

# Integrated Transboundary River Basin Management for the Sustainable Development of the Limpopo River Basin

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10182

**Countries**

Regional (Botswana, Mozambique, South Africa, Zimbabwe)

**Project Name**

Integrated Transboundary River Basin Management for the Sustainable Development of the Limpopo River Basin

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

4/7/2019

**Review completed by PM**

10/17/2019

**Program Manager**

Astrid Hillers

**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

(4/15/2019) Please – once revising also the components (see later comments) – assign table A amounts according to the sub-objectives of the IW objective 3 (information, cooperation/institutions, investments).

(5/2/2019) Comment not addressed. All funds are still under one sub-objective while the project is also addressing 3.5 Advancing information exchange; and currently also Nexus investments.

(Please also note that the GEF amount in the endorsement letters and the GEF tables differs by just one USD. While these are non-STAR resources, the amount should be consistent.)

(10/16/2019) Comments have been addressed. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

Table A adjusted. IW 3-5 is not selected because LIMCOM didn't prioritize their priority interventions related to disaster risk management (Programming 2 of the LIMCOM IWRM Plan) to be supported by GEF. This is mainly because 1. GEF funding expected is too limited to be spread across, 2. they want GEF to support TDA-SAP-NAP development, 3. They secured other partner support (mainly USAID Resilient Waters and UK CRIDF) to support activities related to DRM, and 4. they didn't want to wait until 2021 (when the UNDP-GEF project is expected to start the implementation, assuming that the PIF is approved in June 2019) to start working on this Programme area.

UNDP Response 1 Oct 2019

After consultation with GEFSEC and based on the clarification provided regarding IW 3-5,

Table A has been revised to include IW3-5.

**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**

(4/15/2019) Not in the current version. The components and outputs do not appear to build on each other well in order to provide a clear vision of an end of project state that leaves behind a functioning RBO. It also seems to support only a dispersed set of investments benefiting regional cooperation compared to demos for national investment. On the other hand, the LIMCOM draft IWRM plan clearly emphasizes the need to support basin coordination to e.g. address Disaster Risk Management related activities (see comments under Part II – Project Justification). Unless supported by other development partners, this may be useful to reconsider. Further, the PDO is very general, please revise the PDO to be more specifically addressing the project scope/components.

(5/2/2019) Comment not addressed in full. The dispersed set of components remains and call in question feasibility of achieving intended outcomes - see comments in Part II. Components covered by other partners (DRM and other) are noted.

(10/16/2019) Comments have been addressed and details discussed under part II of the review sheet. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

Component and Output description strengthened in the PIF to present more explicitly why these interventions were selected for GEF support, how they collectively will contribute to strengthening regional cooperation, to addressing priority issues identified in the LIMCOM IWRM Plan, and to its implementation, and what are the expected transboundary benefits and impacts through the implementation of those actions implemented through Comp 4.

DRM-related activities presented in the IWRM Plan was not prioritized for the GEF support because 1. GEF funding expected is too limited to be spread across, 2. they want GEF to support TDA-SAP-NAP development, 3. They secured other partner support (mainly USAID Resilient Waters and UK CRIDF) to support activities related to DRM, and 4. they didn't want to wait until 2021 (when the UNDP-GEF project is expected to start the implementation, assuming that the PIF is approved in June 2019) to start working on this Programme area.

PDO has been revised as follows: "To promote sustainable development in the Limpopo River basin through the basin-wide cooperation and the evidence-based joint management and planning by basin countries, coordinated by the LIMCOM with strong stakeholder engagement throughout the implementation of its Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Plan and the development of the Strategic Action Programme for the Limpopo River Basin (LRB)."

UNDP Response, 1 Oct 2019

After consultation with GEFSEC, a proposed set of project interventions have been significantly revised. Following closely the suggestions received from GEFSEC, the project now place a strong emphasis on the institutional capacity building of LIMCOM (Component 1), and limits the on-the-ground SAP implementation demo activities only to sedimentation control activities working with communities and/or private sectors (Comp 4, Outcome 5).

#### **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**

(4/16/2019). For all amounts in the co-financing table, please indicate whether these represent "investment mobilized" or "recurrent expenditures". If the project includes any "investment mobilized", please describe how it was identified, including the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines ([http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf)).

(5/2/2019) Please provide an initial description on how investment mobilized co-finance was identified (see above). This can be refined at endorsement stage. Not addressed.

(10/16/2019)

By ENDORSEMENT, please note:

- co-finance amounts need to be made transparent and a table explaining how the co-finance is aligned with which project component be provided.
- Letters of co-finance need to all be in english (if originals are not in english, an informal agency provided translation suffices along with the original)
- Letters of co-finance need to spell out what the co-finance is made up off and how it aligns with the project and project PDO.

(10/31/2019)

As communicated to UNDP, please note that there has been some mislabeling of co-finance as investment mobilized vs in kind/recurring. Note that in-kind contributions are to be labeled "recurring" and not "investment mobilized" and grants should be labeled as "investment mobilized" and not "recurring expenditures". Please also review of LIMCOM is truly the one providing a 1.2 million grant co-finance or is this in-kind/recurring expenditure (?) or co-finance is *via* LIMCOM but provided by another development partner (in that case please list the development partner as "co-financier"). Please review and address.

## **Agency Response**

UNDP, 26 April 2019

Addressed in the revised PIF.

UNDP Response, 1 Oct 2019

An initial description for investment mobilized is provided. The description will be refined during the project development phase before the CEO endorsement request is submitted.

UNDP Response, 1 Nov 2019

Addressed in the revised PIF.

**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**

(4/16/2019). Yes.

Cleared.

**Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

No response required.

**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**

yes, see above.

Cleared.

**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**

(4/16/2019). Yes, the PPG amount is in line with GEF guidance/norms.

