



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

GEF ID:	<b>5115</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Kyrgyz Republic</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Promoting Climate Resiliency of Water Supplies in Kyrgyzstan</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>EBRD</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCM-2; CCM-2; CCA-3; CCM-3; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$5,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$28,560,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$33,560,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>October 03, 2012</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Bonizella Biagini</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Craig Davies</b>

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?	The Kyrgyz Republic, is eligible to receive resources.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A letter of endorsement, was submitted and signed by the OFP. However, the amount in the endorsement letter does not match the grant request. Please resubmit an endorsement letter with the correct amount or resubmit the PIF request with the correct amount matching the endorsement letter.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	The comparative advantage of the EBRD for the GEF lies in the Bank's experience and track record in market creation and transformation, and ensuring sustainability through private sector and municipal environmental infrastructure projects at the country	

	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?	The project fits into the agency's program in the country. The proposed project's objectives are consistent with the EBRD's Country Strategy for the Kyrgyz Republic (BDS/KY/07-01), the EBRD's Municipal and Environmental Infrastructure Operations Policy (BDS/04-68) and the Early Transition Countries Initiative. The EBRD has an office is based in Bishkek with a professional staff of seven to implement the programmes in the country.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	The resources are available under the SCCF Adaptation window.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, the project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework in terms of objectives, outcomes and outputs.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, the project's focal area objectives include reducing vulnerability to climate change and climate variability, and increasing the adaptive capacity.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national	The project is consistent with the recipient country's strategies. The	

	<p>assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>noted the need for, more effective and careful management of irrigational systems in order to preserve and reduce water loss; regulation of surface water-flow and creation of water reserves in artificial reservoirs; implementation of modern, more efficient systems and modes of water distribution in order to reduce losses, and incentives for water-users to use available water resources efficiently by implementation of paid water use system.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>The water utilities for the participating cities and city administrations will be actively involved in all project activities. There will be institutional strengthening of water utility and municipalities to support adaptive planning; climate change education and training programme designed and implemented in at least 3 cities. Capacity of the institutions will be developed.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<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>	<p>The baseline projects are sufficiently described. The EBRD began working on water projects in Kyrgyz Republic in 2009, signing the first EBRD Municipal and Environment Infrastructure (MEI) project in the country, the Bishkek Water Project, which is now under implementation. The Swiss Government and the EBRD have provided EUR 11.8 million to improve the water supply in Bishkek. The project has enabled the Bank to make progress with water tariff reforms, meeting accounting standards, and promoting efficiency in the Bishkek water company.</p> <p>The EBRD developed a Water and Wastewater Framework that comprises</p>	

		<p>throughout the country. The Framework streamlines the EBRD approval process for sub-projects in water and wastewater. In May 2011, the Bank signed new water/wastewater projects for Osh and Jalalabad.</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>Yes the activities which will be financed using the SCCF funding are based on additional reasoning. The project will strengthen awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at the local and national level, improve the climate resilient supply of drinking water, reducing pressure on climate-vulnerable water resources, enhance institutional capacity developed and governance of water companies and city authorities strengthened for integrating climate change impacts into water resources management and increase community involvement in water governance and awareness of climate issues in water governance.</p> <p>Specific adaptation intervention activities and options under consideration include: Using deeper, more secure wells; identifying new, alternative climate-resilient sources of drinking water; introducing loss reduction measures; introducing approaches to increase efficiency of water use to reduce climate vulnerability (new water meters. water-saving</p>	

		wastewater recycling; and water user participation programmes.  Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement please use the ongoing technical studies to finalize the specific adaptation options to be implemented.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the additional benefits is sound. The project proposes to apply interventions and adaptation options which will enhance the resilience of the water supplies in cities in Kyrgystan.	
	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?	Yes. The efficiency of water use is a local social issue . The socio-economic benefits delivered by the project include resource savings through reduced drinking water consumption, reduced leakage and water losses, enhanced water supply, and improved access to cleaner and more climate-resilient water sources.  The associated economic benefits of reduced resource use will make participating cities more competitive, and can thus support better the well-being of their populations. This is particularly important for women who are particularly vulnerable to economic and climate risks, and who are often directly impacted by the ease of access to household water for domestic purposes. To further support equity and gender mainstreaming, the water usage committees formed under the project will ensure equitable representation of all population groups. in particular	

	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Local authorities and the Ministry of Finance are key stakeholders for the project. Further information on public participation, including CSOs should be provided at CEO Endorsement	
	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)	Yes, the project takes into account climate risks, environmental and social risks, and institutional risks and provides mitigation measures	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The projects is consistent and properly coordinated with other initiatives in the country. The EBRD is coordinating closely with other actors in the field of water infrastructure rehabilitation in the Kyrgyz Republic. Coordination between agencies in the water sector in the Kyrgyz Republic is conducted through the meetings and sessions of the Development Partners' Coordination Council's (DPCC) Water Supply and Sanitation Subgroup. The post-conflict JEA outlined cooperation with the World Bank, Asian Development Bank and the United Nations, and the proposed project will continue to ensure that needs are addressed while gaps and overlaps are avoided.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>This project will be directly executed by the EBRD. The project team consists of bankers and specialists from the specialist Municipal Environmental Infrastructure (MEI) team and the EBRD's Bishkek Office.</p> <p>Recommended Action. Further information on the implementation and execution arrangements should be provided by CEO Endorsement.</p>	

		will assist with the project implementation.	
	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?	No costs are provided under management cost. Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement please provide additional information how the costs of managing the project will be covered. Please note that the ratio of PM costs covered by the SCCF vs. by the cofinancing should be pro-rata with respect to the ratio of SCCF total grant vs. total cofinancing for the project	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, the funding per objective is appropriate.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The level of cofinancing is adequate. Further information, including confirmation of cofinance should be provided at CEO Endorsement.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes EBRD will bring to the project the following (i) a loan- \$10,688,000, (ii) a grant-12, 573,000, and (iii) in kind contribution \$ 5,299,000	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

	adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The PIF will be recommended for approval upon receipt of a revised endorsement letter with the correct amount for the SCCF grant request.  Yes. JS 10-3-12	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please ensure that additional information related to questions 13, 17,20 and 23 is provided at CEO Endorsement.	
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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	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 Review	1. Are the proposed activities for project	



	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.