

Managing Watersheds for Enhanced Resilience of Communities to Climate Change in Nepal (MaWRiN)

Basic Information

GEF ID

10727

Countries

Nepal

Project Title

Managing Watersheds for Enhanced Resilience of Communities to Climate Change in Nepal (MaWRiN)

GEF Agency(ies)

WWF-US

Agency ID

WWF-US: G0033

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

CCA-1 and CCA-2 in Table A is aligned with 2018-2022 GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF.

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response Thank you for your comment.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response Thank you very much for your comment.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response Thank you very much for your comment.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

N/A

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response Thank you for your comment.

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes. PPG has been requested and is within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

Excellent. Thank you for your response to the request for PPG.

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10.15.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

10.04.2020:

Climate adaptation indicators are sufficiently provided. However, Core Indicator 11, which is dedicated for GEFTF projects, seems to be irrelevant for this project. If so, please delete this.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

Agency Response

Thank you for this feedback. We have deleted the reference to Core Indicator 11 by removing the listed numbers of male and female beneficiaries.

10/22 Thank you for your re-evaluation

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10.15.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

10.04.2020:

Climate change mitigation is indicated in Rio Markers as well as in taxonomy. However, how this proposal is expected to contribute to the 'mitigation' is not explicitly explained.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

Agency Response

Thank you for providing this feedback. We have removed the climate change mitigation Rio marker and removed the reference to climate mitigation within the taxonomy.

10/22 Thank you for your re-evaluation

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you so much for your comment.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10.22.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

10.15.2020:

ToC diagram has been developed. However, outcomes and impacts from the project are unclear in the diagram.

10.04.2020:

Different barriers, activities and expected outputs/impacts etc. are identified and mentioned in the text. However, linkages between these are not clear. Please elaborate this in ToC diagram in order to effectively provide better view and logic behind the proposal.

<https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

Agency Response

Thank you for this observation. We have worked to create a Theory of Change diagram that demonstrates the linkage between barriers, activities and their expected outputs and impacts. The Theory of change has been inserted into the body for the PIF as well as uploaded as a separate attachment for clearer viewing.

10/22: I thank you for this feedback. We have included an updated Theory of Change Diagram in which the outcomes are labeled, there is also a key that has been included to help clarify each result. The updated Theory of Change has also been attached to the submission.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment on the Incremental Cost Reasoning section.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for this comment.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you very much for this comment.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for this comment on the gender section.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at EIT / WORK Program inclusion

10.22.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

10.15.2020:

Explanation is sufficiently provided. Please update the response to the question 'Will there be private sector engagement in the project?' if the proposed project will be engaging with the private sector.

10.04.2020:

In terms of technologies, engagement with private sector could have potential benefit. Component 2 seems to have technological aspect. As such, please reconsider to engage with private sector or provide further rationale to how the project objectives can be fulfilled without the engagement of private sector, particularly for Component 2.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment on engaging the Private Sector more in relation to Component 2. We have revised the Private Sector Engagement Section to include working with local service providers as well as micro-finance institutions and cooperatives. Please see the Private Sector Engagement section which briefly outlines how engagement with the private sector could help support the use of climate smart technologies and potentially credit facilities, in this project. We have also edited the Institutional barrier section and the technological barriers to reflect the strategy more clearly.

10/22: Thank you for this observation- we have updated the response to the question accordingly

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response Thank you for this comment.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for this comment on coordination.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you very much for your comment.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Thank you for this comment on the safeguards section.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11.06.2020: Cleared

10.29/2020 /10.22.2020 /10.15.2020 /10.04.2020:

The endorsement letter from the GEF OFP is lacking.

Agency Response

The OFP is prepared to endorse the project, but there has been a COVID-19 outbreak within the Ministry of Forestry and Environment in Nepal, during which staff have been required to vacate the ministry and are not signing and sharing hard copies of documents. This has caused a delay in the Letter of Endorsement from the OFP. The week of October 26th is also a holiday in Nepal, therefore the ministry is closed as is our partner office in Nepal. We have unofficial support from the Ministry of Forestry and Environment and the Ministry of Finance and are expecting the LOE by Monday, November 9th.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11.06.2020: This PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

10.29/2020 /10.22.2020 /10.15.2020 /10.04.2020: Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the update).

