



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND:SCCF

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Promoting Climate Resiliency of Water Supplies in Kyrgyzstan			
Country(ies):	Kyrgyz Republic	GEF Project ID: ¹	5115
GEF Agency(ies):	EBRD (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Other Executing Partner(s):		Submission Date:	
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	500,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCA-1 (select)	Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks	SCCF	500,000	862,000
CCA-1 (select)	Reduce vulnerability to climate change in development sectors	Vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	SCCF	500,000	862,000
CCA-2 (select)	Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced threats at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated	SCCF	150,000	1,233,000
CCA-2 (select)	Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced threats at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Systems in place to disseminate timely risk information	SCCF	500,000	863,000
CCA-2 (select)	Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level	Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities	SCCF	262,500	439,000
CCA-3 (select)	Successful demonstration, deployment and transfer of	Relevant adaptation technology transferred to	SCCF	3,000,000	30,815,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

	relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas	targeted groups			
CCA-3 (select)	Enhanced enabling environment to support adaptation-related technology transfer	Relevant policies and frameworks developed and adopted to facilitate adaptation technology transfer	SCCF	87,500	146000
(select) (select)			(select)		0
Total project costs				5,000,000	35,220,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To improve the climate resiliency of water supply in cities in the Kyrgyz Republic by fully mainstreaming climate change considerations into water infrastructure rehabilitation.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Integrating climate change assessments into the design and appraisal of water infrastructure	TA	Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks	Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted; Detailed water resources system studies carried out at the national level; Design and appraisal methodology developed and disseminated.	SCCF	150,000	1,215,000
2. Building in additional climate-resiliency features in water infrastructure rehabilitation projects	Inv	Decreased water demand and improved climate resilient supply of drinking water, reducing pressure on climate-vulnerable water resources	Approaches to increase efficiency of water use and reduce climate vulnerability (water metering, wastewater recycling and ensuring the climate resilience of new water sources) developed and implemented in 2 cities; Drinking water supply infrastructure rehabilitated in 2 cities; Drinking water supply infrastructure rehabilitated in 2 cities	SCCF	3,000,000	30,360,000
3. Increasing capacity for water governance	TA	Institutional capacity developed and governance of water companies and city authorities strengthened for integrating climate change impacts into water resources management	Institutional strengthening of water utility and municipalities to support adaptive planning; climate change education and training programme designed and implemented; Climate monitoring and early warning systems	SCCF	1,500,000	2,548,000

			developed and launched; Information network operational for participating cities			
4. Increasing community involvement in water governance and raising knowledge and awareness of climate change implications among water users	TA	Increased community involvement in water governance and awareness of climate issues in water governance	Lessons learned collection and dissemination to cities in Kyrgyzstan and other EBRD countries; Water User Committees established	SCCF	350,000	577,000
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal					5,000,000	34,700,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				(select)	0	520,000
Total project costs					5,000,000	35,220,000

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	EBRD	Hard Loan	15,650,000
GEF Agency	EBRD (grant)	Cash	220,000
GEF Agency	EBRD (in-kind)	In-kind	520,000
GEF Agency	EBRD (SECO grant)	Cash	12,300,000
GEF Agency	EBRD (EU IFCA grant)	Cash	2,410,000
GEF Agency	EBRD (TC donors grant)	Cash	4,120,000
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			35,220,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				0	0	0

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	847,500	3,532,667	4,380,167
National/Local Consultants	699,000	1,766,333	2,465,333

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

No changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

No changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF.

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

No changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

No major changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF. Additional information has been collected on the baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address in the cities included in Component 2 of the project.

This has included significantly more information regarding the potential vulnerability of water resources to climate change. This additional information is in Section 1.4 and Section 1.5 of the EBRD Project Document.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

The RCE is closely aligned with the project design of the original PIF. At the RCE stage, the project activities have been refined and interventions within particular cities/areas have been more fully elaborated based upon a thorough assessment of likely climate change vulnerabilities in the cities to be involved in the project. These changes are summarized in Annex E and the detailed design is given in the attached EBRD Project Document.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

No changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

No changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Please refer to the EBRD Project Document 'Key stakeholders' in Section 3.4.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Please refer to the EBRD Project Document 'Socioeconomic benefits and gender dimensions' in Section 3.3.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Please refer to the EBRD Project Document 'Cost-effectiveness' in Section 3.5.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan used by the project supports planning and adaptive management requirements of the project, meets the requirements of both the EBRD and the GEF/SCCF, and facilitates reporting of progress and impacts to the GEF Secretariat and the EBRD. The EBRD uses a Results Based Management approach, based on the Project's Results Framework (Annex A).

