

Integrated transboundary water resources management in the Corubal basin between Guinée and Guinée-Bissau

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10508

Countries

Regional (Guinea, Guinea-Bissau)

Project Name

Integrated transboundary water resources management in the Corubal basin between Guinée and Guinée-Bissau

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

3/15/2020

Review completed by PM

10/26/2020

Program Manager

Christian Severin

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

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

(3/19/2020) No - please split the allocation between the relevant sub-objectives for IW objective 3 - freshwater (not IW objective 1 - marine or 2 - ABNJ).

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, please add countries after Regional. on front page of portal.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN – 28 July 2020

The objectives have been revised and integrated GEF focal areas as defined in the GEF 7 Programming Directions. Presently the objectives are:

- IW- Objective 3-5: Advance information exchange and early warning, budgeted at US \$ 1, 000, 000
- IW- Objective 3-6: Enhance regional and national cooperation on shared freshwater and groundwater basins, budgeted at US \$ 2, 000, 000
- IW-Objective 3-7 Investments in water, food, energy and environmental security, budgeted at US \$ 3 222 096

IUCN – 16 October 2020

Done in the portal

Please note the figures have been updated to correspond strictly to the endorsement letters provided for this project.

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

(3/20/2020) No.

1. The outcomes and outputs in table B only partly coincide with the component descriptions (page 25/42 in the portal). Just as an example, items such as the SAP appears missing in the Project component text, while vice versa the described flood- and drought forecasting in the components misses from table B.

2. They also do not align with the description of global environmental benefits - the latter are way over-ambitious in their description given what is listed both in table B and the project components - see below.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): No. Please address following points

1) SAP is to be signed at Ministerial level, approval is not enough.

2) Please include component outcomes and outputs that align with the quantifiable core indicators that the project will deliver. They are currently missing in Table B.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, address following comments:

1) please make sure there is coherency between the project title included in portal and the title included in the endorsement letters.

2) Executing Partner: OMVG is not a government entity – please amend.

3) Other Executing Partners: the Gambia River Basin Development Organization [OMVG] is not the only Executing Partner. Based on the LOEs, Guinee had indicated OMVG and the Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forestry as Implementing Partners. Likewise, Guinee-Bissau indicated OMVG, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, and Ministry of Environment and Biodiversity as Implementing Partners. Please amend.

4) There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC – it should be around 5% as it is the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$25,349,000, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,267,450 instead of \$800,000. Please amend.

28th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN – 28 July 2020

1. The text has been revised and components description is strictly coincided with the Outcomes and outputs in table B.

2. The section on Global environment benefits has been entirely revised to reflect the characteristics of the project.

IUCN – 23 October 2020

1) Addressed in the revised version of the PIF.

2) Table B has been updated with components outcomes and outputs, which are aligned with the core indicators expected to be generated from this project.

28 October 2020 – IUCN

1) Addressed

2) Modified to “others”

3) Addressed

4) Addressed. PMC co-financing has been adjusted.

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

(3/20/2020)

- Overall, the co-finance is extremely low at around a 1: 1 ratio. While no individual project is held to the portfolio-wide co-financing targets, this is too low .

- That said, great to see the substantial co-finance from OMVG. If it is grant, please label as 'investment mobilized'. If it is in-kind, please label as recurrent expenditure.

- African Water Facility (english please) - ditto

- Any IUCN co-finance ?

- Co-finance from governments? There is no government co-finance. There need to be at least in-kind and project specified/"trackable" items of e.g. staff time and office space. Otherwise this suggests that the effort does not seem to have traction in the government yet. This is a significant concern..

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): Cofinancing is still too low, only 1:2. Please reevaluate

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed. However, please continue to work on cofinancing during PPG, as indicated in response below that you are planning to do.

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address below points

1) with over US\$21M grant co-financing identified as “recurrent expenditure”, i.e. operations costs. Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures" and review the grant co-financing against that definition.

2) For the co-financing from OMVG, please use source “other”, and not Donor Agency.

3) For the co-financing from IANDA - in the "Name of Co-Financier" field, please use only the name of the entity that provides the co-financing (UE Funding), rather than the name of the project with which it is associated.

28th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN – 28 July 2020

- Following substantial discussions and negotiations with stakeholders and Governments, the co-financing has been revised and increased from \$ 7,000,000 to \$ 15, 500, 000.

- OMVG co-financing increased from \$4,500,000 to \$7,500,000. See in Table C of the PIF.

