

Management of Competing Water Uses and Associated Ecosystems in Pungwe, Busi and Save Basins

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9593

Countries

Regional

Project Name

Management of Competing Water Uses and Associated Ecosystems in Pungwe, Busi and Save Basins

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

11/23/2018

Review completed by PM

6/24/2020

Program Manager

Astrid Hillers

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/7/2018). There are significant changes between the PIF and endorsement stage documents that need to be addressed and/or explained further, incl.

- lack of addressing groundwater - which was an innovative activity in the PIF. Please note that the lack of attention to groundwater and conjunctive management no longer aligns with IW objective 2, program 3.

- lack of attention to drought and groundwater or drought warning overall
- the decrease in ambition in terms of e-flows and translating these into (basin-wide) policy and regulatory frameworks to the extent anticipated in the PIF (seems now limited to a few pilots)
- the lack of addressing e-flows and salination in the estuary
- decrease in clarity to operationalize data exchange provisions across the countries as relevant to the project
- lack of a clear connection of fund mobilization and a planned donor conference after SAP signature (which needs to be on ministerial level - please capture the latter clearly in the results framework)

(9/19/2019)

The revised submission is largely consistent with the PIF.

Does the recent cyclone and damage caused around Beira area require a need to readjust or re-prioritize any of the activities?

(10/28/2018) Noted. It would be useful to document/show who is expected to be providing support for the post-cyclone rebuilding of the hydromet network. e.g. the PPCR provided large sums in previous investment.

(3/2/2020) Comment addressed. **Cleared.**

Response to Secretariat comments

- The activities have been re-organised to follow the PIF logframe. Two activities - to assess groundwater and conjunctive management in hotspots have been added
- Activities on drought and flood warning were added
- E-flows assessment activities were revised to focus on e-flow determination in priority ecosystems and in options in improved dam flow management. Another activity on estuary management was added

14/10/2019

Not really, the project already focuses on early warning systems and mitigation strategies. These are priority focus areas, and they will blend in well with other indicatives that are responding to the cyclone impacts. However, some hydromet stations were damaged by the cyclone and may need substantive refurbishment

02/12/2020:

There are many efforts in the region to help the post cyclone recovery. Specifically, the UNOPS got a \$72million grant from the World Bank for Idai Recovery Projects, including refurbishing the early warning systems . Some further US\$24.5 million worth Post Cyclone Idai Emergency Recovery and Resilience Project (PCIREP), funded by AfDB, will also be implemented by the UNOPS

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/07/16/world-bank-supports-recovery-efforts-for-cyclone-affected-people-in-zimbabwe>

<https://www.afdb.org/en/news-and-events/press-releases/zimbabwe-african-development-bank-supports-post-cyclone-recovery-efforts-247-million-29442>

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/7/2018)

At this point the project design would benefit from being more clear and relate to the logical/results framework more clearly to track activities and outputs and achieve the suggested outcomes.

Component 1 (former 2) - Flood and drought

1. Flood and drought is lumped to a degree that does not make it credible how both will be addressed nor is there clarity on the different range of stakeholders for each. In terms of drought - the geographical extend, time of onset and duration, and likely stakeholders are expected to differ for flood and drought events. The project

is not clear in this. The PIF had a focus on floods and in terms of drought resilience focused on the amelioration of available water and enhancing of resilience via groundwater and therefore assessing the groundwater resources. This is no longer the case. Ambition and effort at present do not align well.

2. An operationalization of data exchange seems prerequisite for the transboundary cooperation and early warning on floods. Please address more clearly and include in the Results Framework (RF).

3. GEF IW funds overall are regional and not designed to finance national hydromet stations; national co-finance is required here. In the case of early warning one could see that some strategic stations from regional point of view (and with GEF support as needed) need to enhance national capacities in this regard. That said, there needs to be clear, demonstrated commitment from national agencies to contribute to the O&M costs during and after the project in order to not contribute to the frequent legacy (across projects in general) of defunct stations after a project closes.

4. Activity 1.2 (page 79) mentions the design of a Masterplan ? Will this be part of the project ?

5. Has the availability of full time counterpart staff been committed to. The country co-finance letters are supportive but not concrete on what staff for what activity and time (see pge 80). How will the project assure this from the onset?

6. It is unclear what the rationale and logic is for what early warning systems will be at basin scale and what in pilot basins and how these compare in terms of impact to the overall flood risks identified in the country (Pg 82) - please provide information and enhance this.

Component 2: Ecosystems (former component 3 - eflows)

1. Parts of this component need to be clarified - e.g. the general nature of "roadmaps for environmental concerns" and 'mainstreaming of environmental concerns' should be made more specific. Overall the component and sub-components alter between generality and highly specific and ambitious efforts which on the other hand are not reflected in the RF which is a key tool for project monitoring. E.g., such as (but not limited to) :

2. The project component text (page 86) mentions the ambition/stage e.g. for a 'transboundary water sharing framework' as part of the project - yet nowhere else is that reflected as an outcome or output or a process described on how to get there.

3. Similarly, component 2.3 does address data sharing for e-flows (but not flood warning ??). Please add in RF.

4. Another example: page 89 and somewhere down the line mention the need to the revision of dam operational rules as part of the e-flow design. Well noted especially as in the Save basin there are around 50 such dams, yet there is no clear process addressing such cooperation between infrastructure operators and water agencies in country and/or via the JWC at regional level.

Component 3. Integrated Basin planning (for component 1)

1. Please indicate in the RF that the SAP is to be signed by Ministers of both countries
2. Please refer to the IW-Learn TDA and SAP guidance and assure appropriate participatory processes for the TDA and SAP (and budget for it).
3. Clarity on the process and timeline for the TDA is essential in order to allow its early completion allowing time to inform SAP formulation.
4. The KM budget seems low given that 1 % of the project grant (and please indicate this in the budget) is to be designated for IW-learn related activities (incl. website, min. of two experience notes; participation in two global IW conferences, and in regional meetings). Other KM funds relevant to the project should supplement this.

Cross-cutting issues:

Gender:

- The project design does not address gender dimensions in terms of flood and drought vulnerability and gender differentiated involvement in the project activities.
- The RF is to large degree void of gender differentiated indicators.
- Please submit a gender analysis/action plan associated with the project.