The project's performance indicators, defined in the Results Framework, will be monitored at regular intervals throughout the project implementation period.

Mid-term review and final evaluation

Project mid-term review and final evaluation will be carried out by an independent party at the appropriate time and have two basic objectives:

- a) To assess the results and impacts, both intended and otherwise, of the project (accountability function); and,
- b) To determine whether there are lessons to be learned from past experience to make future operations better, thereby contributing to "institutional memory" (lessons learned or quality management orientation).

The mid-term review will be used to identify areas where improvements could be made and to improve the effectiveness of results and impacts. Gender issues and gender equality will be considered on an ongoing basis (according to targets sets out in Annex A), as well as systematically at the time of the mid-term review and terminal evaluation.

The project review and evaluation will provide the basis for a system of accountability for operational outcomes to managers, and ultimately to the Board of Directors of the Bank and the GEF.

Monitoring and evaluation budget

M&E will be financed from agency fees, with 135,000 budgeted for costs associated with:

- Establishment of project monitoring baselines relative to SCCF investments;
- Monitoring of physical implementation of SCCF activities;
- Timely tracking and reporting of adaptation impacts using the GE Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT); and
- Synthesis and communication of lessons from the project to enhancing future climate adaptation activities of IFIs.

The M&E framework will assess the Project's impact on the improvement of the climate resilience of drinking water supplies in cities in Kyrgyzstan. The foundation of the framework is given in the logical framework (see Annex A) which includes indicators, targets, and timelines.

Monitoring and verification of the results is the key to determining the success of the programme. The participating companies in the project and the cities involved need to agree to provide the required information as part of relevant grant agreements that will be signed prior to the start of the capacity building programmes.

Most of the baseline information is available in the feasibility studies, which are carried out during project preparation. The participating companies/cities will provide all updated information on water consumption and other indicators.

The external monitoring and evaluation will take place with summarised reports showing the overall progress and projects that receive financing and can be used officially.

The project consultants will be responsible for regular progress reports with full support of and in agreement with the participating companies and cities.

Finally, as a part of the baseline projects, the EBRD will carry out its own due diligence and M&E activities, including:

- Establishment of project monitoring baselines;
- Monitoring of the physical implementation as well as the institutional reform and development during the course of the project.

The indicative monitoring and evaluation plan is given in Annex F.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Marta Simonetti-Whitford, EBRD			Craig Davies	+44 20 7338 6661	DaviesC@ebrd.com

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).

See EBRD Project Document, Annex 1. Project Results Framework.

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).

GEF Secretariat Review

	Comment	Response
1	By CEO Endorsement please use the ongoing technical studies to finalize the specific adaptation options to be implemented.	The specific adaptation options to be implemented have been finalized and described in detail. See Section 2 of the Project Document for the details.
2	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	The stakeholders identified for the project are described in Section 3.4 of the Project Document. The main vehicle for public participation in the project will be the Water User Committees that will be set up in Activity 4.1.
3	Further information on the implementation and execution arrangements should be provided by CEO Endorsement. Information on the local agencies who will assist with the project implementation.	The implementation and execution arrangements have been fully elaborated and are described in Section 4 of the Project Document.
4	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	All project management costs for this project will be covered by EBRD cofinancing.
5	The level of cofinancing is adequate. Further information, including confirmation of cofinance should be provided at CEO Endorsement.	Included in the submission is a letter confirming cofinance from EBRD.

STAP Scientific and Technical screening

Comment	Response
STAP believes that the project could be strengthened by more fully describing the additional burden likely to be imposed by future climate change, and, thus, the changes in the baseline required to address that burden.	The additional burden to be imposed by climate change has been fully elaborated within Section 1.4 and 1.5 of the Project Document. The main burden will be due to potential lack of water (especially during certain times of the year) because of lack of glacial sources of water as well as potential extreme events which will undermine the security of the water systems.
1. Under the project framework, STAP notes that an output for component 1 are risk and vulnerability studies. Although this is a necessary first step, STAP believes	Support of institutional changes has further elaborated in Component 3, Activity 3.1. These institutional changes include training related to climate change adaptation