- The English name has been spelled out for African Water Facility.
- IUCN co-financing has been added. It is related to the PREE project that aims to address water governance problems in the Fouta Djallon. More details are provided in the section on baseline in the PIF.
- Co-financing from both Governments are available and concerns public investment in waters resources and agriculture. They include in-kind contributions related to providing the project with infrastructures and technical staff related to water resources management, national meteorological services and rural hydraulics in the two countries.

IUCN – 23 October 2020

Co-financing has been increased through the contribution of the Ianda Guinée project that is intervening on water management and energy supply in Guinée-Bissau. The contribution of the Governments could increase but this will be assessed during the PPG, in agreement with the two Governments involved.

IUCN 23 October 2020 (2)

Noted

IUCN 28 October 2020

- 1) The table has been updated. The grant financing is in fact investment mobilized in the context of this project. This has been explained in the text box under the co-financing table in the GEF portal.
- 2) Done
- 3) Done

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
(3/20/2020)

At present GEF IW resources are available.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, currently IW resources are available.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
(3/20/2020)

At present GEF IW resources are available.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

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

(3/20/2020)

- yes, amount is in line with GEF policies.

- Please label country as "regional" or "regional (Guinea-Bissau, Guinea)" and not just one of the countries.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, addressed.

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

(3/20/2020)

1. Please attach the worksheet and an explanation on how/what areas/location are contained in the listed 50.000 Ha under indicator 3 .
2. Ditto for indicator 4 and listed 350.000 ha. Please also give an idea on estimated investment cost assumed in this (\$/ha).
3. Please fill the overall indicator 7 : # of shared water systems is 1 (not zero)
4. Please fill out sub-indicators 7.3. and 7.4.
5. How were the estimated DIRECT beneficiaries of 630000 people calculated (as well as the male/female split). This number seems too high as only direct beneficiaries are to be tracked here.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): No,

- 1) Please provide explanation on how these core indicators has been calculated, as requested above. One place to include this could be below the core indicator table, where room has been allocated for this exact purpose.
- 2) Please fill in the name of the shared river basin (Corubal) in core indicator 7.

3) Please include rating for core indicator 7.4

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please include explanation on how core indicators has been calculated. Further, Corubal River Basin should now be available in teh drop down menu, please choose that.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly. Brief explanation included, hence it is expected that this be worked on substantially during PPG.

Please change the Corubal in the drop down menu under core indicator 7

26th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN - 21 April 2020

!

1. Worksheet attached and updated in the portal. The 50,000 ha covers areas under irrigation and areas under high pressure throughout the river basin. In Guinea, 18,000 ha and in Guinea Bissau 8,562 ha of irrigated plains will be restored (Area of degraded agricultural land restored). Also the project will restore forest (5000ha), natural grassland and shrublands (5000 ha) and wetland (13438 ha).

2. The average price of restoration per hectare is estimated at USD 118 per hectare according to IUCN calculations (IUCN, 2016). Done

3. Done but the Corubal proeject is not in the dropdown menu to be selected.

4. Done but the Corubal proeject is not in the dropdown menu to be selected.

5. It's estimated using population data's of the main rural communities living closely around the basin and estimated now to 263,997 inhabitants in 2019 (OMVG, 2019).

IUCN – 23 October 2020

1) A paragraph has been added in the text box following the indicator table in the portal.

2) The Corubal river basin is not listed in the dropdown menu in the portal. The only one found close to this basin is the Gambia. Please advise on how this can be addressed.

IUCN 23 October 2020 (2)

Done in the box below the core indicator table.

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

(3/20/2020)

- Please fill in Rio Markers

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, addressed.

Agency Response

IUCN - 21 April 2020

Addressed.

Part 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

(3/20/2020)

1. There is an underlying notion in the drafting/wording in the PIF to not aim to balance development needs/ambitions of the countries and address associated needs e.g. for energy and agricultural incomes, together with ecosystems needs. Not taking this into account and focusing basin management on a conservation agenda is not likely to have country buy-in or reflect existing and planned developments by the countries. This may just be a drafting or translation issue. Please clarify and amend the text to reflect a cross-sector balance and approach.

2. Please take account of the needs for balance and trade-offs across all of the Nexus dimensions to allow for countries to develop scenarios to achieve both development and environmental objectives within SAPs and other strategies. See above.

3. Water pollution appears a significant problem in the basin. Please provide some details/quantitative information on chemical fertilizer use in the basin (FAO Data ?) and on any water quality data existing (mentioned are fertilizers/nutrients and POPs).