Stakeholders:

- there is insufficient clarity on key stakeholders (types and numbers) for each component. Please address and provide detail in terms of anticipated involvement and impacts (by type and # of stakeholders) - e.g. in the flood early warning - incl impacts on settlements, larger private sector partners (beyond community level farming)

Budget:

- there are large allocations for "TA" for e.g. 1.9, 2.5., and 3.3. etc. to set up "technical assistance for component ...implementation". This suggest a number of consultancies and it is not clear how project sustainability is guaranteed. Please clarify and provide a clear sustainability plan/exit strategy for the project.

Results Framework

- There is a recurring mismatch between key activities mentioned in the text and what is reflected in the Results Framework. Please aim for a better match. This starts with easy figures of "number of PSC meetings/year" to "commitments to address the coordination of dam operations with e-flows".

Sustainability and exit strategy:

- the project design needs to be much more clear what institutional structures it leaves behind and how sustainability of the activities on national and regional level are envisioned and will be assured via commitments from countries.

- Contracting GWP as a regional executing agency in this case has the merit in addressing Council concerns on the lack of financial controls in one of the countries. The risk though increases to a lack of how project activities will be embedded in the countries and maintained after project closure. Project design needs to be clear in this especially with regard to the flood and drought management/early warning efforts.

Clarity of project description could be much improved

- there is much text and work shown in the project design, but clarity and logic of flow could be further improved and would significantly clarify what the project does and how it is implemented.

Portal endorsement request:

- Please make an effort to more comprehensively address ALL sections in the endorsement request and attach related documents (e.g. on gender). Some of the sections are meager. Please feel free to ask for a discussion with GEFSEC to aid in this.

- Please note that the portal ask for project duration in months not years.

9/19/2019

Most of the comments have been addressed and the project mostly rewritten. Thank you for making a real effort to address comments.

Please address the following:

- **Please fill out ALL sections in the portal** and not just include reference to look things up in the project document (.e.g. including the results framework, maps/geo-locations etc.) - see previous comment. Please let us know if any technical difficulties exist with the Portal to do so and we'll be ready to assist.

- **Executing agency:** Please note that GWP is not listed in Part 1/basic information as one of the executing entities. Again, if tech assistance is needed to make changes between PIF and endorsement in the 'basic information ' fields, please let us know.

- Please address the previous comment on an "**exit strategy**" on GWP and what institutional structures will be expected at the end of the project to sustain activities. Based on baseline and parallel efforts funded by development partners there appears useful synergies to address this, but the project should clearly outline an end of project exit strategy e.g. in section 5 Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements). Please also address in that section the concerns raised in Council with regard to assuring funds are used within the project control/project procurement and not channeled to certain government entities directly.

- The **Results Framework** needs strengthening (pg 9) and better correspondence to the well written logical framework - page 80 onwards.

> Currently, the Results framework seems to be reduced to simple 'counting' of items, which in some cases works but in others is utterly inadequate. e.g. Activity 1.2. addresses to "operationalize *efficient* exchange of data between the riparians for *flood and drought warning* systems". The Results Framework simply counts exchanges and gives a target of "2". Please enhance the indicators.

> the Results framework (pg 9 of prodoc) is lacking baseline information.

> Please review for adequate ambition of target values (even where there are simple counts). Just as example: an increase of staff trained on e-flows is given as + 2. Is that sufficient ?

> Please provide sex dis-aggregated indicators/targets where applicable.

- **Gender:** Please assure that gender aspects are evident within the project component description and key relevant gender aspects are at very least highlighted to assure that project implementation will take such into account.

- **Hydromet Stations** - to reiterate that GEF International Waters usually *does not fund hydromet stations*. In our experience regionally funded and operated stations have little lifetime past the project timeline, are often not aligned with national needs and hence countries tend to not commit and budget for O&M costs (and often no MOUs are put in place to assure this ahead of installation). This project on the other hand suggests to spend substantial budget for high cost, automated equipment (who will service these and avoid vandalism?) at 12 * 50 K, i.e. USD 600 K. This needs revisiting and discussion with GEFSEC. Further it should be noted that the outlined baseline projects have already put in place substantial equipment (such as e.g. the recent GFDRR support for Mozambique (USD 21 million) as well as PPCR support).

- **Budget** - The budgeted amounts for International consultants (900 USD/day) and flight costs (2900.-/travel) are of course only *budgeted* figures (and not actuals) and may be based on being conservative in budgeting in case these are firms and not individuals to be hired and possible distant travel. Nevertheless, please *exert oversight in implementation* for adequate fees and IUCN procedures for economy travel. Second, please note that the budget for the TDA development given participatory/consultation and participation appears quite tight.

- **e-flow:** The revisions and outline including in the annex (with regard to pilot area selection) and the fact that capacity building on e-flows is enhanced by BRIDGE co-finance is appreciated. Two things to please clarify/confirm: (i) in pilot/sub-basin areas where dams are part of the area (e.g. in Save basin) agreement on e-flows needs to include modifications of dam operating rules and hence dialogue with ministers of energy and dam operators. These are not listed in the stakeholders for the project so far. (ii) clarification that the e-flow determination will highlight needs for adequate flow regimes (incl mimicking natural fluctuations) and not mere minimum flows (and possibly no needed fluctuations to support fish and other migrations).

- **Groundwater.** Please *consider* partnering/involving SADC-GMI expertise as regional center of expertise in the groundwater work.

- **M&E costs** - it is noted that you distributed the costs across components. That is acceptable and the summary table on pgs 129/130 appreciated to summarize these efforts in one place. *Just note:* another approach would be to include an M&E component and this may simplify in budgeting and implementation. Neither would add to the PMC.

(10/28/2019)

1. Previous comment: "**Please fill out ALL sections in the portal**" : previous comment not addressed. The CEO endorsement is a free-standing document that will be provided to the public and the Council. Please assure it is readable and all sections are filled out. Thank you.

2. Previous comment: "**Executing agency**" and "**Executing partner type**" : Please note that GWP is not listed in Part 1/basic information as one of the executing entities. Again, if tech assistance is needed to make changes between PIF and endorsement in the 'basic information ' fields, please let us know so we can assist from IT side. " Previous comment not addressed.

Please also note that text on page 120 with respect to the role of IUCN needs clarification/revision as it indicates/leaves leeway for partial execution by IUCN which is against the aim of GEF policies and guidelines for separation of implementing and executing agency roles (see e.g. formulation in the prodoc: "IUCN will support the Executing Agency to ensure execution of administrative and financial matters and will assist in key technical and scientific issues. The IUCN role will also be to consolidate results with national governments. ..."