<p>that it may not adequately ensure that climate change assessments will be incorporated in the design and operation of water infrastructure. Therefore, STAP recommends considering institutional and regulatory changes that will allow for continued consideration of climate change risks as a part of this component.</p>	<p>technologies and the incorporation of climate change considerations in future planning amongst municipal water companies and authorities.</p> <p>Additional activities in Component 1 will also address knowledge gaps related to water resource planning, as well as the design of an appraisal methodology for carrying out risk and vulnerability assessments.</p>
<p>2. STAP would value a better distinction being drawn between rehabilitation and making new infrastructure climate resilient (Refer to component #2 in the project framework).</p>	<p>Section 2.3 of the Project Document differentiates explicitly the investments which would be geared towards general rehabilitation and making the infrastructure more climate resilient.</p> <p>The climate resilient investments will be focused on water saving technologies and upgrading wastewater systems to be more resilient to extreme events.</p>
<p>3. STAP supports a well-defined results-based management framework similar to the LDCF/SCCF Secretariat. Therefore, it encourages the EBRD to define scientifically its baseline during the proposal development by including the following aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) references (scientific or anecdotal) that support the baseline narrative; 2) baseline data and/or specify a timeline when the data will be collected; and 3) include indicators to measure and monitor each adaptation benefit. <p>Essentially, there is little discussion of specific indicators that could be used to monitor project outputs and outcomes. Certainly, with regard to water resource (and waste-water) systems, physically-based, measurable indicators of system performance are feasible.</p>	<p>A fully developed results-based framework has been developed and is included in Annex 1 as well as in the description of all project outcomes and outputs within the project document.</p> <p>The Outcome indicators and Output indicators are consistent with those of the LDCF/SCCF framework, with a few additional indicators which the EBRD will track during implementation.</p> <p>Additionally, the justifications for the baselines versus targets have been fully elaborated within the project document and then included within the framework. This has included physically-based, measurable indicators of system performance for water and waste-water resources.</p>
<p>4. STAP recommends for the context of the problem statement to be described more explicitly. For example, the proposal indicates that "a reduction in flow of between 43.6 to 88.4 per cent" will occur. However, it would be useful to know more details about this projection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) is the reduction for a particular basin? 2) which year is being considered? 	<p>This is elaborated fully within the full project document under Sections 1.4 and 1.5.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reductions are for the Chu and Talas river basins. 2. The year being considered is up to 2025 for analyzing water consumption. The year being considered for impacts includes impacts from climate extremes which can occur now and guarding against future water shortages which will occur in the coming decades. 3. The expected changes in precipitation are not fully

<p>3) what is the expected change in precipitation?</p> <p>4) what is relative contribution of glacial melt versus rainfall to the overall water availability?</p>	<p>known, but changes in precipitation are not the main source of risk. The areas are already semi-desert. Without glacial melt, there may be shortages in water availability.</p> <p>4. This is not fully known, but it is understood that glacial and snow-pack melt are major sources. This lack of certainty is one of the reasons for the project – Component 1 and Component 3 contain activities which will allow for better monitoring and prediction of the impacts of glacial melt and rainfall on water availability.</p>
<p>6. Similarly, the relationship (and dependencies) between water supply and waste water may be brought out more fully in the project overview. Furthermore, STAP recommends considering the climate sensitivity of water supply – that is, what is the climate sensitivity of waste water systems?</p>	<p>A description of the relationship between water supply and waste water is now included in Section 1.5.1 of the Project Document. The water supply is sensitive to climate in that a lack of glacial water availability and snowpack melt may undermine the water supply. Seasonal drought can also negatively impact supply in areas where shallow groundwater sources are used.</p> <p>The waste water systems are vulnerable to extreme climate events (especially flooding).</p>
<p>7. Under the additional cost reasoning, STAP wishes for EBRD to consider to what extent are the baseline activities likely to lead to an enhancement of the coping range with regard to climate variability? Are the activities for climate change resiliency being proposed different from those being undertaken under the baseline for water infrastructure rehabilitation?</p>	<p>This is elaborated more clearly in Section 2 of the Project Document.</p> <p>There are basically no baseline activities for technical assistance to the water utility sector related to climate change. Thus, all technical assistance in addressing climate vulnerability through increased knowledge and better management practices are additional.</p> <p>For the investments, Section 2.3 of the Project Document outlines the relative impact in terms of climate resiliency in baseline water infrastructure rehabilitation versus the situation with SCCF involvement.</p>
<p>8. For component #1, STAP believes that water resource rehabilitation needs to take into account the availability and variability of the resource - even in the baseline. Therefore, STAP recommends for the adaptation alternative to specify clearly how climate change considerations could change the baseline planning, evaluation methodology, and the process. In this regard, STAP recommends describing further the following aspects:</p> <p>1) What resolution climate projections are required?</p> <p>2) Are they available for the cities / regions?</p>	<p>These issues are addressed within Section 1.4 and 1.5 of the Project Document.</p> <p>Responses to each of the issues are described below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to the rough topography of the country, high resolution climate projections are required to include the associated mesoscale weather systems. 2. These are not available for these cities/ regions. Available projections that were used in the SNC are those produced by global climate models, whose resolution is typically too low for the kind of detailed projections needed here. More detailed modeling of projected changes in glaciation is available and was reviewed.