4. Same for sedimentation and decreased fish stocks.

5. The overall summary of the barriers (page 21) appears overly simplistic. From all that is described barriers are far not only the lack in the transboundary dimension of planning but also the lack of sustainable management actions and weak governance on national level that need to be addressed. In fact, based on the PIF it is not clear what is the more serious issue. This needs addressing. The project likely needs to work on both transboundary cooperation and strengthening national policies and regulations.

6. There is no discussion on the role of OMVG with regards to the Gambia, Geba and Corubal rivers and planning in these basins. Please do so – especially given co-finance from OMVG.

7. There needs to be a brief analysis of the gaps in the 1978 agreement that the project needs to address. E.g. the agreement provides for a Permanent Technical Committee – no more, no less. It describes who should be on there and four objectives giving the committee specific but limited mandates for studies, masterplans and investments of common interest. It does not provide e.g. for obligations on the exchange of information, prior notification for planned measures, any provisions in times of floods or droughts, or any arbitration provisions. It also does not call for or set-up a full Commission or describe various organs beyond the PTC. The project would need to facilitate the process of negotiation of amendments and/or additional protocols to address the issues described in the PIF incl. low flow provisions etc. The countries also would need to decide whether they indeed want (and pay for) more than a PTC (in addition to OMVG which already appears to take on some common functions on the three basins). Please add some clarity on this and then translate this into elements of the project design under component 1 – Governance and Institutional Strengthening.

8. Please be overall more specific when describing barriers, incl. e.g. “legal and regulatory gaps’. It mentioned land tenure but does not say what current situation is; nor does it describe what are regulations and enforcement for regulations on water quality etc. This issue is not specific to barrier 2.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, above comments addressed, but please add a section on the underlying Theory of Change

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN - 21 April 2020

1. The whole PIF was revised, taking into account not only the ecological importance of the Corubal but also the development plans related to agriculture (through the Terra Ranka Programme for example), water resources management, and energy generation. There are also mining activities but the link to this project, including having the relevant stakeholder on board, will be done during the PPG phase. The project team wants to ensure that what is being proposed is feasible within the budget allocated. The global environment problem description also describes the governance challenge in managing these competing needs throughout the basin.

2. The revised version of the PIF balances the trade-offs across all of the nexus dimensions. As explained in the response to the previous comment, the PIF considers primarily how agriculture, water resources management and energy related activities are competing with global environment benefits and ecosystem services provided by the river basin. Therefore, the project proposes to include these sectors as part of the solution proposed, mainly through the TDA and SAP (given the substantial development of these sectors in the recent years) and in the financing mechanism to be established in order to provide the basin a sustainable model following the project end.

3. Data on water pollution has been added to the paragraph on water and soil pollution in the revised PIF (section 1.b), particularly the ones related to upstream activities.

4. Data on sedimentation and on fish has been added (section 1.b).
5. The overall summary of the barriers has been fully revised.
6. Following discussions with the countries and OMVG, the transboundary institutions has been included as an executing agency and its activities, as a part of the baseline.
7. A paragraph and a table has been inserted in the baseline scenario description in order to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the agreement signed in 1978 between the two countries.
8. The section on barriers has been modified. It is now aligned with the text on the global environment problems, the main threats to the environment and is aligned with the solutions proposed by the project.

IUCN – 23 October 2020

Narrative on the theory of change has been added to this version of the PIF in the description of the alternative scenario. The ToC has been modified also according to the revisions made to the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(3/20/2020)

1. Please move paras in the baseline that should be part of the background. Again, these background sections seem rather general and void of concrete data and information to outline the extend of any of the problems. This section should focus on the description of baseline actions and existing investments on national and transboundary levels.
2. The baseline section mentions “immense efforts to conserve the environment” but the list of project sshown seems rather short incl. GEF and non-GEF regional initiatives the countries are part of.

3. Please when listing baseline investments list and make sure the timeline is relevant to the project implementation and please list amounts and source of finance.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin):No, Please address following issues

1) Regional Baseline seems to include a project that is also listed as cofinancing. The Baseline is to provide the foundation on which the proposed investment will be building on.

2) the national baselines are primarily listing ongoing/future investments. The rationale is the same here. Please ensure that the baseline includes investments that the proposed investment will be building on.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN - 21 April 2020

1. Noted. This has been addressed in the revised version. Paragraphs have been reorganized and data has been added to substantiate the description of the global environment problem and justify the barriers to be removed and activities proposed under the project components.

