implementatrion/exacution framewrk is supposed to be developed within the PPG period. Cleared.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, less than 5% of the GEF grant is proportional to the overall co-financing ratio.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Without addressing the comments above it is not possible at this stage. April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The proposed co-financing is in line with co-financing indicated in the GEF Council approved PFD.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for		

	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet, the agency is kindly asked to address the comments above.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 (IZavadsky): The agency is asked to address remaining issues in the boxes above.</p> <p>April 18, 2012 (IZavadsky): The agency clarified all remaining issues from earlier reviews. The PM now recommends the PIF clearance into next WP.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	This is not possible to assess without more clarity and additional information requested in the PIF review.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	This is not possible to assess without more clarity and additional information requested in the PIF review.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not yet, this or potentially revised PPG request - according to revisions in the PIF - will be reviewed once the agency submits the revised PIF.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.