(10/16/2019) Justification has been provided via email (oct. 16, 2019) and 200 K PPG requested. The justification is sufficient and increase of the PPG for this regional project is approved due to higher transaction costs to involve stakeholders in several countries and bring them together on regional level. **Technically cleared.**

**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**

(4/16/2019). Please revise sub-indicator 2: the TDA in essence will constitute the update of the *existing* monograph. Also, the IWRM plan has so far been the Limpopo version of a Strategic Action Plan. Hence the rating seems low.

(5/2/2019) While the overall core indicator in table F is correct (one basin/shared water system), sub-indicator "Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program formulation and implementation" is still regarded low and puts LIMCOM at even level with a basin with no prior TDA/SAP type assessments. Please reconsider BY ENDORSEMENT.

(10/16/2019) Comments have been addressed and comment for consideration at endorsement stage noted.

Further, at endorsement: please substantiate (and update) the estimate of *direct* beneficiaries (incl. sex aggregation of indicators) - indicator 11.

**Cleared.**

**Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

When developing the TDA, the past assessments, studies, and existing data will be fully considered, including the Monograph. Yet, the LIMCOM would like more elements to be included in the TDA compared to the Monograph, which was essentially the State of Environment Report. Two key elements that they wish to see in the TDA are 1) Causal Chain Analysis and 2) Future (Water Resource) Development Scenario Analysis. Thus, the development of the TDA is not a simple update of the existing Monograph, while it will definitely have to update the data and information in the Monograph in the process.

LIMCOM doesn't consider their IWRM Plan as their SAP equivalent. Their SAP equivalent is the "Long-Term IWRM Strategy" included as an expected output in the IWRM Plan to be delivered through a strategic planning process. They consider their 5-yearly IWRM Plans as an implementation tool at a more operational level to implement the Long-Term IWRM Strategy, or SAP.

No change is made on the Table F in PIF, as it is not clear how these can be reflected in the Table. In the table, we can only show the number of shared water ecosystems under new or improved cooperative management (which remains as 1).

UNDP Response, 1 Oct 2019

GEFSEC comments on 2 May is noted. The Core Indicator (and sub-indicator) will be reviewed again for reconsideration before the CEO Endorsement Request submission.

**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**

(4/16/2019) Yes for the most part. Few comments: It is hard to see that the project addresses large corporations. Also, some changes in the keywords may be considered based on comments on the components/activities.

(5/6/2019) Comment addressed.

Cleared.

**Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

Table G adjusted. (“large corporation” removed from the Table.)

## **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**

(4/16/2019). Support to strengthen LIMCOM and mainly a focus of cooperative actions should be the focus of the proposal. The PIF outlines immediate causes as water scarcity (incl. irrigation being major withdrawal) and a current lack of basin-wide modeling capacities, lack of adequate policies and regulations as well as monitoring to address water quality, sedimentation, and lack of governance and management of groundwater among threats from extreme weather events that are likely to increase with increasing climate variability and change. It does not mention the role of cooperation on these issues or those related to pressures based on needs for water-food-energy security. Please strengthen this aspect.

(5/6/2019) Comment addressed.

**Cleared.**

#### **Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

The linkage between these issues in the basin and the importance of cooperative actions of the basin states through LIMCOM is strengthened in the revised PIF (under the systems description and under the alternative scenario). The importance of the basin-wide cooperation through LIMCOM to address the need for water-food-energy security, as well as the importance of water-food-energy nexus consideration in the basin’s future water resources development scenario analysis is also mentioned more explicitly in the revised PIF (under the Incremental Cost Reasoning section).

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

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

(4/16/2019) Yes, the baseline is described under respective section as pertaining to river basin management and in the section on coordination as it links to some of the related national projects funded by GEF in basin countries.

(10/16/2019) The baseline on regional level is well articulated and some of the most relevant investments on national level mentioned throughout the project document. During PPG PHASE, please expand on a more detailed analysis of current national level investment (either ongoing or about to become active) with the purpose to coordinate and seek synergies with project activities as relevant. **Cleared.**

Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

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

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

(4/16/2019) Please see earlier comments on table B. It would be good to have a clearer outline of the Theory of Change underlying the project.

While the project components cover the GEF approach of a TDA and SAP, data sharing, pilot activities etc. the process in LIMCOM is not the same as a basic first foundational/first project support of GEF. LIMCOM already has an IWRM Plan (2011 to 2015) and a revised final draft for 2018 to 2022. LIMCOM /cooperation also relates to the 2010 Limpopo Scoping Study, and the River Basin Monograph (2013), plus various other previous studies supported by the countries and development partners. It seems crucial to build on these and not create parallel outputs.

1. Please be more clear that the “TDA” is equivalent and a revision of the existing monograph (even though the “TDA type process and guidance is likely to be more participatory , GEF does not impose to change products of a basin-organization, but provides good practice experience and guidance). The Limpopo draft IWRM plan notes the need for a monograph update (why not call it that ?).

2. What is the added benefit to develop both an IWRM plan and a SAP? Can these be merged ? NAPs also could be free-standing or appendix volumes to the IWRM plan/SAP for the basin.
3. Having a component on strengthening LIMCOM and assure sustainability is well placed and crucial. Some of the key institutional challenges of a small LIMCOM secretariat – as for many RBOs – seem to relate to limited capacities of core functions (incl. financial management, procurement, office and HR procedures) which have to be addressed alongside technical needs. While the PIF outlines that USAID support provided for procurement and FM manuals, it is not clear if there are skills and staff in LIMCOM to address the handling of these crucial RBO Secretariat functions. If not, will the proposed project assure these are in place to support the project activities (either within LIMCOM or supported via SADC or hired in via a project agency)?
4. Based on above, component 1 lists the drafting of a sustainability strategy as a project activity. In fact, this should underline the project design and be reflected in the choice and design of the project activities to strengthen LIMCOM. Please describe in the PIF what elements are key to support LIMCOM sustainability and reflect these needs in the PIF design.
5. Data Sharing protocols – this is essential to assure that data are available for certain purposes. As written it is not clear what data are needed for what benefit/use. Please link the data sharing protocol to the use of the data (e.g. such as disaster risk management/flood forecasting (as listed as priority in the Limpopo IWRM plan) and link to other components of the project so that the agreement on exchange of the data is linked to the needs and benefits for this data exchange.
6. Stakeholder engagement plan and linked communications plan: please link to project activities/components.