2. The whole baseline section has been revised, adding initiatives that have taken place and are still taking place at the national and the regional levels.

3. The revised PIF has made a separation between the baseline activities, which are not linked to the project timeframe (in the coordination section) and the activities that are directly linked and complementary to the project itself in the baseline section. Timeline and amounts have been included.

IUCN – 23 October 2020

1) The PREE project has been removed from the baseline. It is used to further describe the incremental reasoning.

2) The baseline activities are related to projects or initiatives that have either closed or are under implementation, with planned closure in 2021 or 2022. Given the preparation time required for this project to be endorsed and start implementation, these should be all closed or about to close when the project begins. A paragraph has been added following the description of the national baseline activities to that respect.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(3/20/2020)

1. Please note earlier comment of the inconsistency between table B and the component description (page 25 of portal PIF).
2. Please have a quick second look at the PDO : the wording of “improve ... water quantity” is somewhat odd. Please reword. Also, just more of a question for *possible* consideration on wording: most projects aim at 'reversing degradation' or 'preventing further degradation' and the wording of "conservation" (sometimes implying "no use") can cause confusion.
3. The structure of the components could be more clear. Please preface with a para of a narrative/Theory of Change for the project. A clear ToC will provide a clear frame of what the project will (and will not) do. Currently what is described across the three components has a rather weak correlation to the comprehensive and ambitious GEBs (see qu. 6 below).
4. Component 2 picks up governance aspects e.g. to “review and adapt” the 1978 accord to present needs. Would these be better addressed under component 1?
5. Component 1- the 1978 protocol is not setting out anything more than a PJC and does not define other organs and relations between these to account for a full functioning RBO governance set-up (see earlier comment). Are the countries intending to revise the 1978 accord. If so that process needs to be outlined and an output under component 1.
6. What about a separate protocol for the exchange of data and information ? Or will this be part of the revision of the 1978 agreement?
7. Financing of the PTC (or the Commission): innovative finance is mentioned which is good. Usually one would also expect mention of discussion on country contributions as part of a finance strategy (to be developed during the project) and commitments by countries to be leverage to do so with an aim to cover core costs over time/past the project.

8. Component 2: Please be much more clear (suggest to use bullet points or paras) what this component will support. There are several items that need specific mention as outputs in the component text and in table B/project framework,. For example the the a ministerial adopted (signed) SAP is missing among the outputs in the project framework.

9. Floods and droughts early warning: If this is to be financed, please clarify if any real time flow model exists to support flood early warning ? Who will host such system/s ? Each country would need to have a node in the ministries of water resources plus a link to communities to support community flood management and early warning in highest at risk areas. Please also note the earlier request to provide quantitative data in the project description on (i) the extend and impacts of floods and droughts in the basin and (ii) an analysis whether the lack of e.g. flood preparedness is mostly based on barriers on national level or indeed the availability of flood information from upstream warning and transboundary cooperation will lead to a substantially better response to floods via greater lead times.

10. Can the project handle both flood and drought early warning system and community preparedness given the different warning and response mechanisms as well as differing stakeholders and geographies for floods and droughts ? Funding and capacities seem to be limited to do so.

11. Please be much more clear on the type and thematic, geographical and approx.. finance envelope /scope on envisioned pilot activities. Again, ambition (described under the GEBs) needs to be aligned with capacities and available budget.

12. Component 3: Please separate/make specific what is intended to be done in terms of (i) communication; (ii) what to do under KM; and (iii) what is project M&E. Then, in addition, there is mention of “monitoring and evaluation tools for the dynamic of the Corubal River and its basin' which seems altogether a different item. Even at PIF stage there needs to be some clearer view of major outputs.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly.

- 1) as mentioned above and also in question 1 under section II, please add a section on theory of change for the project. It will provide clarity
- 2) as mentioned earlier in review too, please ensure that results framework presented in Table B, includes activities, outcomes and outputs that will be able to deliver the specific core indicators that has been identified in the Core Indicator framework. This can not all be pushed to the PPG phase.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN - 21 April 2020

1. The whole text in the PIF has been revised. Project components have also been reorganized to provide more coherence to the entire project and how each component will inform itself from the two others. Consistency has been brought in between table B and the component description in the revised PIF.
2. The wording has been revised in this version of the PIF.

