



---

## GEF IW:LEARN 5: Supporting Portfolio Coordination Within and Beyond the International Waters Focal Area, particularly in Small Island Developing States, Through Knowledge Sharing, Information Management, Partnership Building and Programmatic Guidance Services

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10374

**Countries**

Global

**Project Title**

GEF IW:LEARN 5: Supporting Portfolio Coordination Within and Beyond the International Waters Focal Area, particularly in Small Island Developing States, Through Knowledge Sharing, Information Management, Partnership Building and Programmatic Guidance Services

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNDP, UNEP

**Agency ID**

UNDP: 6438, UNEP: 0000

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

International Waters

**Program Manager**

Christian Severin

# PIF

## Part I – Project Informatics

### 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly,

1) Please reformulate: First: it is unclear what is meant with “strengthen management performance of results delivery of GEF International Waters projects *and development partners...*” How and why would IW-Learn strengthen management performance of our development partners ??

2) Second: “.. with emphasis on Small Island Development States..” suggest that this is only addressing GEF IW. This is not the intent but the “SIDS Learn” component is to enable learning exchanges and capacity building *across GEF focal areas* and within and across SIDS groupings. [note: the component text/title expresses this but not the PDO or table B]

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed.

##### Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 01/11/2019**

*1. The project objective has been reformulated*

*2. The project objective has been corrected to expand SIDS intervention into all GEF focal areas. Also in the corresponding Table B outcome*

## 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, it is not clear how the funding will be split between the implementing agencies. please include in the framework, by adding agency name. Further, please address below comments:

- 1) Please clarify the use of terms of “development partners” and GEF “country partners” throughout
- 2) Delete words “sometimes using the IW website toolkit” in table B under 2.2.. Such details are better captured in the text.
- 3) Component 2 is around 800 K which seem high given this builds on previous GEF finance on the IW-Learn website, and IW website toolkit.
- 4) Component 3: Delete words in table B *following* “Enhanced global collaboration and communication among Small Island Developing States” (i.e. delete: ..”on integrated water, coastal and ocean resource management”. The aim is beyond exchanges on IW related topics only.(note: the component text is o.k. ; table B less so)
- 5) Component 4: Please change wording “Technical assistance on ..” under outputs 4.3 and 4.4. to “training and capacity building “ or similar in order to not give the impression that IW-Learn will provide direct, project specific TA. This is clear in the text (page 13 etc.) but not so clear in table B.
- 6) Why is the LME consultation annual and not bi-annual; in the off-years this will be combined with IWCs.
- 7) Please retain two outputs from previous phases: (i) “Thematic reviews” and (ii) “ Dissemination of experience and tools developed within selected GEF IW global tools/methodology projects”.
- 

Under ALternative Scenario section:

- 8) First para: SIDS: this should be more than/beyond Samoa pathway areas of Climate Action and Blue Economy and include e.g. areas related to water security, sustainable food and nutrition; sustainable tourism and sustainable energy .
- 9) Reference needs to be made not only to GEF 7, but also support to GEF 8 implementation (starting in 2022).
  - 10) Component 1: There is no need to highlight or to narrow the IW learn regional meetings and learning exchanges to the “replication of the Athens Petersburg process” or focus at this point on particular regions (here: Central America).
  - 11) Component 2: see earlier comment. In addition, this reads very much like the UNEP- GRID activities in the last phase. Please clarify that the delivery of training on story-telling , visualization, data management etc. will be via the IW-Learn PMU and partnering and engaging resource people from within or outside of GEF agencies and current GEF IW-Learn partners. Note: Please note GEF’s policies on separation if implementing and executing functions. There should be no UNDP or UNEP self-execution of project funds.
  - 12) Component 3: see earlier SIDS related comment re. SAMOA pathway.
  - 13) Please mention that the SIDS-learn component will where possible seek synergies with the knowledge management component of the GEF 7 ISLANDS program.
  - 14) Component 4: No need to focus on Objective 1 of the GEF 7 strategy. Also, when describing support to GEF 7 objective 3: add 3.1. on Information management. Please also add objective 3.1 in section “4. ) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program Strategies”.
  - 15) Second para: what are “key GEF sub-regions”? There is no such thing. Change to “selected regions and sub-regions” ...if you want to indicated that IW-Learn may not be able to cover all regions to same degree.
  - 16) Conjunctive management: this is wider than addressing linked ecosystems but the wider need to address water and food security through improved governance of groundwater use (quantity and quality) and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater resources.
  - 17) Component 5: Please make clear if there is a GEF IW Learn Advisory Panel on private sector engagement, a GEF IW Advisory Panel on private sector engagement (which needs to be agreed with GEFSEC/GEF management) and/or a Global Partnerships Advisory Panel (mentioned in the second para) ? Which ? Right now this is not clear nor is it clear if there will be one or two panels.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed. However, please note that as indicated above, under comment 17, these activities may be fully taken over by GEF corporate activities. If this is the case the suggested Advisory Panel would have to ensure to fully support corporate activities, and hence close coordination will be essential.