Component 2:

7. See earlier comments on TDA and link to monograph (which in itself should include a governance analysis).
8. Groundwater (2.1): could the project build more closely on the LIMPOPO – SADC Groundwater Management Institute MoU signed in December 2018 here and on KM activities/component 5 ?:

<http://sadc-gmi.org/2019/03/25/limpopo-river-basin-course-commission-limcom-and-sadc-groundwater-management-institute-launch-the-limcom-groundwater-committee/>

*“Realizing the potential of RBOs in groundwater management in the region, SADC-Groundwater Management Institute (SADC-GMI) and LIMCOM, in December 2018 signed a Memorandum of Understanding for collaboration on groundwater issues in the Limpopo River Basin. The framework for cooperation covers the following areas: Transboundary Cooperation that will facilitate the integration and harmonization of groundwater provisions between the national and basin level commitments;*

- *Support the need to update Protocols/Agreements with reference to solutions to address shared groundwater challenges, sharing of data and benefits from the cooperation;*
- *Promotion of Transboundary Aquifer Management in the riparian Member States and in collaboration with relevant government authorities;*
- *Jointly finding solutions to shared groundwater challenges through Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Plans (SAP).*
- *Research on groundwater challenges in LIMCOM Transboundary Aquifers which will involve studies/pilots, information exchange on findings, training and implementation of solutions to emergent and priority groundwater management challenges;*
- *Collaborate on establishment and operationalization of institutional arrangements for shared Transboundary Aquifer management;*
- *Joint planning and implementation of activities such as workshops, research projects, etc including solicitation of funding where necessary; and*
- *Information and Communication Technologies for knowledge sharing platform to build an integrated data management system.”*

9.

Furthermore, the component aims to support sediment monitoring and modeling – which is resource intensive and hence best linked to design of actions to address land degradation. Further, the component aids the establishment of dry and wet season ecological flow requirements (in this context, please also explain the scope of measurements of “ecological water requirement stations” and who will finance and maintain these). Both of these activities address key challenges in the basin, but as mentioned before, the range of *different* and dispersed measures across the project do not seem to add to a comprehensive set of related actions supported by the project. This casts doubt on the feasibility and sustainability of the project.

10.

Output 1.4 seems unclear and seems a summary of previous outputs. Will the DSS mentioned be financed by USAID together with/in addition to the revived LIMIS?

Component 3: See earlier comment/question on IWRM and SAP relation.

11. Private Sector: there are two activities relating to the PS which would be good to have more information outlined:

- (i) Innovative PS engagement for Limpopo IWRM (under component 1) and (ii) a SAP investment plan (component 4) which is not entirely clear if PS oriented or a roundtable to raise finance for the SAP implementation as it targets “investors and partners”. Please clarify both. Please outline/explain the parallels mentioned with Globallast and GloMEEP(via the Global Industry Alliance model).

Component 4:

12. GEF IW support is unique in being able to fund regional activities of which many are prioritized in the draft final Limpopo IWRM plan, incl. those addressing urgent basin-wide flood early warning and community DRM plans, a basin-wide Disaster Risk Reduction Action Plan, a LIMCOM Nexus assessment, a transboundary benefit sharing assessment and related communications materials, cooperation with GMI on a groundwater management strategy in the LRB (mentioned above and in the 2018-2022 IWRM draft plan), etc. (these are just examples !! from the draft 2018-2022 IWRM plan). As written it is not obvious how the national actions chosen are the most urgent to address basin-wide cooperation needs. While such ‘on the ground pilots’ will have replication potential if truly innovative, the dispersed topics add to the impression of a dispersed set of activities supported by the project.

Component 5: A component on knowledge exchange and communication of results is well placed.

13. Component 5.1 – exchange with other RBOs and regional institutions e.g. OKACOM, ORASECOM, ...): Please explore cooperation with SADC Water Sector/Water Division and their track record and mandate on knowledge and experience exchange. We see at the GEF secretariat that several projects intending to request similar exchanges across the region. A consolidation and coordination at regional/SADC level will be needed beyond a project by project approach.

14. Component 5.3: Please mention that at least 1 % of the project budget will be allocated to the participation. Please also mention the establishment of a project website and the formulation of two experience notes.

**(5 (5/6/2019)**

S Several of the comments above have not been fully addressed. There has no change in the consideration of component/component structure to make it clear how components build on each other what therefore the theory of change is for the project (see comment above). Given the emergent level of LIMCOM a clear project design with less diversity of actions and aligning component ambition and funds is needed.

S Specifically:

1. Explanation provided why the monograph update and revision is called TDA. Comment addressed.

2. The request is to support the next i.e. third LIMCOM IWRM plan spanning the time period from 2023 - 2028. As the current IWRM plan (2018 - 2022) has not been finalized, the next IWRM plan time frame likely will shift by a year and hence be 10 years out, which seems to fulfill the intention by LIMCOM for a long term strategic plan. BY ENDORSEMENT: Please consider to not create a proliferation of plans and using GEF terminology necessarily unless requested by the countries. SAPs should be implementation oriented and in that are usually not so different from the current IWRM which does prioritize actions. The current draft is missing

though targets for some of the measures e.g those in terms of stress reduction (where applicable) and as described in the agency response could therefore be enhanced. Please during project design/ppg phase consider if the long-term strategic plan and next 5 year IWRM plan (up to 2028/29) can be merged.