<p>3) What is the local capacity for regional climate modelling, and hydro-climatological scenario generation?</p> <p>4) Why (and how) will climate change affect water resource demand, particularly since the project is focusing on urban drinking water (rather than agricultural use)?</p> <p>5) How would socio-economic factors likely affect water resource demand?</p>	<p>3. Since the object of this project is mainstreaming climate change considerations into water infrastructure rehabilitation, we have focused on using the available information for a best estimate of availability and variability of water resources. A research project to improve national climate modeling would undoubtedly be useful, but is not within the scope of this project. Instead, this project (under Component 3) focuses on building capacity for monitoring water resources at the basin level – which would include examining climate sensitivity and possible impacts of climate change.</p> <p>4. For municipal water use, climate change may have some impact on demand, but we compared the expected norm of demand in each of the cities within the project with those of warmer climates. The differences in demand are expected to be insignificant in comparison to the amount of waste currently in each city and in comparison to increased demand due to population growth/more connections. Thus, to address risks of water availability, efficiency measures are considered far more important.</p> <p>5. The most important socio-economic factor is actually likely to be population growth and increased number of connections – which will drive up consumption much more than a general increase in well-being of already connected households.</p>
<p>9. STAP wishes to share a paper on the Aral Sea Basin water-energy-food-nexus that confirms the baseline description regarding the poor Water Resources Management (WRM) capacity and the threats of climate change that will reduce the mass balance in glaciers in the medium term, producing more runoff (Granit, J. et al. "Regional Options for Addressing the Water, Energy and Food Nexus in Central Asia and the Aral Sea Basin", International Journal of Water Resources and Development, 28:3, 419-432, June, 2012.). (For a copy of the paper, please contact the STAP Secretariat. Jakob Granit is the STAP member for international waters.) The paper also outlines the political economy of cooperation related to increased hydropower development in the upstream countries (Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan) which will change the hydrology and the cooperative regime in the basin (less water stored for summer irrigation downstream and more HEP generation in the winter months).</p> <p>STAP recommends that EBRD specifically address transboundary issues – for example, how are</p>	<p>See section 1.4.2 for the baseline description including this information. Consultation with neighboring countries has been more fully elaborated in the stakeholder engagement plan, and Activity 1.2 now includes an element collecting lessons learned from neighboring countries.</p>