IUCN – 23 October 2020

- 1) Addressed. A section on the Theory of Change has been added to this revised version.
- 2) Table B outcomes and outputs have been updated according to the core indicators the project is expected to generate.
3. The project components have been reorganized completely. In this revised version, component 1 is about doing the TDA & SAP, which are inexistent for this basin. This will be a major breakthrough from this project. The second component will focus its intervention on building capacity at the local, national and regional level, including revising the initial agreement signed in 1978, which is considered very weak by the two countries and does not reflect any longer the characteristics of the basin, which has substantially changed in 40 years. This second component, building on the analytical and planning work done in component 1, as well as the updated governance framework and increased capacity by the first outcome of component 2, will establish the foundation for the sustainable financing of the economic activities in the Basin. This acknowledges that the sustainability of the transformative effect that the project will bring will be done by involving the private sector and economic ecosystem present in the basin. At PIF stage, it has been decided that the focus of this investment part of the project will be on agriculture, water management and supply, and energy as these sectors are the drivers of unsustainable water flows. The project will aim at supporting investments guaranteeing sustainable at the same time sustainable water flows and livelihoods in the basin.
4. Indeed, this has been revised as suggested. However, in the revised version of the PIF, the governance and institutional capacity building component has been moved as component 2 (while it was component 1 initially), as this will be done in parallel to the work to be undertaken in the TDA/SAP exercise to be performed in component 1 (in the current version).

5. Yes, countries intend to update and revise the agreement according to the revised component 2. This will include having a river basin organization, which is called “a river basin management commission” in the revised PIF.
6. The protocol on exchange of data and information is included in the work to be done under component, with the revising of the initial agreement signed in 1978.
7. The second component will address this, and it will be a major breakthrough from the project, justifying partly its increment towards the baseline. Currently, there is very weak capacity and potential to mobilize financing for sustainable activities in the basin. This is partly due to a weak regulatory framework and no coordination of the entrepreneurial activities in the basin. The financing mechanism proposed under the revised component 2 will support sustainable entrepreneurial activities in the basin (with a focus decided at PIF level on agriculture, water resources management and supply, and energy generation). The financing will be designed in a way that it supports entrepreneurial activities (including financial intermediaries) that can lead the basin in an economic paradigm that uses natural resources management (and mainly water resources) in a sustainable way, ensuring the Corubal river basin can continue to provide its ecosystem services and support livelihoods. Also, the financial mechanism will be tailored in a way it can contribute to the financing of the basin commission that will be established. This latter part will have also to be dealt within the context of revising the agreement since there will have to be a contribution from the countries to it. All this (including the sectors to support) will be further refined during the PPG phase.
8. Addressed (this has become component 1 in the current revised version).
9. It has been decided that floods and droughts early warning systems will not be financed under this project. These are funded in Guinée and Guinée-Bissau by the LDCF (see section on Coordination). Therefore, the project will ensure there is strong coordination with these two projects and that they link up together since the investment opportunities and their sustainability proposed under component 2 is linked to their level of risk, which should be reduced by these two projects as stakeholders will be better informed. The needs for having the TDA, SAP, capacity built and a financing mechanism that addresses the drivers of environment degradation, the funding will not suffice to establish proper warning systems. However, the TDA and data analysis will be done in such a way it can inform such systems once they are established.

10. See response to question 9. The project will not support the establishment of early warning systems.

11. The pilot activities have been removed from the current revised version submitted following this first review. These have been replaced by the activities to be funded under the financing mechanisms to be established at the basin level under component 2. The mechanism will support activities in the sectors of agriculture, water resources management and energy supply. The mechanism will support entrepreneurial or small infrastructure work that will have a positive impact on the use of water resources so it contributes to the preservation of ecosystem services in the Corubal river basin. Exact activities and financing modalities will be defined during the PPG but will focus on agroforestry, switching to agriculture practices that are reducing water stress, small irrigation projects (not involving any land use change), off-grid electric projects that will reduce the need enhance the balance for hydro-power sources.

12. Addressed. Component 3 has been revised and made more explicit in terms of the outcomes and outputs expected.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(3/20/2020)

- Please mainly focus on describing how there is alignment with the funding from the IW focal area. You could describe alignment of each component with the relevant IW 3 sub-objective (which then should correspond to tables A and B and how funds are split there).
- In addition, one could mention the co-benefits to other focal areas (provide specific how that is so).

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please strengthen the co benefit paragraph, it is very broad in its current formulation. A project like the proposed, is listing a good number of core indicators, from across other focal areas, hence it seems it should be easy to illustrate alignment.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN - 28 July 2020

Addressed. The section on alignment of the PIF with the focal area objectives has been fully revised and now provides increased details and what will be done and achieved.