Throughout the document - incl. the section on Implementation Arrangements" - please assure that there is clarity that neither IUCN headquarters nor country offices are taking any part in project execution, confirm that IUCN HQ and country office staff is only paid out of the GEF agency fee (not project grant), and neither IUCN HQ nor IUCN country offices are performing any project procurement functions in behalf of the project executing agency/the project.

3. Previous comment: **Exit strategy:**

There is still no clear outline of the arrangements and finance of the regional activities post project closure (incl. food and drought warning). This should be e.g. also addressed in section 4.9 /Sustainability. While the review sheet mentions that the PMU will be in ARA-Centro and is 'envisioned to continue to operate', there is no clarity on "how" and no mention of a strategy for countries to commit finance and/or staff for regional activities. Would it make sense to outline elements of an exit strategy (and finance for regional institutional structures) and anchor these as an explicit - and hence trackable - project output?

4. Previous comment: **Results Framework:** The majority of comments have not been addressed. Please also note (and add in RF) that the SAP needs to be endorsed by at least one minister from each country. In addition, please add IW_learn cooperation/participation both in the RF and in the budget as per regular practice in IW finance (at least 1 % of GEF grant).

5. Previous comment: **Gender:** The answer provided is inadequate. The project engages e.g. in component 1 (just as an example) in flood vulnerability assessments and in community early warning and resilience. It seems very unlikely that there are no gender aspects to vulnerability, flood warning and to increasing resilience. Furthermore, all training and participation processes (e.g. such as in the TDA and SAP development) would need to assure that both genders are adequately consulted and are providing input.

6. Previous comment re. Regional **hydromet stations:** not addressed. Please discuss with GEFSEC to make sure the comment is understood. There are only very rare exceptions in which GEF IW funds should finance hydromet stations (and if so then MOUs with country counterparts would need to be assured before such installation and provide commitment from countries to cover O&M costs of these stations).

7. Previous comment on **Budget:** I do not see a response on the comments made above (review mid September).

8. Previous comment **e-flows:** comment (i) is sufficiently addressed when combining the main document and methodology note in Annex 10. Comment (ii) is not addressed and while the Save basin may be difficult to address due to the # of HP dams already being operated (as noted in Annex 10), a couple of other dam sites in the Pungwe basin are being proposed and would need to address dam operation. Please add dam operators as stakeholders and mention in the e-flow annex and stakeholder section for these sites that modification to dam operating procedures may need to be modified to assure season dependent e-flow regimes.

9. Previous comment: **Groundwater:** No response found in the review sheet or changes in revised Portal submission or the agency prodoc. As the SADC GMI is supporting several basins e.g. in including groundwater in basin frameworks, it would be a natural fit to engage SADC-GMI in the project.

In fact -as many portal sections are incompletely filled: there is no section on coordination with ongoing regional/national GEF and non-GEF projects during implementation. This should be part of section A 6 of the endorsement submission and a section on "Coordination" should also be part of the agency project document.

10. Previous comment: **M&E:** In addition to the component references, please add the budget figures to the M&E plan and M&E table in Section 7 of the prodoc (now page 132). Please assure that these figures can be easily traced to the budget/respective budget lines/sub-components and the PMC. For example, there is an activity 4.5 listed in the M& E activity table on page 132, but no activity 4.5 in the budget table of the excel spreadsheet.

11. Please note that **your previous response indicates that component 1 now separates flood and drought** risk activities (assessment, early warning and response activities). That does not seem to be the case despite the difference in the data and data frequency of exchanges needed, difference in vulnerable locations and vulnerable groups, difference in response times and hence alert systems needed, and differences to type of community responses. Please address.

(3/2/2020) Several comments have not been or not been fully addressed. The numbering below retains the numbering as per the last comments of October 2019:

1. Comment addressed (though note that the section Part II/1. Project Description is not providing this but comments on changes since PIF).

2. Not addressed. Please let me know if GEF IT needs to aid to update the "Executing Partner" and "Executing Partner Type" to include GWP along with the government agencies. See previous.

3. Insufficiently addressed unless a process on how the PMU *"will transition into a the long planned tri-basin institution (RBO), funded by the member states that will have a mandate to manage financial and project activities in the basin"* (as per IUCN response) is outlined and addressed during the project.

4. Not addressed. Please see comments of September and October 2019. While there have been some enhancement of indicators, all other comments raised are still valid and need addressing (e.g. lack of baseline, ambition (e.g. +2 on e-flow), clarity and relevance of indicators (see e.g. indicator for political commitment on wetland conservation expressed as "newspaper articles" ?? or a combination of three indicators for 1.2.1. male/female staff trained; number of operational SMS warnings; and number of local committees trained into ONE target of "60". Further [IW:Learn](#) participation is still lacking; SAP endorsement add "by at least one Minister of each country". Also, sex differentiated indicators are lagging in the logframe.)

5. IUCN tool use noted -yet, some clear consideration of gender roles in the project component design would have been a much appreciated.

6. Noted and exception due to the exceptional character/impact of hurricane IDA is warranted, yet support from AfDB, World Bank and the IDA Recovery Project (IRP) which have large resources designated to this should be maximized where possible.

7. O.k. based on endorsement request which states that the TDA budget was intentionally low as the work can build on the existing monographs.

8. o.k. and response noted.

9. o.k and response noted.

10. **Only partly addressed.** (i) Please note previous comment to include budget figures (in \$) in table 11 and make these easily traceable to the budget. (ii) Also, please note that the audits should be contracted by the regional executing agency as these are paid out of the project funds not the agency fee.

11. **Explanation is insufficient.** Yes, both flood and drought are weather and climate related risks, yet differ, including e.g. : (1) flood is fast onset and riverine (besides flash floods); drought is slow onset. Hence warning mechanisms differ. (2) differ in terms of affected groups/stakeholder types; (3) differ in affected geographies. Response strategies therefore will differ as well.