3. Not addressed.

Agree with UNDP's comment on the need for a lean secretariat and also on the fact that core functions for the secretariat needing to be able to be covered by country contributions (as at this point there is not other sustainable finance in place for LIMCOM). All experience of RBO secretariats include the need to be able to receive and build a track record to successfully handle funds i.e. basic FM and procurement as well as M&E functions.

The request is that the GEF support puts this in place and strengthens e.g. LIMCOMs FM capacity so that by end of the project there is a track record and experience to handle substantial outside funds. UNDP used to do this is many projects and increase project imprest accounts over the lifetime of projects to a substantial level to build a track record of the ability to receive and administer funds. I hope this clarifies.

We would be happy to forward summary/guidance on RBO functions incl. those produced for IW-Learn on RBO functions presented at the last IWC.

4. The sustainability strategy to be developed during project implementation could the address outstanding issues incl. defining options to finance core functions. Addressed once comment above is addressed.

5.Explanation provided for the range of data that Limpopo countries seek data sharing on. The focus of such data sharing protocols may want to initially be on what UNDP outlines as being the priority requests to UNDP for LIMCOM support based on the current draft IWRM plan, i.e. those related to sediment transport monitoring and modeling and e-flows. This also creates synergy and consistency across project supported activities. Addressed.

6. Please clarify further by ENDORSEMENT how these plans support project activities. Addressed at PIF stage.

7. See earlier comment 2 and consider during project design/by ENDORSEMENT.

8. Comment addressed.

9. Component 2 addresses and combines support to a large range of interventions (joint basin survey, alluvial aquifer abstraction, sediment monitoring and modeling, e-flow monitoring and establishment of e-flows, water resources modeling and scenario development, production and dissemination plus a few other). This component alone combined with component 1 is already a tall order for a project and for LIMCOM capacities to cover.

UNDP 's agency response makes a strong case for these activities and especially the sediment monitoring and modeling and e-flow work.

Project design should therefore focus on this. Relative fund allocation needs to reflect this - the current amount of funds allocated for these complex activities is insufficient to address what is described.

From the PIF it appears that there is no existing systematic program of sediment monitoring in the Limpopo. Sediment monitoring alone is not cheap with expensive in-situ real-time equipment that may be \$30-80k per site or simpler turbidity measurements (\$6-25k per site), grab samples, or even community-monitoring but that still requires large amount of TA. This is only for just the physical monitoring – not including the chemical/biological monitoring relating to e.g. basin survey and e-flow monitoring. Project *design* will then still need to address MoUs with country entities to maintain stations and assure sustainability of these efforts. While there is some information from previous studies and from national level e-flow work to build on, there are still likely substantial costs involved.

If useful, you may want to look of an in-situ monitoring e-book (in draft) to give an overview of the costs for typical types of monitoring:

<http://appsolutelydigital.com/MonitoringSystems/hydrology.html>

On the modeling side, while there are models of all types and one can possibly built on some free tools to get a quick overview with built in surface/gw hydrology water balance, revised universal soil loss equation, and some simple sediment flow estimation. TA efforts to built these tools still require substantial amount of TA funds. In addition, sediment and water flow etc monitoring data will be needed for calibration/validation that may be expensive, plus capacity development to maintain models and monitoring.

While there may be some synergies with RESILIM investments, the whole of component 2 is underfunded and is covering a lot of different issues that should be better split into several separate outcomes.

10. Comment addressed.

11. Comment on SAP investment plan addressed component 3).

Some information on the 'innovative private sector engagement modality (component 1) should be indicated, such as some idea of the type of sector or what challenge it is likely to address.

12. Component 4: UNDP's answer is noted and we are obviously aware of GEF type of support at various stages of cooperation.

If LIMCOM needs and priorities are for institutional strengthening and management and planning (components 1 & 3) and investments in sediment/eflow and related under component 2 (as per UNDPs agency response), then this is where the focus of the project should be.

There also seems limited capacity in LIMCOM to handle additional and thematically and geographically dispersed actions.

13. Please consider if additional SADC/RBO knowledge exchange can be supported that there are synergies built across projects in the SADC region and activities coordinated by SADC. Comment addressed at PIF stage.

14. Comment addressed.

14. Comment addressed.

(10/16/2019) Comments have been addressed. **Cleared.**

**BY ENDORSEMENT:**

- please consider earlier comments to be addressed at endorsement stage and - in addition:
- please simplify the formulation of the project development objective (PDO). The essence of it is valid, but the wording should be tightened to express the objective of what the project aims to achieve and revised, more concise wording on 'how to get there'.
- please strengthen the formulation/wording of the project outcomes 2 and 3 in line with the project's theory of change. In these cases the project outputs and activities are quite tangible and the outcomes to be achieved with these could be worded much more clearly and strongly. By endorsement this needs revision and the results framework provide transparent and quantifiable indicators for these outcomes (e.g. "Outcome 2: Priority knowledge gaps filled to update the monograph" is a weak wording to capture the component outcomes: a Joint Basin Survey; Establishment of e-flows; Sediment Transport modeling; Assessment of ecological impact of small scale groundwater withdrawals (in select areas); a Governance review; and Future Development Scenario analysis).
- please add in the project document that the SAP/IWRM plan needs to be signed by at least one minister from each country.
- Please provide sufficient detail of the project management costs , incl. such as e.g. GWP execution costs, staff costs (partial staff equivalent and/or fulltime) involved in project management, and office/PMU running costs.
- JBS indicators - please consider to be informed by other ongoing efforts in the choice of indicators to make this effort most useful on national and regional level, by e.g. striving to align indicators with national requirements, with SADC-wide reporting and assessment needs, and synergies with e.g. SDG and other MEA reporting efforts.
- Update the Theory of Change to provide formulations of outcomes in the TOC to align with quantifiable indicators in the project results framework in the prodoc/endorsement request
- Design into SLM pilots sufficient efforts for quantification in order to support e.g. assessment of costs and benefits, form a base for cost-effective up-scaling, and to inform the design and stakeholder engagement in possible PES schemes.
- Seek not only exchanges with GEF/UNDP implemented transboundary river basin activities and RBOs but also others, such as the Pungwe, Save, Busi basins and involving some of the same national agencies and stakeholders. The PuBuSa GEF project will be endorsed shortly.