A paragraph on co-benefits has been added

IUCN – 23 October 2020

A paragraph on co-benefits has been added

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

(3/20/2020)

- Please revise this section to address what the increment of transboundary cooperation and project scope adds to the baseline. Be specific and avoid general wording or overambitious formulations (e.g. “The project will enable the implementation of all recent recommendations related to governance of shared water resources and etc etc. “). Stick to what the project will actually aim to do (e.g. the section mentions “establishment of platforms that will allow access to sustainable financing models for economic and farm” – will it? What does that mean?)

- As mentioned earlier the lack of transboundary governance appears to be only one of the limiting issues given the shortcomings of effective governance and sustainable management of water and related resources on national levels.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, incremental reasoning is also to explain what will happen in a status quo situation (what will happen without the GEF investment). Further, reading the baseline description it seems that the proposed investment is to built on a number of activities and not only the 1978 agreement.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN - 28 July 2020

Addressed in the revised PIF based on the revisions made to the project logic of change (from the global environment problems, to the threats, barriers and activities proposed to complement the baseline activity identified for this project).

IUCN – 23 October 2020

The section on incremental reasoning has been revised. Two introductory paragraphs have been added to this section explaining the status quo situation without the project. Also, the details of how activities are incremental to what would happen in the business as usual scenario have been further developed.

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

(3/20/2020)

Please describe realistic and achievable and project specific GEBs and in line with IW finance. In the moment this seems to address issues way beyond the project scope.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): No,

1), please include TDA and SAP among the main deliverables. Getting a transboundary agreement on management of shared water resources is indeed one of the GEBs of the IW focal area. Right now the three points listed are primarily focusing on LD GEBs.

2) Please ensure to include description on how you reached the core indicators included.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address above point 2), by including description on how the core indicators were calculated

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed. but it is expected that the core indicator calculation will be refined during the PPG Phase

Agency Response

IUCN - 28 July 2020

The section on global environment benefits has been revised and better aligns with the revised project scope.

IUCN – 23 October 2020

- 1) Addressed- TDA and SAP have been included in the GEBs section
- 2) The description of how indicators were reached has been provided in the text box.

IUCN 23 October 2020 (2)

Done. See above.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(3/20/2020)

I suggest to revise this section after the comments on the components have been addressed and it is clear what the project can/will and cannot do. Based on that you then may want to expand on key items which are good candidates for up-scaling.

Prospects for the sustainability of the PTC/Commission as well as other project supported key outputs should also be mentioned and how the project design will put in place efforts to sustain these.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes.

Agency Response

IUCN - 28 July 2020

This section has been revised. The potential for scaling-up of this project stems from the fact that without a revised governance framework and a SAP (which requires a TDA), There will be no coordinated planning in how investments are considered in the basin. The project is innovative mainly through component 2, which will establish a financing mechanism that will support activities enhancing entrepreneurship in the basin (see above response 11 in comment #3). This, with a good governance and institutional framework, has a huge potential for replication and constitutes the project exit strategy. In fact, the project will set the basis for having a mechanism that contribute to the financing of sustainable development activities in the Corubal basin following the project end.

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

13th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes, map of the shared river basin has been included

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
(3/20/2020)

Table on page 32: Stakeholder Engagement during Project Identification:

- Have the ministries of Water Resources and Irrigation been involved (beyond one directorate of hydraulics)? They are not mentioned in the table page 32).
- Which ministries are the focal ministries for the project/project execution ? The 1978 agreement is an agreement pertaining to the management of the basin and one would expect the water sector to be the lead agencies.
- What is the role of OMVG? Have they been consulted in the project identification phase? OMVG is providing substantial co-finance.
- What key NGOs in the countries have been consulted with so far if any?

13th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response
IUCN - 28 July 2020

Addressed

- Yes, respective countries' Ministry of Natural and Water Resources and the Ministry and Environment and Biodiversity will be the focal institutional partners for the project.

- Idem
- OMVG has been consulted as part of the preparation of this revised PIF. OMVG will be the project executing agency.
- National and international NGOs related to water resources management will be identified and consulted during the PPG phase.
- Guinée Ecologie, WCF, SEG in Guinea
- Ação para Desenvolvimento (AD), Palmerinha, DDS/IEGB & Tiniguena in Guinea Bissau
- International NGOs: Universal & GRDR.