(5/12/2020)

Most comments have been addressed. Please address remaining issues on the logframe (comment 4) now and address bullets noted below during the inception phase. Furthermore, with regard to M&E framework, please address questions in question 9:

Re comment 4 (address at resubmission):

i) Outputs 1.1.1 (Improved water resources monitoring ..):

- Second indicator (Number of meteorological stations..): Please revise means of verification (annual reports; users manual) to something more operationally tangible/timely

- Third indicator (Frequency of data exchange): Baseline and target do not make sense. The values given are "1" and "2" and do not provide any indication of frequency of data exchanges (e.g. such as for example: in type/quantity of data exchanged per month or similar)

ii) Output 1.2.1: Capacities for flood and drought management strengthened

- Indicator on Number of SMS warnings: end of +5 SMS warnings seems utterly inadequate. This may just be a wording issue. Please revise to something appropriate (e.g. X SMS /per day in Y number of flood seasons? or something along those lines as you see is the best indicator and also end of project target in this case)

During the *inception phase* please address:

- a. Get confirmation of counterpart staff needed for all activities (see pg 82 and 87 in TC prodoc; this is implied /assumed but needs written confirmation from government before any e.g. installation of equipment should occur)
- b. Establish a structured/operational partnership arrangement with SADC GMI to support groundwater management capacity and provide technical advice
- c. Develop a clearer plan on the difference of community engagement/community EWSs and response mechanisms being put in place for community preparedness for flood (fast onset) versus drought (slow onset)
- d. On drought affected 'sectors' (page 89 TC prodoc): consider - where relevant - coordination and conflict mitigation needs between pastoralists and farmers especially in times of drought
- e. Environmental flows: make clear to all stakeholders that e-flows are not simple/static minimum flows (text talks about "allocations") but it is important to maintain seasonal variations to allow for ecosystems functions to be maintained

(5/18/2020) Comments re the logframe/indicators have been addressed. **Cleared.**

Response to Secretariat comments

Component 1

1) flood and drought risk activities were separated, and risk response is now focused on strengthening community early warning systems
-assessment of groundwater resources to mitigate drought risk was added (Activity 2.2)

2) Activity 1.2 now focused entirely on data exchange

3 & 6) the revised work mode will ensure that monitoring stations used will only be for basin-wide data gathering, not for national purposes

4) Activity revised - designing of Masterplan will not be an objective of the project

5) The availability of staff is being considered and committed to in the final version. Staff is available within respective basin agencies but the protocol to secure their commitment is bureaucratic and long. However, an understanding was reached that this is necessary

Component 2

- 1) Component revised to one outcome to specifically focus on improved water ecosystems
- 2) this framework was revised and scope is now limited only to e-flow regulation (Activity 2.6)
- 3) Activity added
- 4) Activity revised to focus on trade-offs and options for improved flow management

Component 3

- 1) Indication has been added
- 2) The necessary participation processes were added
- 3) TDA and SAP activities will be carried out successively (Activities 3.1 and 3.2) under the component 3

4) Budget will be reviewed to provide more funds for KM.

Gender:

Project interventions are mostly at strategic level and as such, does not have specific gender sensitive indicators. However, the project recognizes that women are under-represented in positions of responsibility within civil society organizations and local institutions, and face significant barriers to securing resource rights.

The activities proposed have been defined in view of involving men and women equally. As such, all local community engagements – training, awareness raising and consultations, will be gender inclusive. Any adaptation measures and mitigation actions, including equipment and infrastructure, will consider equitable gender access.

Stakeholders:

Stakeholders identified in the PIF were analysed and their roles clarified - Table 12

Budget:

These activities were revised and technical assistance will be integrated with the organisational management unit (the PMU), which will remain capacitated to function beyond the life of the project.

Results Framework:

RF was revised to ensure a tight sync between activities in the entire document

Sustainability and exit strategy

The PMU, being established by the GWP project, will be used in this project and is envisaged to continue operating after project closure and it will be housed in ARA-CENTRO. Capacity built in the project will facilitate the establishment of the unit

Clarity of project description could be much improved

The revision of the prodoc was added more clarity to the project description

Portal endorsement request:

The request is noted and will be honoured prudently

02/12/2020

1. Done. Gender paragraph added page 80 in prodoc, and GReACT in Annex 13. For the section C on M&E, a budget has now been provided
2. We confirm that IUCN will play the role of an implementing agency, providing oversight and supervision to the executing agency. The selection of the Global Water Partnership as the project-executing agency provides clear separation of functions.
3. Paragraph added in 4.9. The PMU will transition into a the long planned tri-basin institution (RBO), funded by the member states that will have a mandate to manage financial and project activities in the basin.
4. We are very reluctant to have this clause in the SAP, for purely practical reasons. Lending the process to a political decision, that neither IUCN nor the executing agency can control, can make things very difficult. If what we are seeking here is the adoption of the SAP by member states, it is much more feasible, and practically relevant, to do this at a joint policy dialogue/workshop with senior department officials.
5. IUCN will employ its GReACT gender assessment tool (Appendix 13 in the prodoc) for project implementation. This will monitor and report on gender inclusivity – a key component of all IUCN projects as stated on page 80 of the prodoc.
6. Both ZINWA and ARA CENTRO already had hydromet stations. Most of these were destroyed by the cyclone, but they were owned and managed by these basin entities. As such, refurbishment of the stations is meant to make them functional again, but they will still be operated and maintained by the basin agencies. An MoU will be signed at national level to ensure that the stations are maintained.
7. Component has been now selected as “INV” to reflect the investment component of this work in Table B.
8. Dam operators added in the stakeholders section and annex. As far as dam operation procedures are concerned, we limit ourselves to assessments that determine the trade-offs and options for improved flow management because IUCN is exempt from dam operations procedures by GEF rules.

9. We are aware of the critical role that SADC-GMI, and other regional bodies, can play in the implementation of the project's various components. As such, we have been reaching out and discussing with all these organisations. However, their roles will be specified in the implementation agreement with the EA, not in the prodoc. For example, the SADC-GMI has an ongoing conjunctive water management programme in the region, which is a perfect fit for activities 2.2 and 3.4

The project will work in tandem with current projects – BRIDGE 4 and the Idai Recovery Project, with joint implementations wherever possible. Work done under previous projects will also inform the implementation of this project. A coordination section was added on page 105 detailing this synergy.

10. Budget figures added. And the activity 4.5 is corrected to 4.3

11. Flood and drought activities, while assessed by differing measures, are not separable as they are both indicators of varying weather extremes. Outcome 1.1 focuses on floods and droughts management and mitigation of related risks and Outcome 1.2 focuses on improved national and transboundary capacity for integrated management of floods and droughts

IUCN – 04/14/2020

2. GWP has been added in the “executing partner” box and qualified as “multilateral” as per the options available in the drop box menu in the portal. 3. The envisaged strategy is to use the project implementation period to create capacity for a River Basin Organization, which the countries are already discussing - independent of this project. At project closure, the staff, equipment and operational procedures secured by the PMU will be directly taken up by the incoming RBO (given the advanced discussions between the riparians, this RBO may actually come in before project closure). Text in the prodoc was amended to reflect this in section 4.10.2.

