



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

GEF ID:	5748		
Country/Region:	Regional (Bolivia, Peru)		
Project Title:	Integrated Water Resources Management in the Titicaca-Desaguadero-Poopo-Salar de Coipasa (TDPS) System		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4383 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$6,563,750
Co-financing:	\$33,460,000	Total Project Cost:	\$40,173,750
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	13th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, both Bolivia and Peru are eligible countries.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	13th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	13th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes the funds are available under the IW focal area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>13th of March 2014 (IW): Yes, the proposed project and its results framework is aligned with the GEF 5 IW strategic Objective 3, but should be expanded.</p> <p>Please address and resubmit.</p> <p>From current description, it also appears to aim at early SAP implementation. If that is correct - please clarify - then both IW 3 and and I are to be selected.</p> <p>26th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>13th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project and its activities support the National priorities of both countries.</p>	
	<p>6. 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>13th of March 2014 (IW): The Baseline seems to be substantially supported by UNDP activities. There is mentioning of national activities from both countries, however, please strengthen the baseline with national activities towards transboundary actions on their shared waters.</p> <p>Please clarify how increment is not duplicating some of the related activities.</p>	<p>26th of March 2014 (cseverin): Please make sure to address during the PPG phase the issue on exploring the possibilities of formulating a transboundary agreement on sustainable fishing between the two countries.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>What is state of fisheries sector in Lake Titicaca and how is impacted by decreasing future inflows and pollution threats? Is there an agreement assuring sustainable management of fishing among the two countries?</p> <p>26th of march 2014 (Cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>13th of March 2014 (IW): Component 1, is the largest of the proposed components with planned spending of 55% of the entire proposed project grant. This may be the correct amount ot address updating the Binational master plan and formulating a SAP, however, all the included outputs, does only seem to addressing processes. Sure these process indicators are important to have addressed in a binational project, however, with a proposed spending of \$3.3 mio, it is assumed that the component would also include demonstrations/pilots to demonstrate a number of possible technologies that could inform the "TDA/SAP" process. However the framework for component 1, have a total lack on indicators towards these. Please include.</p> <p>An output indicator like 1.3.2 is not formulated like an output indicator, but more like mentioning a set of tools needed to facilitate the process of collaboration across the basin.</p> <p>Output 1.3.3 is going to be hard to measure when reached, as formulated it</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>seems more like a standard part of formulating and agreeing on the regional SAP. Maybe consider to remove or reformulate.</p> <p>It is realised that component 2 is to primarily focus on funding pilots, however, looking at the budgetlines for component 1 and 2, it seems that there may be room to include some demonstrations in component 1. Please do for Component 2, include some of generic indicators to indicate what the interventions will be focusing on (nutrient reduction N or P in kg/year, cubic meters of water saved/year, BOD in kg/year etc.)</p> <p>Please note that GEF 5 IW strategy does not support solid waste management. Please remove this activity, or make sure that it is fully funded by the associated national co-financing.</p> <p>Gender is not mentioned in the Results framework, nor in the stakeholder analysis. Please make sure to include activities to support gender focused groups, as well as CSO activities.</p> <p>The project offers scope for private sector engagement. maybe this is already covered under the suggested activities under Component 1. If so please add a specific indicator to this effect, and make sure to reach out to private sector stakeholders during the PPG phase to get their thinking and needs reflected in the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project document.</p> <p>Please clarify what measures are foreseen to strengthen institutional capacity of ALT.</p> <p>Please clarify and delineate the suggested finance is not duplicating (i) efforts in the TDPS-OEA environmental management project and other activities in baseline; and (ii) not duplicating various finance on climate resilience (e.g. GEF, Climate Investment Fund, World Bank, IDB and/or other) with regards to water balance, information, and adaptation/climate resilience. Given quite substantial existing knowledge and experience, the current project description is very process oriented and does not give clear enough indication of the intended outcomes or anticipated impacts of pilot measures or criteria of their selection.</p> <p>What is the role of groundwater in Lake management. Why is it not considered in project design?</p> <p>26th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed, however, please make sure during PPG to coordinate properly to avoid duplicating efforts in the region financed by other donors.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>13th of March 2014 (IW): Yes the GEBs have been identified. Further, the incremental reasoning for GEF to invest in the transboundary management of the shared resource has also been provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>However, there have been a number of previous efforts among the two countries as well as on regional scale. Please expand the reasoning for limited impacts on the ground and the factor of success that would set the proposed project apart from other efforts ?</p> <p>26th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	