neighbouring countries tackling similar challenges?	
<p>10. Furthermore, STAP recommends defining clearly in component #1 which stakeholders will be involved (as participants or merely to be informed?) and what criteria will be used to define their competencies in this part of the design brief. Further, STAP recommends that the proposed studies support the three activities –</p> <p>(i) risk and vulnerability assessment;</p> <p>(ii) water resources studies; and</p> <p>(iii) design and appraisal methodologies, are much more clearly defined within the full project brief prior to approval.</p> <p>Points (ii) and (iii) in particular should be undertaken in other project frameworks as well.</p>	<p>The three activities of Component 1 are now more clearly defined in the Project Design section (Section 2) of the Project Document including what stakeholders will be involved, trained and informed.</p> <p>Note: The three activities mentioned in this STAP comment are already included in the project plan (and results framework).</p>
<p>11. Similarly, component #2 appears to include a number of adaptation alternative activities that also will be required in the baseline. For example, increasing efficiency of water use and rehabilitation of drinking water infrastructure could already be part of the baseline activity. The proposal suggests "new, alternative climate-resilient sources of drinking water" as the main adaptation intervention. It is not clear what this means – unless, these are desalination options. In this regard, STAP recommends defining explicitly the climate-resilient water sources the proposal will develop. Furthermore, would it be valuable to define what the risks are to these new water sources due to climate change?</p>	<p>The main adaptation intervention is actually related to better monitoring and planning of water resources, improving efficiency of the water distribution network, increasing end-user efficiency, increasing the climate-resiliency of municipal water system infrastructure. Exploring new alternative climate-resilient sources of drinking water is one of these measures.</p> <p>New, alternative climate-resilient sources of drinking water will not include desalination but rather drilling of new boreholes, for example.</p>
<p>12. Under component #3, bullet #2 is unclear - that is, how are laboratory facilities a part of the adaptation alternative? If these are for water quality testing, then this is required as a part of the baseline itself. Furthermore, how will strengthening of transparency and governance lead to enhanced capacity to manage climate impacts?</p>	<p>The establishment of laboratory facilities has been removed in the finalized list of measures the project will support, since it was judged that these are indeed part of the baseline, not of the adaptation alternative.</p>
<p>13. Component #3 also appears to lack a policy dimension regarding the enforcement of science-based monitoring, the assumed role of calibrated models to predict flows and storage options, and actions based on a pre-approved strategy and action plan with clear responsibilities for chain of command. It would be useful</p>	<p>The project does not include an explicit policy dimension, but rather approaches this issue through raising capacity and awareness of decision-makers in municipalities. This particularly relates to those municipal workers involved with the municipal water utilities.</p>

to address these further in the full proposal.	
14. For Component 4: STAP recommends defining what are the incentives proposed for communities to participate in the proposed Water User Committees?	No financial incentives are proposed for Water User Committees. The incentives are that they will receive better water service from the municipality if the community is involved. In preliminary discussions, users have expressed interest in being involved in the committees without any additional incentives.
15. STAP notes the EBRD will coordinate its initiative with those of the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. It also may be useful to share learning that can benefit the implementation of all four components – particularly, in the design of methodologies for designing and appraising water infrastructure projects that are climate resilient. For example, the World Bank Report "Sustaining water for all in a changing climate (2010), places water resources and management at the core of climate change resilience. It also draws from case studies in Central Asia, including the Kyrgyz Republic.	As described in Section 3.4 of the Project Document, the EBRD will involve the World Bank and Asian Development Bank in stakeholder consultations and keep them fully updated on the design of the methodologies for designing and appraising water infrastructure projects that are climate resilient.
16. STAP recommends including a gender expert in the project team to develop further and more explicitly targeted interventions addressing the gender dimensions of climate resilience in urban water supply in the Kyrgyz Republic. Alternatively, there are a number of studies and robust guidelines the EBRD may be able to reference to develop gender-disaggregated targeted interventions. To complement these studies and guidelines, STAP suggests referring to the following study on how adaptation is taking place, inferring that women (among other vulnerable populations) are frequently under-reported (Refer to Berrang-Ford, L. et al. 2012 "Are we adapting to climate change", Global Environmental Change, Volume 21, Issue 1, February 2011, pg. 25-33).	<p>EBRD has provided support to the City of Bishkek for two gender pilot projects in the water and transport sectors. To build on the lessons learned from these pilot projects, the EBRD is offering a package of gender advisory services to the city.</p> <p>EBRD has a Gender Action Plan and has been developing a number of gender products and services, including guidance materials, to assist its clients with addressing gender consideration at all project stages. Lessons learned are being prepared based on pilot projects in relevant areas.</p> <p>Draft reports for the gender and equal opportunities municipal advisory services for Bishkek are already available and were used to address gender dimensions in Section 3.5 of the Project Document.</p>

**LDCF/SCCF Work Program: Comments from Council Members
(REFERENCE GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/03)**

Comment	Response
<i>Germany's Comments</i>	
It shall be considered that around 70% of Kyrgyzstan's water resources go into agriculture, the rest being private	A reliable supply of potable water is of crucial importance to the health and wellbeing of urban populations. Climate