4. The logframe has been updated to reflect the obtaining baseline and relevant indicators including IW Learn. Budget was updated

5. Section 4.2 on the core principles of the project has been updated. Each one of the outcomes of the project have an output, which will be measured in respect to gender equality (1.2.1, 2.1.2 and 3.1.2). The project will ensure that gender equality is being achieved and, as a general principle, will pay attention to having most vulnerable groups benefit from the project outcomes. Component 1 has been updated to have specific responses/mechanisms to floods that are differentiated from droughts where necessary.

10. Budget figures added to the table 11 on M&E and linked to activities

IUCN – 05/15/2020

Addressed in the new version of the ProDoc submitted (in track change and clean version)

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/7/2018)

Cost effectiveness:

This point can truly be addressed only in a revised submission (see points above).

(9/15/2019) Yes, project delivery for budget is high and based on cooperation and building on ongoing and past investments in the region by government and supported by IUCN and development partners.

(10/30/2019) The request and justification for an increased PMC of 5.8 % for this regional project is reasonable and acceptable.

(3/2/2020) Transaction costs of regional projects are higher and the need for a regional executing intermediary is adding transaction costs. As per above already commented: **Cleared.**

(6-4-2020) We note that the GEF grant is paying for 4*4 vehicles. While it is preferred that co-finance and not GEF grants in most cases should pay for vehicles, *the use of GEF grant is allowable in this case based on country circumstances and especial hard hit regions from cyclon in 2019 and hardship and financial stains in the countries related to this.* The project though will require access to and need to reach remote locations. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments See revisions made above

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2018:

Please enhance the risk section, e.g.

- when is the project design response to 'political instability' project cancellation?
- Is the project design adequate if the risk that it outstrips the available capacities and skills is ranked as "high". Please comment.

(9/15/2029)

Risks to project (page 98). (i) The mitigation measure to address staff turn over and institutional turn-over seem inadequate - if staff turns over why not directors and managers of government? Does this only refer to project staff and why? (ii) security and stability in the region: mitigation measures may be hard to put in place even if staff may anticipate these. how will the project then react? (iii) Please address climate risks.

(10/28/2029) Response noted. **Cleared.**

Response to Secretariat comments

Noted. The level of risk is revised, however, project design remains adequate.

14/10/2019

i) Turnover refers to all staff, including directors and managers. IUCN, as project implementer, has no influence over government staff tenure, but efforts will be made, in the capacity building components of the project, to include a broader team of staff in order to avoid gaps should some staff members leave ii) Security in the riparian states is constant for more than three decades. While some conflicts flare up every now and then in Mozambique, these have been very minor and disperse,

and concerned only with electoral contests. The civil unrest in the country ended many years back. Further, project implementation will be done through the existing basin agencies, who have a continuous presence in the sites, with state security backing

iii)the climate risk is explained in detail under item 11.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/7/2018)

Co-finance:

- please comment on the lack of anticipated Sida grant funds which were expected at PIF stage..
- please submit the co-finance letter from GRID arendal.
- please adjust the Zimbabwe co-finance to reflect only what is part of the alternative and to not include any projects with potential safeguards risks (such as larger dams for which IUCN cannot certify environmental and social impacts).
- please change the Mozambique co-finance part of which is listed as "grant". Please also note earlier comment for need of commitment of staff for specific activities (not a general statement).

(9/15/2029)

Please review that all co-finance letters match table 6 figures and provide one file including all respective letters of co-finance to avoid confusion. e.g. right now we have a file for BRIDGE providing 698 745.- figure while table C lists a different amount; the co-finance from Moz of 416,800 in the letter of co-finance seems to be missing from table C. One consolidated file with the latest letters that match table C would be real helpful. Thank you.

(10/18/2019) Please provide a consolidated file as requested above and assure match with table C. (e.g. there is a letter from Moz which is not captured in table C). Please also add an explanatory note to the country co-finance that would detail what staff positions are provided as in-kind co-finance so that this in-kind co-finance (staff, offices (where? what?) and vehicles mentioned) can be tracked by IUCN and the project executing agency and reported on at mid-term and terminal project evaluations.

(3/2/2020) The added section and detail on pages 77/78 is extremely useful. Please also file the compilation of letters of co-finance letter (file you created) in the portal.

- Please add Mozambique's co-finance of USD 416 800.- in Table C of the endorsement request (see already previous comment).

- Kindly just confirm that indeed all of the USD 33.175 million of the Zimbabwe SECA project are relevant co-finance per the GEF definition or reduce to relevant amount.

(5/12/2020) Comments addressed. **Cleared.**

(6-4-2020) Addendum to co-finance review:

1. Co-financing letters from IUCN/BRIDGE, CRIDF and GRID (three first entries) have the right amounts but they do not specify the type of co-finance (in-kind). An email from each entity confirming the co-finance type is acceptable (instead of new signed letters).

2. We could not find letters of Co-finance for GCF/UNDP or SADC/GIZ/BMZ/DFID. Please submit/resubmit. Also, one co-financing type is missing (in table C).

(6-24-2020)

1. Confirmation of co-finance has been provided for the three sources of co-finance. Cleared.

2. We understand that some of the co-finance did not materialize (and one project meanwhile closed). We note the revised co-finance which remains at a satisfactory level. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

-Anticipated SIDA funds did not materialise

-Country co-finance letters was revised

- GRID co-finance letter is available

14/10/2019

This has been corrected. Co-finance is all listed in Table 13.

02/12/2020

This has been revised.

The explanatory note on country co-finance was added in the prodoc p.77. A file with co-finance letters is created and ready to share.

04/14/2020 - IUCN

All co-financing letters have been already uploaded in the portal. In addition, they have been sent by e-mail to the GEF programme manager to ensure these are on file.

We hereby confirm that the co-financing from Zimbabwe SECA is relevant to the GEF project.

IUCN - 10 June 2020

- 1) The cofinancing related to these projects has been removed because projects have not happened or are closing. Project document has been updated accordingly.
- 2) Mails of the nature of the co-financing (in-kind) have been shared.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2018:

As the project has been submitted past July 1, 2018, only core indicators are required. Table F is correctly addressing the # of basins as "3".