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

(3/20/2020)

- Please answer questions on: 'closing gender gaps in access and control of NR'
 - Please provide a text on gender dimensions of the project that speaks to the specifics of the project and shows that there is consideration on where gender dimension are crucial to the project implementation and success and therefore be addressed in project design.
- 13th of October 2020 (cseverin):Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN - 28 July 2020

Responses to the comments have been addressed in the revised PIF

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(3/20/2020)

Please describe the rationale for not involving the private sector? (answer in the PIS is given as "no")

1. It is important to include the private sector in the discussions on the TDA/SAP process due to their role as users and impacts on the resources of the basin and/or vice versa. You would need awareness and – best - buy-in from the private sector to define and implement SAP actions.
2. The project mentions aspects of agricultural supply chains, ecotourism, etc. Would that not need actions via the private sector ? Same for regulation of flows.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin):Addressed

Agency Response

IUCN - 28 July 2020

Addressed. The private sector (as a key driver of sustainable development in the basin) is a key partner to this project, in particular through component 2, with the support to entrepreneurial activities. It has been decided that the project will support entrepreneurial activities that will contribute to balancing water flows in the Corubal Basin (see response to comment #3 above). These will be informed by the TDA(SAP exercise to be undertaken in the context of this project. In fact, The private sector is mainly related to agriculture, mining and hydroelectricity. During PPG, discussion will be engaged to see how to implicate these private sector in the governance of Corubal water resources and the development of communities living around the basing.

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

(3/20/2020)

1. The risk of weak or non-existent regional commitment for transboundary engagement is ranked as “high” – that calls in question the timing and success of the project and cannot be taken lightly.
2. OMVG is mentioned as one mechanism to assure engagement across sector and countries which would call for a role of OMVG in the execution of the project.
3. Ditto for the provision of data. OMVG seems to have a key role to play in the sustainability and may be an appropriate host for a regional PCU for the project.
4. Implementation risk: Who will be the ‘experienced institutions’ cited here ? Part I of the PIF lists the two governments (no specific ministries or agencies) and IUCN (which cannot intermingle implementation and execution functions as per GEF policies).
5. Climate risk: please provide some description of climate risks on the basin and if the project will address such changes and risks in e.g. basin governance.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin):No,

- 1) Please provide a climate risk screening. GEF STAP has provided some guidance on this.
- 2) Please also include an analysis of short, medium and long term impacts of COVID 19.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed, but in the most minimalistic way. Please work diligently during PPG phase to flesh out the COVID related (short, medium and long term) impacts (and include both opportunities and constraints) on the proposed investment. Further, it is also noted that the preliminary Climate Risk Analysis needs to be substantially developed in order to be able to provide value for the investment.

Agency Response

IUCN - 28 July 2020

1. This has been revised. The only fact that the two countries have endorsed this PIF shows their commitment to address the problematics, which the Corubal Basin is facing jointly. Also, in the discussions that followed the first review of this PIF, countries have endorsed the role OMVG will play as the project executing agency. OMVG being the regional body for the management of river ecosystems in the regions is a sign that countries have a strong ownership of this regional project. OMVG has a strong institutional and regional collaboration between Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau and Senegal and will be able to build institutional and political arrangements so that to reduce the timing of addressing this risk.
2. Yes, OMVG will be the project executing agency and will ensure the regional perspective of this project, during and beyond its lifetime.
3. Idem as (2)
4. OMVG, IBAP (Guinée-Bissau) and the Ministry of Environment in Guinée provide strong support to the project. The long-standing relationship of IUCN with these two countries, including having headquarters in Dakar, Sénégal and country presence in Guinée-Bissau, are mitigating the implementation risk. In addition, IUCN has a growing portfolio in the region (already 2 approved projects in Guinée-Bissau, and one regional project with the Mano-River Union which Guinée is part of) and this ensures it can provide strong oversight to the executing entities.
5. Addressed. See the risk table updated in this revised version of the PIF. Two climate risks are possible: inundation and drought. Each risk has possible consequences on the quality and quantity of water resources. Therefore, the project will address these risks in order to guarantee the quality of the water and the sustainability of the distribution.

IUCN – 23 October 2020

Under the risk section, a paragraph has been added on climate risk. An annex has been added and attached to this submission, showing the preliminary climate risk screening performed.

IUCN 23 October 2020 (2)

Noted

.