	<p>9. 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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>13th of March 2014 (cseverin): No, please expand on this in the PIF, as it presently only includes a matrix with some very broad categories of stakeholders.</p> <p>Gender is not mentioned in the Results framework, nor in the stakeholder analysis. Please make sure to include activities to support gender focused groups, as well as CSO activities.</p> <p>Please comment on means to involve the Uru and other vulnerable groups in the project.</p> <p>26th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>13th of March 2014 (IW): Yes, the proposal includes a matrix outlining identified risks and associated mitigation measures. However, climate change is not included as a potential risk. Please include, as the changing climate clearly will impact the basin, the planned activities and their delivery.</p> <p>26th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>13th of March 2014 (IW): Thanks for listing GEF funded projects in the region. However, please explore more fully other projects in the region, with other donors, to complement the few GEF funded initiatives in the region.</p> <p>26th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>13th of March 2014 (cseverin): The two participating countries have been addressing a number of the transboundary issues in the basin, but primarily from a national angle. It will be highly innovative of the countries to embark on this binational collaboration, through not only updating the 1991 Binational Master Plan, but also working towards an agreed Strategic Action Programme to address the main identified stressors in the transboundary system. Having these regional political action frameworks agreed upon at ministerial level is essential towards long term sustainability and for national and regional scaling up of piloted activities.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	13th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes the mentioned levels of GEF and co-financing seems adequate to be able to address the issues identified.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	13th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the amounts and composition seems ok, however, please expore during project preparation how to attract Private sector partners, that would be interested in participating int he project. Considering the stressors identified in teh project document, one should think that the project provides a good opportunity for engagement with the private sector. Further, please at time of PIF revision elaborate on the high levels of grant co-financing mentioned in table C. Will these cash contributions be managed by the PMU or how is this to be understood. Finally, there also seems to be scope for attracting other donor funds than what the GEF and UNDP will be bringing to this project. Please explore during PPG phase.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		26th of March 2014 (cseverin): Addressed	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	13th of March 2014 (cseverin):Yes	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	13th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes and in line with provided guidelines.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	13th of March 2014 (cseverin):NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	13th of March 2014 (cseverin): No, please address above comments and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		<p>resubmit</p> <p>26th of March 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Approval.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>The PIF was not entirely clear, yet we understand that the Global Binational Master Plan (GPMP) containing 'vision, mission, objectives and main lines of action" as well as project profiles IS the equivalent of the SAP. This makes sense and it would not make sense to duplicate such effort. Please confirm before CEO endorsement. Further, if the GPMP is the SAP equivalent, then we would also need to have this endorsed at Ministerial level.</p> <p>Please assure that the updated GPMP assures and builds on inter-sectoral cooperation on national and regional level to address nexus of water-food-environment (and energy) discussed in the PIF. Also, please assure that climate resilience is addressed given the vulnerability of the ecosystem to anticipated decreases in water flows.</p> <p>TDA - we note that the "Environmental Outlook for For the TDPS-GEO Titicaca is relatively recent as well as some other key relevant national and regional environmental analysis and planning document mentioned in the PIF. Please assure that the TDA makes full use of these and essentially expands and builds on existing work/updates existing information/efforts. Again, lets please</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>avoid duplication. It is not important to use the GEF terminology of TDA-SAP in each circumstance if quasi equivalents exist that can be updated and/or expanded (see eg. PIF para 27 and 39).</p> <p>It is appreciated that the PPG will commence with a mapping of ongoing relevant activities and partners to assure coordination (incl. those funded by bilaterals and MFIs). . Please attach a summary to the prodoc.</p> <p>Please outline in that how and by who and how sustainable fisheries management is addressed in Lake Titicaca. The PIF is not entirely clear on this and it is an important aspect.</p> <p>We note the mention of FPIC in project design. Yet, beyond due diligence : please explore opportunities for benefitting indigenous communities through at least one of the pilot measures.</p> <p>Women - the PIF addresses at this stage women and their participation well. As artisanal mining is an issues in the region, please in project design pay attention to gender and age distribution of miners. Is mercury an issue (and hence may be among one of pilot measures building on previous successful GEF finance in other regions)?</p> <p>While the private sector is mentioned in the PIF as stakeholder and target group (e.g. mining operations), the private</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		sector is absent in the stakeholder table (A.2) Co-finance - please assure that the indicative/ approximate level of grant (vs. in-kind) co-finance remains realistic and can be shown at CEO endorsement.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 17, 2014	
Review Date (s)	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.