Please adjust the Rio Markers (in taxonomy) such that there is only one Rio Marker set of each "adaptation" and "mitigation".

(10/28/2019) Please resubmit the tracking tool. It is mentioned that it was submitted as separate file. Thank you.

(3/2/2020) Cleared. Core indicators filled out and additional tracking tool submitted. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Addressed

02/12/2020

Attached to the submission

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2018:

Related projects are listed and a gap analysis is provided. Please consider to invite PMs of key related project as observers to annual PSC meetings.

Cleared.

(10/28/2019) Please note the earlier comment on a section on coordination with the implementation arrangements (section A.6 or portal and this should also be included in the prodoc and address how the project will coordinate and see synergies with the listed ongoing projects).

(3/2/2020) The inclusion of additional information and section on coordination in the prodoc is well noted. Please also explore coordination/synergies with relevant GEF non-IW financed national level activities *during the inception phase*. For now, please also include the description of the main initiatives the project will be coordinated with (see prodoc section) in section A.6 of the portal.

(5/12/2020) Comment addressed. **Cleared.**

Response to Secretariat comments

02/12/20 - IUCN

Done - See response under comment 1.9

IUCN - 04/14/2020

Section A.6 of the portal has been updated. A full section has been included on how the project will coordinate with other projects and initiatives on the ground.

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2018:

Yes, M&E included "component by component" and budgeted.

Please summarize in a table across components to allow an overview of the overall project M&E arrangements.

(9/15/2019)

Summary provided pg 129 onwards. See also earlier comment (under 2).

(10/28/2019) - see earlier comment.

(3/2/2020) See earlier comment under question 2. item 10.

(5/12/2020) Please address two comments:

1. In table 11 in the M&E section: Please delete IUCN from row 4 ("Tripartite review ..."): as written it would mean that IUCN uses PMC budget, which cannot be the case.
2. Independent external evaluation: should be hired by the Executing Agency (here GWP) not the implementing agency (i.e. not by IUCN)

(5/18/2020) The two comments have been addressed in the project document. Please make the same corrections in the M&E section of the portal (table and please check and correct the paras/text above table 11 too).

(5/19/2020) Comment addressed. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Noted. M&E tasks spread along components, and not in Project Management Costs, to comply with PM cost ceiling set by GEF

02/12/20

Done under 1.10

IUCN – 04/14/2020

Addressed. See response to question 2 and updated table 11 on M&E.

IUCN - 05/14/2020

OK. Done

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/7/2018)

See comment on KM above and expand on the KM engagement in more detail, incl. partnering with ANBO and covering additional activities beyond IW learn participation (see GEF Sec comments at PIF stage).

(9/19/2029)

Comment addressed. Cleared.

(10/28/2019) see earlier comment on **budget** for IW learn activities and need for at least 1% of the IW grant to be allocated to IW Learn related activities.

(3/2/2020) Please point out where in the budget/under which component above ([IW:Learn](#)) is budgeted and send revised budget. Thank you.

Comment addressed and IW:Learn deliverables and cooperation clearly outlined in the prodoc. **Cleared.**

Response to Secretariat comments

Noted

IUCN – 04/14/2020

This is in component 3, Activity 3.6. Please refer to page 97 in prodoc, where this activity is described

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/7/2018)

Not entirely, e.g. see comments given to be addressed by endorsement (in the PIF stage review sheet) related to:

- private sector stakeholders in the Beira growth corridor,
- urbanization and associated risks,
- addressing coastal mangroves and their role as fish and crustacean habitats and spawning grounds.

(9/15/2029)

Comments addressed. **Cleared.**

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2018

No. Please address.

(9/15/2029)

STAP comments have been responded to but the answers lack to address a clear answer on the expected impacts of climate change on the water-food-energy-ecosystems dimensions. Please provide some responses - despite data uncertainty in the region a large number of baseline projects (which are listed) should provide some information based on existing models and trends (e.g. on flooding and cyclones occurrences at the coast, including the latest cyclone).

(10/28/2019) this needs to be discussed. As mentioned and is common to IW finance, GEF regional funds do only in exceptions fund hydromet stations due to consistent problems with sustainability. See earlier comment.

(3/2/2020) addressed in comment under question 2. **Cleared.**

Response to Secretariat comments

14/10/2019

This issue was actually covered in the paragraph dedicated to Climate Change impacts in the Global Environment Problem section (section 3.2, p27 of the ProDoc). This section relies on the conclusions of research works of Conway D. et al: “Climate and southern Africa’s water-energy-food nexus”, 2015. This section has been further detailed and climate change impacts on water -including extreme events such as flooding and cyclones -, ecosystems, food production and energy production dimensions were explicated (same section, see p.28 to p.30 of the ProDoc), based on the same publication and on the projections provided by the World Bank webportal dedicated to climate change impacts.

Elements on the impacts of the 2019 Idai cyclone have been added.

STAP review at PIF stage (May 11th, 2017)	
<i>Secretariat comment</i>	<i>Agency response</i>
<p>1. To complement the thorough description of the biophysical factors being threatened by environmental degradation and climate change, STAP recommends describing the socio-economic context of the affected populations living along the Beira Corridor. This information is important in order to understand the population's abilities to cope with climate change, adopt, or adapt, practices that are drought and flood resilient.</p>	<p>Information on the socio-economic context of populations in the basin has been collected, with a particular focus on the pilot sites to be identified, and gathered in the dedicated sections “Socio-economic context” and “Threats, roots causes and barriers analysis” of the Project Document. The Beira city services have developed a Climate Change Adaptation Plan, considered as a reference planning document in the region.</p> <p>In addition, activity 2.1 will consist in further assessing the ecosystems services and the livelihoods of the local populations.</p>
<p>2. STAP suggests detailing the impact of climate variability on the water, energy, food nexus, which the project aims to use as a framework for improving ecosystem based management across the three river basins. This includes highlighting the role of climate change as a driver in the nexus, and identifying actions based on the linkages between climate variability, and resource management. In this respect, STAP also suggests providing details of climate change projections in the target area, or in the region. IUCN may want to refer to the following paper on the connections between climate and the water, energy, food nexus in southern Africa: Conway, D. et al. (2015). "Climate and southern Africa's water-energy-food nexus". The authors of this paper argue convincingly that in southern Africa the physical and socioeconomic exposure to climate impact is especially significant and is crucial in local economies and livelihoods.</p>	<p>The impacts of climate change and variability have been synthesized in the context section of the Project Document, including the recommended paper and references.</p> <p>In that respect, activities 1.1 and 1.2 will be dedicated to the strengthening of hydro-meteorological monitoring networks in the 3 basins and to the processing of generated baseline data for display in a real-time information system. These timeseries and information systems will characterize the impact of climate variability on the water resources and their uses in the 3 basins.</p>