PIF stage: **Cleared.**

- -

## **Agency Response**

### **UNDP Response, 26 April 2019**

*While the project components cover the GEF approach of a TDA and SAP, data sharing, pilot activities etc. the process in LIMCOM is not the same as a basic first foundational/first project support of GEF. LIMCOM already has an IWRM Plan (2011 to 2015) and a revised final draft for 2018 to 2022. LIMCOM /cooperation also relates to the 2010 Limpopo Scoping Study, and the River Basin Monograph (2013), plus various other previous studies supported by the countries and development partners. It seems crucial to build on these and not create parallel outputs.*

The project will build upon the past relevant studies and assessments done in the basin, and the project design is guided by close discussions with LIMCOM and its partners as well as by the LIMCOM IWRM Plan to avoid any duplication of efforts or parallel outputs.

*1. Please be more clear that the “TDA” is equivalent and a revision of the existing monograph (even though the “TDA type process and guidance is likely to be more participatory, GEF does not impose to change products of a basin-organization, but provides good practice experience and guidance). The Limpopo draft IWRM plan notes the need for a monograph update (why not call it that?).*

TDA development will be based upon the ongoing and past fact-finding efforts in the Limpopo River Basin both at the national level and at the transboundary level, including the Scoping Study and the Monograph. The envisioned TDA is not simply an update of the Monograph. TDA development activities will include the

Monograph update, Causal Chain Analysis, and the future water resources development scenario analysis, as per the request from the LIMCOM. Therefore, it is not simply called as a Monograph update. The Monograph update is part of it. This is clarified in the PIF (under Comp 2).

***2. What is the added benefit to develop both an IWRM plan and a SAP? Can these be merged? NAPs also could be free-standing or appendix volumes to the IWRM plan/SAP for the basin.***

LIMCOM does not consider their IWRM Plan as an equivalent to SAP. They developed their IWRM Plan as a document at more operational level. Activities and potential interventions desired in the basin are presented in a thematic grouping, based on the outcomes from the scoping study and the Monograph, but they were not yet prioritized and no necessary/potential trade-offs or any other policy-level negotiations carried out among basin states before they were adopted. They seek for GEF support to develop a SAP for the Limpopo River Basin, as a negotiated policy document at a strategic level with longer time period and most importantly with strong political commitment (through the expected ministerial endorsement).

NAPs will accompany the SAP and will be a document that links the transboundary priorities (presented in the SAP) with national development and sectoral priorities in the respective countries. NAPs may present issues that are considered as priority in a country, even when the issues are not included in the SAP as transboundary priority. From the past experience in the Cubango-Okavango River basin and in the Orange-Senqu River basin, the development of NAP for each basin state prior to the SAP endorsement had facilitated the ministerial endorsement (and Cabinet approval) process of the SAP for each basin. Therefore, it is proposed that the UNDP-GEF project will support the NAP development together with the SAP development.

PIF is revised to clarify the above.

***3. Having a component on strengthening LIMCOM and assure sustainability is well placed and crucial. Some of the key institutional challenges of a small LIMCOM secretariat – as for many RBOs – seem to relate to limited capacities of core functions (incl. financial management, procurement, office and HR procedures) which have to be addressed alongside technical needs. While the PIF outlines that USAID support provided for procurement and FM manuals, it is not clear if there are skills and staff in LIMCOM to address the handling of these crucial RBO Secretariat functions. If not, will the proposed project assure these are in place to support the project activities (either within LIMCOM or supported via SADC or hired in via a project agency)?***

As pointed out in the GEFSec comment, an adequate operational, financial and administrative capacity at the LIMCOM Secretariat is crucial to ensure the sustainability of the LIMCOM, to ensure that the Secretariat can provide effective support to the Commissioners, who make management decisions jointly that will affect the future of the basin. At the same time, we need to be cautious not to place unrealistic expectations on a RBO Secretariat, which needs to be kept small enough to be financially sustained through regular contribution by its member states. In southern Africa, where a number of RBOs have been established and some SADC member states are required to make contributions to multiple RBOs from their limited national budget allocation in order to fulfill these international commitments, it is critically important to prioritize which capacity of a RBO Secretariat to be strengthened first.

An institutional analysis and governance review will be conducted and its outcome and recommendations will inform the LIMCOM Sustainability Plan, which outlines the minimum resources needs for the LIMCOM to perform its core functions, how to meet such resource needs, etc..

LIMCOM Secretariat is still at its infancy and will need significant support to build its institutional capacity. USAID Resilience Waters committed to providing some technical experts to the Secretariat during its project implementation period. UNDP-GEF support will consider a provision of operational and administrative capacity support to LIMCOM through the project during the project implementation, but with the sustainability beyond the project in mind. The details of the project design related to their institutional sustainability must be developed through close discussions with LIMCOM as it bears financial implications to LIMCOM and its member states. The discussions will take place during the project development phase.

The above clarification is added in the PIF (under Comp 1).

The project will decide during the project development phase what the best project implementation modality will be, in close consultation with LIMCOM. SADC Water Sector, while it is mandated to support the establishment and strengthening of RBOs in the SADC region, does not provide any operational or administrative support to RBOs.

***4. Based on above, component 1 lists the drafting of a sustainability strategy as a project activity. In fact, this should underline the project design and be reflected in the choice and design of the project activities to strengthen LIMCOM. Please describe in the PIF what elements are key to support LIMCOM sustainability and reflect these needs in the PIF design.***

Addressed in the PIF (under Comp 1). LIMCOM expects the key elements to be identified through its institutional analysis and governance review.