<p>and industrial water consumption. Although wasting water resources is enormous in urban areas, the biggest problem resides outside urban areas. This should be reflected in the project design.</p>	<p>resilience of municipal water supplies is an essential element in a comprehensive program of adaptation to climate change for any country. In particular, ensuring that climate change adaptation is mainstreamed in development projects such as EBRD is currently undertaking in the municipal water sector in Kyrgyzstan is one of the explicit aims of the SCCF.</p> <p>This project is therefore focused on municipal water systems. World Bank and Asian Development Bank have activities related to agricultural uses of water. All activities are coordinated with one another.</p> <p>Addressing municipal water issues is also considered important in dealing with climate change – as described in Kyrgyzstan’s Second National Communication to the UNFCCC.</p>
<p>In addition, the PIF says “A decrease in the water level of Issyk-kul, the largest lake in Kyrgyzstan, which is important to the country’s economy and ecosystems, is already being observed”. There are other studies that observe a rising water level of Issyk-kul lake at present, because of an increased glacier melting. A closer look into the change of water levels or level pattern over the year seems to be necessary as well as considerations regarding appropriate adaptation measures that can handle increasing and decreasing water levels.</p>	<p>Since lake Issyk-kul is a salt water lake, it is not used as a water source. Since this project deals specifically with urban water supplies, adaptation measures to handle changing levels of this lake cannot be part of this project. Mention of the lake in the PIF was only to illustrate observed effects of climate change on the water cycle in Kyrgyzstan.</p>
<p>Community involvement in water management in urban areas is challenging if there are no precedents in this area in Kyrgystan. Therefore, Germany recommends consulting community water management projects in other countries and considering community management experiences from other sectors in Kyrgystan.</p>	<p>The EBRD has already engaged in community involvement in its projects in Kyrgyzstan, including project in other sectors such as solid waste. It is also currently undertaking an SCCF-funded project related to municipal and community water management in Tajikistan and has carried out other projects related to community water management – not necessarily incorporating climate risks, in many other countries since the mid-1990’s. Information and lessons learned have been incorporated into project design.</p>
<p><i>USA’s Comments</i></p>	
<p>Provide clarification on how the project will ensure that the production of information is driven by the needs of the users, such as water companies, water infrastructure designers, wastewater treatment centers, municipal governments, public health officials, and local communities. We also request clarification on how the</p>	<p>The information to be generated by this project is based primarily on the needs of the users – in particular the water companies as developed in consultations and development of the loan and technical assistance packages. Additionally, it is expected that the information will be useful for other stakeholders such as local community members, municipal</p>

<p>project will deliver this information through appropriate user-friendly channels.</p>	<p>leaders, etc.</p> <p>In activities focused on the production of information, such as those in Component 1, care will be taken that they focus on those locations for which they can be of most use and stakeholder and public participation programmes are planned.</p> <p>The channels for delivering this information are described in Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of the Project Document. This will include workshops, one-on-one technical assistance, literature distribution, internet-based resource distribution, and community meetings.</p>
--	--

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Total	0	0	0

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue 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.

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

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

No non-grant instrument is used.

ANNEX E: CHANGES IN THE PROJECT ACTIVITIES AS COMPARED TO THE PIF

As described in the PIF	How this is incorporated into the Request for CEO Endorsement
Component 1: Integrating climate change assessments into the design and appraisal of water infrastructure	
<p>Expected outcomes:</p> <p>Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at the local and national level</p>	<p>The content of the outcome of this Component remains largely unchanged, but the phrasing has been adjusted in order to better reflect the outputs. The outcome is now described as: “Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks”.</p>
<p>Expected outputs:</p> <p>Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted for 3 cities;</p> <p>Detailed water resources system studies carried out at the national level;</p> <p>Design and appraisal methodology developed and disseminated.</p>	<p>The key elements of these outputs remain unchanged. The project consists of one component with investment activities (Component 2) and three components with technical assistance activities, including this one. While the investment activities will focus on two cities, technical assistance activities will be offered to a larger group of cities in which EBRD is working on or preparing water projects. Not every TA activity will be implemented in all of the cities, but for each one a choice will be made after considering where the activity will be of most benefit.</p> <p>For example, the risk and vulnerability assessments in this Component will be incorporated into feasibility studies for new water investments, to be done in cities in which the projects are still at the preparation stage. In this way the results of the assessments can contribute to increasing the resilience of the project as a whole. For this reason, the number of cities in which the activity will be conducted has been removed from the output formulation.</p> <p>The creation of groundwater resource monitoring systems that was included in the description of the adaptation alternative is now covered by the “Climate monitoring systems” Output of Component 3.</p>
Component 2: Building in additional climate-resiliency features in water infrastructure rehabilitation projects	
<p>Expected outcomes:</p> <p>Decreased water demand and improved climate resilient supply of drinking water, reducing pressure on climate-vulnerable water resources</p>	<p>This Component is unchanged. Additional clarifications, detail and targets have been provided in the EBRD Project Document. The outcome is unchanged. It has been informed by significant preparatory work during the project design phase.</p>
<p>Expected outputs:</p> <p>Approaches to increase efficiency of water use and reduce climate vulnerability (water metering, wastewater recycling) developed</p>	<p>The key elements of these outputs remain unchanged. In the PIF, three cities were identified as candidates to be involved in the Component: Bishkek, Talas and Kant. It was decided since the PIF stage that focusing</p>