## Agency Response

### UNDP Response, 01/11/2019

*The “split” has been included in the output section of the Project Framework*



1. All references to "country partner" have been fixed and an example of development partners provided in the narrative.
2. This language removed from the output, noting that the IW Website Toolkit has been an important innovation, utilized by dozens of GEF projects.
3. The component has been reduced by 100K, however noting that there are still innovative and new activities contained in the component, as well as the ongoing need for augmentation of the website, particularly its content and including its maintenance
4. Deleted the language from Table B (no change to component text)
5. This has been changed in Table B
6. The Annual LME Consultation has been an annual event for the last twenty-one years, driven from its inception as agency effort and separate from the activities of IW:LEARN. While the event does now enjoy the support of the project and rely on its project coordination unit, by its very definition it is an annual and highly specific and targeted event for the LME portfolio. Language has been added to indicate that when it would be possible, the Annual LME could be back to back with the portfolio meeting, however, avoiding the risk that the combined meetings would be too long.
7. (i) This was alluded to in 2.3 ("innovative focal area communication synthesis publications") but have adjusted the language.  
(ii) This was already well noted in output 1.2, but has been emphasized again
8. The output in Table B has been adjusted as well as the narrative text in alternative scenario
9. This has been adjusted in the narrative text
10. The first Central American Dialogue was extremely well received by member states. The first dialogue had participation of all region countries including the MFA and Environment ministries and while commitment to the dialogue process could not be promised, it was implied that the new project could offer new opportunities for continuation. The Athens-Petersberg Process is a trade mark approach design to facilitating transboundary cooperation, with a methodology based on it paid for in this phase. However, that language will be removed and clarified further during the PPG phase.
11. Communications and data visualization is not the province of any single partner, old or new, in the proposed project. Language has been added to the narrative text that the sub-component will be led by the project coordination unit.
12. Revised based on earlier comment
13. Language added to alternative scenario
14. Removed, although noting it that there is a sub-component in direct support of Objective 1. 3.1 has been added in the relevant sections
15. The term has been changed.
16. This has been adjusted to mention better governance

*17. This has been standardized as Global IW Partnerships Advisory Panel. Only one panel is envisioned.*

## 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, please include REV OCEAN to the list too (and other potential partners that you have been discussing with). Further considering all the cofinancing identified are re occurrent and UNDP and UNEPs large diverse portfolios and inhouse expertise, the identified cofinance seems LOW

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, however, it is noted that the word document includes many more sources of potential cofinancing, than what has been added in the actual portal submission.

### Agency Response

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*REV-Ocean has been added to the cofinance table as well as other partners. The noted cofinance figure has been adjusted as well.*

## 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 25th of October 2019 (cseverin): yes**

**Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

## Agency Response

### The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### 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** 25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

**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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, please make sure to include appropriate core indicator value under core indicator 7 and please reassess if the project will not have a higher value under core indicator 11.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Please make sure to include core indicators into the portal, reflecting them in the word doc uploaded is not enough. Further, please make sure to only list information under core indicator 7.4 (not number of LMEs and freshwater system the project will be engaged). Moreover, the core indicator values for 11, is still low. please revise.