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
(3/20/20)

1. Please complete the list of relevant ongoing and/or GEF TF and LDCF projects to coordinate with (incl IAPs/IPs) – these are easy to access in the portal
2. Are there any other relevant initiatives funded by the government or development partners that should be considered along the river and the coast ?
3. IUCN cannot take both implementing and executing roles as per GEF policies. Please explore alternative execution mechanisms for the project and remove IUCN as executing partner in Part I..
4. While arrangement for project coordination will be designed in detail during PPG phase, some indication and how the project will be managed should be provided.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin):Addressed, however, it is still not 100% what the implementation and executing arrangement will be. Therefore, the eventual technical clearance of this project, does not hold any approval of the actual execution arrangement.

Agency Response
IUCN - 21 April 2020

-

1. Addressed in section 6.
2. Addressed in section 6
3. Addressed. IUCN will only be the implementing agency while OMVG will take on the role of executing agency. This will ensure there is clear separation of duties related to project management and oversight, in full compliance with the GEF policy on that matter.
4. Addressed in section 6

.

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

(3/20/20)

1. Please separate these for both of the countries and provide information for both Guinea and Guinea Bissau. Please list the year/time span of the strategies and plans described.
2. Please include a summary/discussion of Water Resources Strategies of both countries. Same for other major water using sectors.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, the consistency with the national water resource management strategies seems to be missing or not very well articulated. Please strengthen.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

21/04/2020

Revised and completed, see the PIF.

National water strategies for each country added, see the PIF

IUCN – 23 October 2020

The section has been strengthened and is clearly outlined by country.

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
(3/20/20)

1. Please explain wording “conservation in the de stricto sense” and what that may mean for IUCN
2. Please refer to/align this section to proposed activities in component 3 (including, but not limited to a 1 % budget for participation in the IW:Learn related activities).

13th of October 2020 (cseverin):Partly

1) point one is still not addressed. Please explain "stricto sensu"

But KM activities are otherwise fairly well described at this point. but will need to be further developed and alignment with the IWLEARN KM framework further expanded on.

sufficiently at this point, but please work on KM strategy and alignment with the IWLEARN activities during the PPG.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

21/04/2020

All these comments have been addressed in the PIF

IUCN – 23 October 2020

The paragraph has been rephrased. Restoration has been added and conservation has been removed since this reflects better the project activities and theory of change.

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

13th of October 2020 (cseverin) Yes

Agency Response

Part 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

(3/20/20)

- The LOEs are signed by the right persons/OFPS, but the IW resources in each letter indicate a 50/50 split between the two countries which is not only against the spirit of the IW strategy but also makes little sense as many of the funds will not be spent on national level but for truly regional activities such as the TDA/SAP, flood early warning, and creation of the regional institutional set-up.

- The LOEs appear to indicate an unclear role and co-mingle of IUCN's role as GEF implementing agency and project execution functions.

Please obtain new LOEs over the entire IW amount requested for the project (without splitting resources by country) and clearly stating IUCN as *implementing* GEF agency.

13th October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

IUCN - 28 July 2020

- Addressed. New Letters of Endorsement have been requested and attached to this submission.
- Letters of Endorsement have been revised and make the separation clear between IUCN as the partner agency for this project and the executing agency (OMVG) as per the GEF guidelines on this matter.

Done

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

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC 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

(3/20/2020)

No. Please address comments above.

Also, please submit the PIF/concept stage safeguards screening incl. indicative safeguards rating.

13th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, Please address above comments.

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): No please address the comments and resubmit ASAP

23rd of October 2020 (cseverin): No Please address comment

28th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

26th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is recommended for technical clearance

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): No please address comments and resubmit ASAP

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

3/20/2020

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The Corubal River or the Koliba is a West African river shared between Guinea and Guinea Bissau. Its watershed covers 24,000 km² and is crossed by several climate-ecological zones. Its vegetation cover is diverse and largely constituted of rare and endangered species and diversified fauna. The Corubal watershed is an important reserve of freshwater for human consumption, agriculture (irrigation), fisheries and hydroelectricity development. Economic activities in the basin are steered by the sectors of agriculture, fisheries, forestry, livestock farming and various ecosystem services.

The primary objective of this GEF 7 IW project is to support Guinea and Guinea-Bissau in the development and establishment of institutional and regulatory frameworks for sustainable management of the Corubal river basin. This process will be facilitated through the development of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and the formulation of a Strategic Action Programme.

The establishment of enhanced transboundary institutional and regulatory frameworks will lead to transforming the practices in a sustainable manner. The project will support entrepreneurs in the water management, agricultural, energy and forestry sectors, for activities that are aimed at the protection and sustainable management of the shared water resources.