As described in the PIF	How this is incorporated into the Request for CEO Endorsement
<p>and implemented in 3 cities;</p> <p>Drinking water supply infrastructure rehabilitated in 3 cities;</p> <p>New, alternative climate-resilient sources of drinking water accessed.</p>	<p>SCCF resources for investment on Bishkek and not focusing SCCF investment resources in Kant would be more effective and impact more people/ have a larger impact on the basin. This is because Bishkek is by far the biggest urban area in the Chu watershed, in which Kant is also situated. As a result of this, it is now planned that the activities of this investment Component will take place in Bishkek and Talas only. Details of the Project design have been informed by significant preparatory work during the project design phase.</p> <p>The accessing of new, alternative climate-resilient sources of drinking water has been changed from an independent output to part of Output 2.1, since the activities are related.</p>
Component 3: Increasing capacity for water governance	
<p>Expected outcomes:</p> <p>Institutional capacity developed and governance of water companies and city authorities strengthened for integrating climate change impacts into water resources management</p>	<p>This Component is unchanged. Additional clarifications, detail and targets have been provided in the EBRD Project Document. The outcome is unchanged. It has been informed by significant preparatory work during the project design phase.</p>
<p>Expected outputs:</p> <p>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;</p> <p>Climate monitoring systems developed and launched;</p> <p>Information network operational for participating cities.</p>	<p>The key elements of these outputs remain largely unchanged. A list of possible measures the project may support was included in the PIF. This list was finalized for the RCE. One element, establishing laboratory facilities, was judged to be part of the baseline, so it has been removed from the adaptation alternative.</p> <p>The output of climate monitoring systems has been specified to focus on groundwater monitoring systems.</p>
Component 4: Increasing community involvement in water governance and raising knowledge and awareness of climate change implications among water users	
<p>Expected outcomes:</p> <p>Increased community involvement in water governance and awareness of climate issues in water governance.</p>	<p>This Component is unchanged. Additional clarifications, detail and targets have been provided in the EBRD Project Document.</p> <p>The outcome is unchanged. It has been informed by significant preparatory work during the project design phase.</p>

As described in the PIF	How this is incorporated into the Request for CEO Endorsement
<p>Expected outputs:</p> <p>Water User Committees established in 3 cities;</p> <p>Lessons learned collection and dissemination to cities in Kyrgyzstan and other EBRD countries.</p>	<p>These outputs are unchanged and have been informed through the project design phase. As explained above, the number of cities in which Water User Committees are to be established has been removed from the output formulation.</p>

ANNEX F: INDICATIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

Type of Monitoring and Evaluation activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$*	Time frame
Inception Workshop (IW) and related reports	-Project consultants -EBRD	2,000	Within first two months of Project start up, with reports immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance	-Oversight by project consultants Project Leaders (EBRD In-country Staff)	15,000	Start, annually and end of Project Verification of projects under the Programme (funded under the Project)
Quarterly Project progress reports	-Project Leaders (EBRD In-country Staff)	5,000	Every three months
Annual Project Report and Project Implementation Report	-Project Leaders (EBRD In-country Staff) -EBRD (HQ staff)	3,000	Annual
Mid-term Review and External Evaluation	-EBRD (HQ staff) -External consultants	30,000	At the mid-point of Project
Terminal Evaluation and Report	-EBRD (HQ staff) -External consultants	50,000	At the end of Project implementation
Lessons learned	-Project consultants - Project Leaders (EBRD In-country staff)	5,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	-EBRD (HQ staff) -Government representatives	25,000	Yearly
TOTAL COST		135,000	