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Please include sub indicator for 7.4. Please during PPG carefully investigate if the numbers listed under core indicator 11 will not be higher.

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*These have been adjusted to reflect the rough number of projected beneficiaries of IW:LEARN services. The number of basins is based on a rough estimate of 10 large marine ecosystems and 10 freshwater basins, the approximate number of projected active transboundary basin projects during the lifetime of the proposed project. Noting that the project cannot directly affect governance of the basins, it can however, support the projects in their effort.*

## 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, please make sure to reassess tags, there are multiple important tags missing.,

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed adequately at this time. But please carefully access during PPG, whether the project should also be associated with some of the ecosystem tags.

## Agency Response

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*Several tags have been added to the table*

## 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): this section needs to be revised.

0) the initial paragraph should be focusing on the fact that IWLEARN is bridging KM and learning gap in IW investments. probably highlight the importance for such mechanisms, when dealing with regional aspects, which at times are not directly linked to governments, and hence IWLEARN can be instrumental for such bridging.

1) Please update the first paragraph, so that it talks about most recent numbers.

2) Please include in second para more specific mentioning of the different manuals that the project has been producing and how they have been used.

3) Please consider to delete para 3, and that seems to have little relevance to IWLEARN. sure these are the circumstances we work within, but it has no direct impact on IWLEARN.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed

### Agency Response

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*0. Reformulated to reflect the comment.*

*1. Figures were corrected.*

*2. Reference to manuals and methodologies inserted.*

*3. This paragraph has been deleted.*

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly.

1) Please make sure that there is consistency between numbers referenced in the document. (some places it mentions the GEF to be 25 yr old and others 27, other places again it talks having reached 1700 people, others 1800 etc etc).

2) Please make sure to insert organisations such as SPREP and SPC in the third para of the section (btw, this also needs to be inserted in the sixth para of Coordination section)

3) please delete last sentence of second para under "baseline section"

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed

**Agency Response**

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*1. The inconsistencies have been corrected*

*2. These entities have been added.*

*3. This has been deleted.*

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, please delete most of initial paragraph of component 3, and start with " This component will be based on....."

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed



**Agency Response**

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*This is done.*

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

**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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

**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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, the nature of this investment is to capture lessons learned and innovations and share these with the wider portfolio.

### **Agency Response**

## **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**

NA as this is a global investment

### **Agency Response**

## **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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, this needs to be expanded upon considerably. the ticked boxes for some reason omits local communities, which IWLEARN and its activities often engage with. Further, other groups of importance is project staff, and ministerial staff from local and national governments. Please provide a proper initial analysis.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed

#### **Agency Response**

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*This section has been greatly expanded*

#### **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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, please expand. Gender mainstreaming and gender related activities have been central deliverables in previous phases of IWLEARN. It will continue to be an important set of issues towards improving project delivery and impact.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Please expand on this section, considering the role of IWLEARN, it is expected that this section is better elaborated on.

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

### Agency Response

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*This section has been expanded and modified.*

## Private Sector Engagement

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, please expand. One thing that particularly should be highlighted is the initial partnership discussions with private sector entities such as REVOcean.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, but please continue to seek private sector partnerships and in particular co-financing, throughout the project preparation, as well as project execution.

### Agency Response

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*Language has been added to this section correspondingly and REV-Ocean mentioned as a likely partner of the effort.*

## Risks

**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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

**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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, it should be noted that as the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

**Agency Response**

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*This is well noted. The execution arrangement proposed, through a single entity (by both implementing agencies), is well documented in the coordination section.*

**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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, please elaborate on the scope of the project being global and to improve implementation of regional investments.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Addressed

**Agency Response**

*UNDP Response, 01/11/2019*

*Language on supporting national priorities has been added.*

**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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin):Yes

**Agency Response**

### **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**

NA

**Agency Response**

### **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**

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, Please address comments provided

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): No please address comments and resubmit urgently.

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): No please address comment and resubmit

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes, project is recommended for Technical Clearance

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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



**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>