***5. Data Sharing protocols – this is essential to assure that data are available for certain purposes. As written it is not clear what data are needed for what benefit/use. Please link the data sharing protocol to the use of the data (e.g. such as disaster risk management/flood forecasting (as listed as priority in the Limpopo IWRM plan) and link to other components of the project so that the agreement on exchange of the data is linked to the needs and benefits for this data exchange.***

LIMCOM has identified three core challenges in the basin: 1) frequent disasters - Droughts and flooding- due to the uneven and seasonal variation of rainfalls experienced in the region, amplified lately by climate change and variability, 2) water quality - pollution of the aquatic ecosystems being a serious concern that potentially can hamper socio-economic development and health of the people and the environment, and 3) water scarcity- water demand from all sectors will increase, creating a need for a better planning of the available surface and ground water at the basin level to ensure effective, efficient and equitable allocation of the resource. Data sharing protocol will be essential to address the three core challenges at the basin level.

The Data Sharing Protocol will be instrumental in the basin-level planning, management and monitoring even more broadly.

The above clarification is included in the PIF.

**6. Stakeholder engagement plan and linked communications plan: please link to project activities/components.**

Addressed in the PIF (under Comp 1).

*Component 2:*

**7. See earlier comments on TDA and link to monograph (which in itself should include a governance analysis).**

See the response to the earlier comments.

**8. Groundwater (2.1): could the project build more closely on the LIMPOPO – SADC Groundwater Management Institute MoU signed in December 2018 here and on KM activities/component 5?:**

The project will work closely with the SADC GMI, which signed a MOU with LIMCOM for collaboration on groundwater issues in the Limpopo River Basin. SADC GMI supported LIMCOM to establish its Groundwater Task Committee, which is now regarded as the institutional structure to drive groundwater management in the LRB.

The project intervention in particular will support the following, related to the LIMCOM-SADC GMI collaboration or more generally, the promotion of the conjunctive management of surface water and groundwater resources in LRB:

- ensure the recommendations from the Groundwater Committee will be fully considered by the LIMCOM discussions.
- ensure the findings from researches and assessment of groundwater be fully integrated into TDA, SAP and NAP development process.
- ensure the groundwater information be well captured in LIMIS
- assess environmental impacts of the sub-surface water capture, commonly practices in the basin, on the riverine ecosystem.
- produce at least one IW:LEARN Results Note focusing on the conjunctive management of the surface water and groundwater management in the LRB for wider dissemination.

The clarification above is added in the PIF (Comp 5).

It is important to note that LIMCOM has successfully mobilized partners (SADC GMI, USAID Resilient Waters, IWMI, A4Labs, IUCN) to support them to implement activities contributing to the improved groundwater resources management in the LRB (Priority Intervention 4.5 of their IWRM Plan); thus, they requested GEF support to focus on other priority interventions. This clarification is added in the PIF (Under Comp 2)

**9. Furthermore, the component aims to support sediment monitoring and modeling – which is resource intensive and hence best linked to design of actions to address land degradation. Further, the component aids the establishment of dry and wet season ecological flow requirements (in this context, please also explain the scope of measurements of “ecological water requirement stations” and who will finance and maintain these). Both of these activities address key challenges in**

***the basin, but as mentioned before, the range of different and dispersed measures across the project do not seem to add to a comprehensive set of related actions supported by the project. This casts doubt on the feasibility and sustainability of the project.***

As recognized in the GEFSec comments, there exist some good baseline data for the LRB through the past studies and assessments, including (but not limited to) the Scoping Study and the Monograph, yet there are still significant knowledge gaps for LIMCOM to support effectively the joint planning and management efforts by the basin countries. Given the resource constraints by GEF, LIMCOM was asked to prioritize which knowledge gaps should be filled urgently. Lack of sedimentation transport modeling and monitoring and e-flow monitoring (to set the e-flow requirements) are identified by LIMCOM as key knowledge gaps to be filled during the TDA development process. Strengthening knowledge base on these two issues would contribute to the environmental sustainability in the joint management and planning effort at the transboundary level and subsequent policy decisions; thus, they are eligible for GEF support.

Sedimentation transport modeling and monitoring is considered critically important for the sustainable management of the LRB, especially because a number of dams in the LRB are observed to have lost their expected productivity/capacity gradually due to sedimentation over years. To scientifically validate such observation, and to identify cost effective ways to implement countermeasures, the UNDP-GEF project is requested to support LIMCOM to develop a sedimentation transport monitoring and modeling activities, as well as sustainable land management activities at a pilot scale in the basin with an aim to reduce sedimentation

There are some ongoing national-level efforts in the establishment of e-flow requirements. LIMCOM considers the basin-wide approach to the e-flow is critical to adequately conserve or restore the LRB ecosystem in the future, while allowing much needed development activities to take place in the basin to support the socioeconomic development of the basin population and of the basin states. With its importance on the environmental aspect of the IWRM Plan and implementation, LIMCOM requested this intervention be included in the UNDP-GEF project. The support to e-flow establishment is fully in line with the GEF-7 IW Strategy. It is also useful to note that the results from the GEF interventions to establish the e-flow requirements for dry and wet seasons carried out in the Orange-Senqu River basin has provided useful information to influence the dam operations of the basin to ensure the environmental sustainability in their IWRM Plan implementation.

PIF is revised to provide this additional clarification (under Comp 2).

***10. Output 1.4 seems unclear and seems a summary of previous outputs. Will the DSS mentioned be financed by USAID together with/in addition to the revived LIMIS?***

Assuming that this comment is on Output 2.4. Output 2.4 is about the packaging of the data, information, and scientific knowledge (generated through all other outputs under Outcome 2) for consumption by policy makers and wider dissemination for public consumption.

LIMCOM DSS development is supported by USAID Resilient Waters together with the LIMIS.

The above clarification is added in the PIF (under Comp 2).