<p>3. An aspect of the project that will need to be addressed more fully as the project is developed is the role of indigenous (local) technical knowledge. This is more specific than the stakeholder and community involvement mentioned in the proposal. The Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies in South Africa estimates, for example, that indigenous farmer-saved seeds which farmers have been improving and adapting to local conditions over many years, currently constitute about 70% of seeds used in Mozambique.</p> <p>Top-down modernisation of agricultural development rarely includes the livelihood (and often climate resilience) of local practices; yet attention to local knowledge encourages farmer participation and support to conservation of ecosystems. This will be especially critical in the project achieving its ambitious target of 120 million hectares in sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest). Advice especially on the importance in southern Africa rangelands of addressing local economies in transiting from land degradation to sustainable land management has been published and could give a useful guide to developing project components: Reed, M.S. et al (2015) Reorienting land degradation towards sustainable land management: Linking sustainable livelihoods with ecosystem services in rangeland systems. <i>Journal of Environmental Management</i> 151:472-485.</p>	<p>Indigenous knowledge has been fully integrated into the proposed approach, especially regarding flood management. The development strategy of the community-based early warning systems is based on indigenous knowledge developed by vulnerable communities and on scientific tools implemented by national administrations.</p>
<p>4. It is unclear what contributions the project will make towards addressing water pollution in the Beira Corridor. Conflicts between local farmers and artisanal miners have already occurred in Manicaland and along the borders between Mozambique and Zimbabwe. STAP recommends that the project contribute towards a baseline measuring the contaminants in the rivers, doing so will improve ecosystem functioning in the three river basins, and therefore, the project's effectiveness in addressing the water, food, energy nexus.</p>	<p>The water quality concerns emerged as priority from the discussions held during the PPG mission. In addition the PP2 program has carried out water quality monitoring campaigns. The project, through activity 2.7, will support water quality monitoring to enable the local administration relying on an operational plan to tackle this priority concern in the targeted basins</p>
<p>5. STAP recommends that the project detail how the project will contribute towards addressing the knowledge gap on the impact of climate change on drought, or water availability. One possibility is for component 2 to focus on acquiring baseline data on hydrological responses to climate. Learning generated in this regard should be included under knowledge management. The following paper highlights knowledge gaps and research needs on understanding further the impacts of climate change on water resources in Mozambique and Zimbabwe: Kusangaya, S. et al. (2014). "Impacts of climate change on water resources in southern Africa: a review". <i>Physics and Chemistry of the Earth</i> 67-69 (2014) 47-54.</p>	<p>Activities 1.1 and 1.2 will be dedicated to the strengthening of hydro-meteorological monitoring networks in the 3 basins and to the processing of generated baseline data for display in a real-time information system. These timeseries and information systems will characterize the impact of climate variability on the water resources and their uses in the 3 basins.</p>

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2018

No. Please address comments from German Council member.

(9/15/2019) Only partially addressed . Please respond to comments with regard to fisheries. Fro our/GEFSEC side: The project cannot address all regional and national needs and some of the these will be addressed only in the TDA and SAP actions which will be prioritized by the countries and can only be addressed in a set of next investments for SAP implementation.

For easy reference, except from German Council member comments:

The project documents should incorporate the promotion of sustainable fisheries in their component 3 design (transboundary environmental flow policy and regulatory framework [...] strengthened). These interventions should be fully in line and actively assisting the implementation of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) as well as the FAO-Voluntary Guidelines on Small Scale Fisheries (VGSSF). □ The project should actively seek for more synergies gained from exchanging lessons learned as well as aligning activities with other international projects in the region, like the SADC fisheries programme (2015-2020) active in the management of shared [inland] fisheries resources at the Zambezi River Basin. □ In order to ensure synergies and complementarity, Germany kindly requests to coordinate with two related projects implemented by GIZ on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ): o The bilateral project “Adapting to climate change in Mozambique” also works with the National Directorate for Water Affairs and the ARA-Centro. It supports the development of national framework conditions and actions within the catchment of the Buzi River to adapt to the impacts of climate change on water resources. It uses i.a. approaches and experiences based on GTZ projects on Disaster Risk and Flood management that date back to 2005, which are mentioned in the IUCN/GEF proposal (PIF doc, p. 12). o The regional “Transboundary water management in SADC“, co-financed by the UK Department for International Development (DFID). It supports the implementation

(10/28/2019) We requested a full response to the comments of the German Council member and had provided (for easy reference) the Council comments. Please provide a response to all points raised by the Council member.

(3/3/2020) See previous comment. Please respond to the comments from the German Council member.

<https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/Compilation%20of%20Council%20Comments%20-%20May%202017%20Work%20Program.pdf>

(5/12/2020) See previous comment. Please include the response to the Council member comment in Annex B of the Endorsement Request.

(5/18/2020) Comment addressed. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Secretariat Review at PIF stage (23th August 2016)	
<i>Secretariat comment</i>	<i>Agency response</i>
At endorsement stage/during project design: please expand on alignment with relevant national strategies in key sectors in more detail.	The dedicated section “Consistency with national priorities and plans” has been further detailed and updated.
Baseline: please expand the consideration of 'baseline' to not only address regional but also relevant national activities	The achievements and existing tools and capacities developed by local, national and regional projects or initiatives have been extensively detailed. A specific attention has been paid to build not only the project strategy but also each activity on a robust and accurate baseline. For instance, we recommend to capitalize on the approach and results of projects and strategies implemented in other transboundary basins shared by the 2 countries (Limpopo, Zambezi).
During project design and implementation: please add private sector under 'stakeholder groups' addressed. Currently they are not in the table on stakeholders though the PIF is clear that engagement will be key in maintaining environmental flows (quantity) and water quality.	The private sector, particularly for the agricultural activities (important sugar estates in the basins among other irrigation users), the mining activities and the hydropower production, have been consulted during the PPG mission and will be part of the stakeholder engagement plan during the implementation phase.