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

It is recommended to further explore the following(s) at the PPG stage:

- How can the project further enhance synergies with the baseline projects, including with President Chure Conservation Program which seems to dominates co-financing resources?
- Further elaboration on 'livelihood diversification'.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/4/2020	10/14/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/15/2020	10/22/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2020	10/27/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/29/2020	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

CONTEXT

This project is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer) and CCA-2 (mainstreaming adaptation).

Nepal is vulnerable to numerous climate-induced hazards such as floods, landslides and debris flows due to its steep topography along with extended dry spells and drying up of water sources along the mid hills and mountains while glacial melt is significantly increasing the potential risk of Glacial Lake Outburst floods in the high mountains. Among its landscape, Marin watershed is one of the regions having highly vulnerable communities to climate change risks and impacts which is largely populated by the indigenous people (around 90% of the people in the area) living on subsistence farming.

COMPONENTS and RESULTS

The project will aim to enhance climate resilience of indigenous people and local communities in the Marin watershed through nature-based solutions and livelihood diversification. The project is structured around three Components that will result in adaptation benefits of 40,000 direct beneficiaries, of which 18,000 are female (Core Indicator 1), 10,000 hectares of land under climate resilient management (Core Indicator 2), and 3,500 people trained, of which 1,800 are female (Core Indicator 4).

Component 1:

Enabling environment for main-streaming climate change

Component 2:

Component 2:

Enhance resilience of communities to climate change

Component 3:

Monitoring, Evaluation and Knowledge management

POLICY IMPACTS

The project will support integrating climate change in local level policy and planning processes. For this purpose, the project aims to provide trainings, exposure and peer learning opportunities for municipality staff, government line agencies such as Division Forest Office and CBOs (Community-based organizations) on climate change impacts, vulnerability assessment tools and methods, and mainstreaming approaches. The project will further support the review of relevant local plans, sector and development strategies that address climate risks and, where necessary, support the formulation of tools and guidelines for integrating CCA and DRR into these plans and investments that promote ecosystem-based adaptation and nature-based solutions.

INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY, SCALE-UP & GENDER

Currently, issues of watershed and climate change adaptation are dealt in isolation. Although, river basin offices have been established and currently preparing and, in some level, implementing basin management plan, the plan focuses on costly hard technologies and fails to adequately integrate climate change. This project thus aims to adopt an integrated approach by addressing the threats caused by climate change in the watershed while also implementing other prioritized watershed management activities. Thus, the activities designed are a combination of conventional conservation of forest, freshwater and agricultural lands as well as application of NbS identified under uncertain climate change scenarios, adapted to the local conditions in each community of the Marin watershed.

The project will build the capacity of the most relevant stakeholders at local level including that of CBOs who will be able to continue and sustain project interventions on completion of the project. Further, mainstreaming of climate adaptation and DRR in the plans and budget of government and community institutions will ensure the sustained investment for climate resilience.

The federal government has setup River Basin Offices and the provincial government has established Watershed Office. The learning and successes of this project could provide valuable insight into the watershed approach to natural resource management in the face of climate change, which could help to formulate policy frameworks that would facilitate bringing multiple administrative units together. Further, the project will enable upscaling the best practices at watershed level along the region.

In the project area, most of the young men have migrated to other cities and abroad for employment leaving women in charge of managing natural resources and managing households. However, only 23.80% of women have ownership of their fixed property. As such, gender action plan (GAP) will be developed based on the gender analysis, the assessment on differential impacts of climate change, and the results of gender-responsive stakeholder consultations. The design phase will also review the learning from other adaptation projects regarding gender mainstreaming.

The project will deliver additional benefits within \$26 million of co-financing.