***Component 3: See earlier comment/question on IWRM and SAP relation.***

Clarification on the IWRM Plan and the SAP relation is added in the PIF (under Comp 3)

***11. Private Sector: there are two activities relating to the PS which would be good to have more information outlined:(i) Innovative PS engagement for Limpopo IWRM (under component 1) and (ii) a SAP investment plan (component 4) which is not entirely clear if PS oriented or a roundtable to raise finance for the SAP implementation as it targets “investors and partners”. Please clarify both.***

The details of a proposed innovative PS engagement modality for the LIMCOM IWRM Plan implementation (Comp 1, Output 1.3) is yet to be determined, but the idea is to test some approaches tried in the basin before and/or tried elsewhere that were used for the PS engagement at a pilot scale (through Output 4.2) and an innovative PS engagement modality will be developed for the LIMCOM, based on the experience, knowledge and lessons learned generated from the pilot activity. Accordingly, a SAP demo on WDM in partnership with PS (Output 4.2) will be designed during the PPG phase not only to demonstrate the WDM results but also to test the effectiveness of the PS engagement in such activities.

The above clarification is added in PIF (under Comp 1).

SAP Investment Plan (Comp 3, Output 3.5) is about attracting investments required to implement SAP in general; thus, it will not exclusively target PS investments. A roundtable proposed is just one means/platform to attract resources once the Investment Plan is drafted, while other potential platforms will be considered for the same objective.

The above clarification is added in PIF (under Comp 3).

***Please outline/explain the parallels mentioned with Globallast and GloMEEP (via the Global Industry Alliance model).***

The more details and clarification added in the PIF (under Innovation sub-heading).

#### ***Component 4:***

***12. GEF IW support is unique in being able to fund regional activities of which many are prioritized in the draft final Limpopo IWRM plan, incl. those addressing urgent basin-wide flood early warning and community DRM plans, a basin-wide Disaster Risk Reduction Action Plan, a LIMCOM Nexus assessment, a transboundary benefit sharing assessment and related communications materials, cooperation with GMI on a groundwater management strategy in the LRB (mentioned above and in the 2018-2022 IWRM draft plan), etc. (these are just examples !! from the draft 2018-2022 IWRM plan). As written it is not obvious how the national actions chosen are the most urgent to address basin-wide cooperation needs. While such ‘on the ground pilots’ will have replication potential if truly innovative, the dispersed topics add to the impression of a dispersed set of activities supported by the project.***

All interventions proposed for the GEF support, including those under Comp 4, are targeted and designed to deliver transboundary benefits/impacts at the result level and contribute to strengthening the joint management and planning by all basin states at the transboundary basin level.

Comp 4 is designed to demonstrate on-the-ground activities at a pilot scale to address transboundary issues which will be highly likely identified as transboundary priorities in the upcoming SAP. (SAP demo). This is in line with the strategic approach applied by GEF since GEF-4 that even a foundation phase project (TDA-SAP development project) should include some interventions that lead to stress reduction on the ground. While this approach inevitably reduces the allocation of the limited GEF resources to the development of plans, assessments, etc. (in Comp 1 and 2) in order to finance on-the-ground activities (Comp 4), it has proven to be quite effective esp. in engaging various basin stakeholders (from local communities to Ministers) in the IWRM planning and implementation, raising the awareness of RBO, and considered as good practice, compared to the previous approach of only delivering TDA and SAP (i.e. documents) at the end of a foundation project. Therefore, we propose to apply the same approach and keep Comp 4.

Each Output under Comp 4 is linked to issues identified as priorities by LIMCOM, based on their past studies and assessments thus highly likely will be identified as priorities in SAP. They are all selected from the LIMCOM IWRM Plan's Programme framework. Results from each Output will collectively inform SAP and NAP development process, the SAP investment plan development process, and provide evidence and data during the SAP investment discussions. The indication of the potential geographical location for each SAP demo intervention has been removed from the PIF to avoid any misperception that these demos are national level interventions with little transboundary impacts. The specific location for each SAP demo will be selected during the project development phase. The description of Comp 4 has been strengthened in the PIF to clarify this and avoid the impression of the Comp 4 being a disperse set of localized activities randomly supported by the project.

Planning exercise related to climate change and disaster management (Programme 2 of the LIMCOM IWRM Plan) is supported by USAID Resilient Waters (following on the support provided by USAID RESILIM project) and CRIDF and some activities are already underway.

Regarding Nexus, LIMCOM secured support from EU through SADC to align itself with the SADC Nexus Investment Framework (Phase I: 2017-2019). Its Phase II support (2020-2022) is under discussion, and once confirmed, this is expected to support the LIMCOM Nexus Assessment to identify opportunities and investment. The LIMCOM Nexus Assessment outputs will inform SAP and NAP development and the SAP Investment Plan, supported by the UNDP-GEF project.

***13. Component 5.1 – exchange with other RBOs and regional institutions e.g. OKACOM, ORASECOM, ...): Please explore cooperation with SADC Water Sector/Water Division and their track record and mandate on knowledge and experience exchange. We see at the GEF secretariat that several projects intending to request similar exchanges across the region. A consolidation and coordination at regional/SADC level will be needed beyond a project by project approach.***

Addressed.

***14. Component 5.3: Please mention that at least 1 % of the project budget will be allocated to the participation. Please also mention the establishment of a project website and the formulation of two experience notes.***

Addressed.

#### Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 Oct 2019

Through close consultations with GEFSEC and guidance from GEFSEC, the proposed project interventions have been significantly revised to allocate more resources to institutional capacity building (Comp 1) and TDA development activities (Comp 2). The revised PIF includes less diversity of actions and less activities for SAP demonstrations (Comp 4). More detailed responses to the more specific comments from GEFSEC on 6 May 2019 are as follows:

2.2 Comments are well noted and will be addressed during the PPG phase. A more clarity between the SAP and the next 5-year IWRM Plan will be sought and if at all possible and desired by the countries, the two will be merged.