<p>Urbanization and possible threats and opportunities for maintaining sufficient water quality and quantity of both surface and groundwater should also be better described in the final project document and then addressed in the TDA and SAP (during project implementation; as relevant).</p>	<p>Urbanization specifically (particularly around the city of Beira which is expanding on the mangroves) and threats, root causes and barriers have been further described based on the information collected during the country consultations and the field visits. During the PPG process, the stakeholder have identified the priority issues related to IWRM in the three basins. This output, as well as existing monographs and action plans, will be a basis for the further TDA/SAP</p>
<p>Expand on and provide detail on the 'flood early warning system for community risks and collaboration with disaster risk management agencies' (in 2.2) and/or consider to possibly move to/combine with 2.5. Right now the community warning aspect seems to be only marginally addressed among all the other activities in 2.2.</p>	<p>A set of 2 full activities of the project will be dedicated to Community-based Early Warning Systems in vulnerable communities in the 3 basins: activities 1.4 and 1.6. This activity capitalizes the achievements of the past and on-going initiatives. The baseline related to Community-based EWS is indeed very strong. Mozambique has for instance developed an advanced Community Early Warning Systems (SIDAPs) in the Buzi basin, that has inspired the law for Natural Disaster Management, and which has been replicated in many other basins in Mozambique. The transboundary dimension with Zimbabwe needs however to be developed. In Zimbabwe, community flood management relies on community-based disaster risk management (CBDRM) trainings at ward level to ward disaster risk management committee.</p>
<p>3.2.3 activity[1]¹ is very much appreciated. During project design please try to estimate the degree to which coastal mangroves provide coastal protection and fish spawning and shrimp habitat benefits. The project itself (during implementation) may want to assess this in more detailed economic terms to provide incentives to avoid further degradation.</p>	<p>Activity 2.1 will consist in ecosystem characterization and ecosystem services assessment. The expected result is to generate the necessary background environmental, social and economic information to pave the way to e-flows definition, to be undertaken under activity 2.3.</p>
<p>During project implementation, please consider partnering with ANBO (African Network of Basin Organizations) on learning mechanisms and knowledge exchange</p>	<p>A specific activity (3.6) is dedicated to learning mechanisms and knowledge exchange. In this frame, partnering with ANBO will be considered.</p>

[1] About e-flows in the mangroves area

IUCN – 05/15/2020

OK Done in the revised CEO endorsement request attached to the submission in the Portal

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/8/2018)

The project is not yet recommended for endorsement. If it would be useful to IUCN/the team, I would like to suggest to discuss the comments and question vis-a vis the project design via a conference call soonest and at a time that is convenient for your project team.

(9/15/2029) Not yet. The re-submission provides a radical revision of the earlier submission and addresses most comments. Please address the comments listed above and resubmit.

(10/28/2019) Not yet. We note that many of the previous comments have not been addressed and suggest to discuss this with the IUCN GEF unit to allow clarification.

(3/2/2020) Not yet. Please respond to the remaining comments. Please do not hesitate to reach out to me/GEFSEC for any questions and to accelerate re-submission.

(5/12/2020) Note yet. Please respond to the remaining comments (question 2 and 9 and missing response to a Council member comment)

(5/18/2020) Please address comment on M&E (question 9). Thank you.

(5/19/2020) Comments have been addressed and the project is recommended for endorsement.

(6-4-2020) Please note that our review lead to additional questions on the project co-finance - question 5.

Please in the re-submission: add the country names in Part I of the Portal in *addition* to noting that this is a regional project. This will allow the project to be routed via the Africa regional coordinator without delay and funding accounted under the correct region.

(6-24-2020) Comments have been addressed and the project is recommended for endorsement.

Please note that this project was requested to be circulated for 4 weeks to the Council prior to CEO endorsement.

IUCN - Please reenter the country names in addition to noting its a regional project (Under Part I of the Portal submission).

(6/26/2020) IUCN cannot make the country name changes; this needs to be done by GEF IT at this point.

Response to Secretariat comments

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Background. The project targets the conservation and sustainable use of the transboundary basins resources within three river basins shared bilaterally between Mozambique and Zimbabwe: the Pungwe, Buzi and Save river basins. These three basins are located along the Beira corridor, an important economic corridor that links Beira harbor to the hinterland, with associated impacts on the environment (pollution from mining activities, intensive agriculture, deforestation ...). Populations also suffer high vulnerability to climate hazard (floods, droughts, cyclones) – as lately witnessed by cyclone Ida – and that hazard is likely to increase with climate change aggravation. The increased development of upstream water uses is now raising the issue of water allocation across sectoral needs of water, food, energy and ecosystems and its dimensions of environmental flows that has particular importance in a transboundary context. The need for developing transboundary cooperation for water resources management has been materializing for years through several initiatives, including the signature of a transboundary Pungwe agreement (Buzi’s and Save’s are under preparation), and the wish to establish a bilateral tri-basin river basin organization.

The project seeks to promote holistic approaches to the water-food-energy nexus in the three transboundary basins, with the objective of strengthening the management of transboundary water resources and connected ecosystems for sustained ecological benefits and improved resilience for the riverine communities. The project is supporting flood and drought early warning and community based risk management, training on and conducting environmental flow assessments at selected locations and develop and adopt a framework to apply at other sites, and supports the development of a transboundary diagnostic analysis and strategic action program and its implementation funding for the three basins. In each component, the project will contribute to support transboundary cooperation for water resources management, either with the development of joint initiatives (joint hydrological monitoring campaigns and data exchange protocols), common tools development (TDA/SAP, roadmap to reduce pollution), and bilateral capacity building or through experience sharing including on community-based early warning systems.

Sustainability, innovation and scale-up. Results and impacts will include increased transboundary water cooperation including a coordinated approach for flood and drought risks management and mainstreaming of these risks in the decision making process, strengthened capacities for water management linking appropriate scales

of intervention, increased communities autonomy and ownership in water-related risk management, and reduced vulnerability of the local communities to flood and drought. The project works both bottom-up through investments at specific sites as well as 'top down' in adopting an overall framework for environmental flow determination, and aim for both governments to commit to specific coordinated and/or cooperative actions in the SAP both in terms of policy reform and investments.

COVID-19. A plan to mitigate implementation challenges from the COVID related situation has been sent by IUCN and is filed - addressing risks to staff, facilities, need for remote work and need for flexibility for unforeseen local challenges arising.