3. Following the guidance and suggestions from GEFSEC, the Comp 1 is significantly strengthened to build LIMCOM's financial management capacity. It is proposed that the GEF resources will support an Operations Manager position as well as an Admin and Financial Assistant position at LIMCOM to establish the Operations capacity required to manage partner funds in the future. UNDP and LIMCOM will discuss with the proposed IP for the project (Global Water Partnership – Southern Africa) during the PPG phase in order to develop a clear plan on how to gradually build LIMCOM's financial management capacity and responsibilities throughout the project implementation. Such support to build operational and financial management capacity of LIMCOM throughout the project implementation period will be made as a requirement from IP. Also, operations and financial management training to the LIMCOM Secretariat will be budgeted in the project (Comp 1).

4. Costed Sustainability Plan for LIMCOM is now included as one key output under Comp 1.

6. Noted. It will be further clarified before endorsement.

7. Noted. It will be further clarified before endorsement.

9. After close consultations with GEFSEC, more financial resources are allocated to the overall Comp 2 than previously proposed. 6 proposed outputs under Outcome 2 are all priorities of priorities for the LIMCOM in their IWRM Plan implementation, and UNDP-GEF has comparative advantages to support the delivery of those 6 outputs with our experience in other river basins in southern Africa. Having said that, detailed costing for each of those output differ from a basin to a basin, as the baseline situations are different in each basin and in each country. We will ensure that the level of ambition will be matched with the resources available and the baseline situations during the PPG phase.

11. The ‘innovative private sector engagement modality (comp 1)’ was linked to SAP demo activities (Comp 4) that has been removed during this revision. Thus, the “innovative private sector engagement modality” has also been removed for the time being, although we will continue exploring options for innovative private sector engagement options throughout PPG and the project implementation. (In Comp 4, we will try to work with private sector.)

12. After close consultations with GEFSEC and guidance from GEFSEC, the Comp 4 (Outcome 5) has been significantly revised and scaled down. The Component will only focus on some pilot activities related to sedimentation controls (linked to Comp 2) and no other priority issues identified in the Limpopo IWRM Plan will be piloted through this project.

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

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

(4/16/2019). The project is aligned with the IW strategy in its overall aim to support cooperation on shared waters in the Limpopo basin.

**Cleared.**

#### **Agency Response**

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

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

(4/16/2019). Please adjust after addressing comments under question 3.

(5/7/2019). See above.

(10/16/2019) Comments have been addressed. **Cleared.**

**Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

After addressing comments under question 3, no adjustment was needed in this section.

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

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

(4/16/2019). Please adjust after addressing comments under question 3.

(5/7/2019). See above.

(10/16/2019) Comments have been addressed. **Cleared.**

## **Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

After addressing comments under question 3, no adjustment was needed in this section.

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

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

(4/16/2019). Yes, there is but please revisit and possibly adjust sections after addressing comments under question 3.

(5/7/2019). See above.

(10/16/2019) Comments have been addressed. **Cleared.**

## **Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

After addressing comments under question 3, no adjustment was needed in this section.

## **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**

(4/16/2019). Yes, a map is included.

Cleared.

## **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**

(4/16/2019). Yes, the outline provided is adequate at PIF stage.

Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

### **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**

(4/16/2019). The description of gender considerations during project design is adequate at PIF stage.

Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

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

(4/16/2019). Please address within comment/question under 3 above.

(10/16/2019) Comments have been addressed. **Cleared.**

## **Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 26 April 2019

Addressed under Question 3.

UNDP Response, 1 Oct 2019

Private sector engagement will be piloted at a limited scale under Comp 4 (IWRM demo) for sedimentation control activities, most likely with agricultural sector, but the details will be identified during the PPG phase.

## **Risks**

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

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

(4/16/2019)..Yes, the risk table addresses overall risks adequately at PIF stage. The TDA/monograph update and scenario developments will include the risk from climate variability and change.

(10/16/2019) Increasing climate variability and change and expected impacts are considered throughout the PIF and are underlying the Limpopo IWRM plan and priority actions with GEF supporting key actions of the Limpopo IWRM plan together with partners such as country governments and CRIDF, USAID, GIZ, GWP and others. **Cleared.**

**Agency Response**

**Coordination**

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

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

(4/16/2019). Yes, related projects are mentioned and the intent to closely cooperate e.g. with USAID Resilient Waters project, UK CRIDF, and likely/potential GIZ support to LIMCOM.

(10/16/2019) Yes, considered well at regional, basin level. As mentioned earlier during PPG further potential synergies with GEF and non-GEF supported TA and investments on national and sub-national should be explored (e.g. when designing the pilot interventions).

**Cleared.**

## **Agency Response**

### **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**

(4/16/2019). Yes. the alignment of support to LIMCOM with national strategies and plans is outlined in the PIF.

**Cleared.**

## **Agency Response**

### **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**

(4/16/2019). Yes. The project describes efforts for KM and experience exchange including cooperation with IW learn.

**Cleared.**

## **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**

(4/16/2019). Yes.

(10/31/2019) Please note that the OFP for Botswana changed in May 2019. A new LOE is needed for Botswana.

## **Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

New LOE from Botswana OFP attached

**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**

(5/7/2019). The project is not yet recommended for technical clearance.

Please address comments above.

**(10/31/2019) Not yet.** PIF stage comments have been overall been addressed in sufficient detail but two items remaining.

Please consider the comments provided throughout the review sheet to be addressed during project design/ppg phase, i.e. to be addressed before endorsement.

**Please revise two items before clearance/recommendation for WP entry :**

1. Revise the labeling of co-finance (as outlined above and communicated to UNDP).
2. Please obtain an LOE from the new OFP in Botswana.

**(11/4/2019)**

**Comments addressed. Cleared.**

The project is technically cleared and recommended for a future WP.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

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

Please see specific comments provided earlier within specific sections of the review sheet.

**Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		