

# Enhancing Conjunctive Management of Surface and Groundwater Resources in Selected Transboundary Aquifers: Case Study for Selected Shared Groundwater Bodies in the Nile Basin

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## **Basic project information**

**GEF ID**

9912

**Countries**

Regional (Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda)

**Project Name**

Enhancing Conjunctive Management of Surface and Groundwater Resources in Selected Transboundary Aquifers: Case Study for Selected Shared Groundwater Bodies in the Nile Basin

**Agenices**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

5/29/2019

**Review completed by PM**

7/24/2019

**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**

(6/7/2019) The CEO endorsement document is overall consistent with the PIF. Cleared.

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

(6/7/2019) The project structure is overall clear and well formulated.

Please see few comments below:

#### **1. Pilot projects:**

Roles of local administration, local communities, farmer/pastoralist groups etc in the design and implementation of pilots:

Please be more consistent across the document and annexes (incl the stakeholder annex) on the role of local stakeholders in the design and implementation of the pilots. The description varies across the document and annexes. It is key for sustainability and for potential to scale up in other areas/localities that local stakeholders own and internalize the activities of the pilots i.e. are active drivers of the design and implementation in order to sustain activities past project closure. This may be facilitated by consultants but it is important to be clear the pilots are not simply 'technical' in nature and hence cannot be 'delivered' via contractors but have to be carried out in cooperation and lead by local stakeholders. Indicating this varies across the prodoc sections and annexes, e.g. para 81 mainly lists local stakeholders as workshop and training participants, and the stakeholder annex uses the language of local stakeholders in the pilots as : - Provide field evidence for piloting studies; · Provide local context to the piloting studies; and - Participate in various field survey interviews. This does not acknowledge the need for the active role of local water user groups e.g. in cooperatively implementing managed aquifer recharge schemes, water fund activities, etc..

**2. Gender:** Overall consideration gender aspects run through the document and component description which is well noted.

- Please reference sex disaggregated indicators in the RF where relevant.

- Please revisit the gender action plan with regard to gender roles in the pilot projects and assuring that women will have an active part in the design and implementation as well as equal *access* to benefits (it is noted that the latter is mentioned in the gender action plan already).

**3. Involvement and capacity enhancement of national focal point institutions:**

Similar as point 1 above, the clarity in which the intention to build ownership and capacity as well as a groundwater knowledge base not only on regional level (see para 74) but also in the national focal point institutions should be more consistent across the project document. It will be important for up-scaling activities on national and regional level that this capacity is not only enhanced in the regional Nile institutions but also in national levels. The reference to this in the Results Framework (pg 53) is clear and well noted, but not consistently carried through the project component description and institutional sections.

This may also be aided if one would link more clearly components 1 and 4.

(7/24/2019) All comments have been addressed. Cleared.

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

UNDP Response, 16 July 2019

1. Various sections of the Project document have been enhanced to reflect the efforts that will be taken in ensuring that stakeholders (communities, water users, national and local government staff) are actively involved in all aspects of the project. Please refer to the following paragraphs (highlighted) 71, 73, 74, 77, 91, 92, 101 (including b, c, g, i), 116, 129, 141, 153, 159, 181,

The stakeholder engagement plan (Annex E) has also been edited accordingly

Component 3 (Pilot projects) has been further enhanced by clarifying the roles of various stakeholders in pilot project design and implementation. Of particular interest is promotion of an active role for local communities and water user groups. Refer to paragraphs 101 (including b, c, g, i), 116, 129

2. The relevant sex disaggregated indicators include (1) direct project beneficiaries and training beneficiaries. However, the project aims at integrating gender mainstreaming in all project components and activities.

The Gender Action Plan (Annex F) has been revised accordingly.

3. The following has been added in para 74 (output 1.2) to address this comment: Also refer to the paragraphs mentioned above.

“Each focal point institution in each participating country will be capacitated with dedicated computers on which geodatabase and information system is loaded. Technicians from the focal point institutions will be trained on how to use, update and maintain the geo-daabase. The data collection and population of the database shall be conducted collaboratively by contractors, consultants, relevant experts from the national focal institutions, and the local and international stakeholders. “

In para 153, the following has been added to link components 1 with component 4 (capacity development):

“The training material will be prepared whenever possible using the results of the component 1 of the project. The PMU of the project will ascertain the possibility of linking the various capacity building activities and the results coming from the other projects. “

**Additional question from GEFSec, that is not displayed in portal:**

- The project aims towards identifying potential sources of financing for SAP/RBMP implementation. Please explain if the project aims towards securing commitment from national gov stakeholders towards the financial long term sustainability of the envisioned commission?

Yes. This will be carried out as part of development of scaling up strategy of project results.

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/7/2019

The knowledge on groundwater in the involved countries is to large degree limited and it would be hard to fill this gap with one project. Hence the focus on three selected and limited size transboundary aquifers as a first step. In that regard the project design is clear and cost-effective as reflected in the prodoc and maximizing finance by linking closely with other initiatives. Cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments** No action required on this question

**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**

6/7/2019

Yes, the project reflects on major risks including regional stability and addressing climate risks. Cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments** No action required on this question

**5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/7/2019

Yes, co-finance is confirmed and slightly exceeds co-finance at PIF stage. Cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments** No action required on this question

**6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/7/2019

- The original GEF International Waters (and other focal area) tracking tools are no longer required in previous form. Thanks for submitting it anyway.

- For the GEF core indicators:

Please note that the word document of the endorsement request and the worksheet lists area under improved management (indicator 4 - relating to the pilots) and the main and sub-indicators for the IW cored indicator 7 respectively.

Please assure that these are also entered in the Portal version of the endorsement request (which is the only official/valid version). Please let us know if there are problems in entering this.

2. Can you please comment on the figure of 10 000 000 beneficiaries (50/50 by gender) and how these have been estimated ?

(7/24/2019)

Both comments have been addressed. Cleared.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

UNDP Response, 16 July 2019

1. This is an estimate of the population that resides in the entire aquifer areas and their catchments

Correct indicators are now entered in the portal

2. This estimate was made as proportion of the population that lives in the catchment areas of the selected aquifers and, hence, could potentially benefit from improved practices of conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water. These shall be the indirect project beneficiaries as we acknowledge that the who population cannot be taken as direct beneficiaries. We have revised down the direct beneficiaries to 10% of this i.e. 1,000,000 inhabitants.

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** 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**

6/7/2019

Yes, the prodoc describes on how the project will build on and/or cooperate with related regional and national projects. On national level the project inception phase should make further efforts to identify and cooperate with other ongoing efforts especially in the area of the yet to selected pilots. Cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments** No action required on this question

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/7/2019

Yes , the project includes a budgeted M&E plan. Cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments** No action required on this question

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/7/2019

Yes, it includes component on knowledge management, dissemination and also sets aside a 1 % budget for active participation in IW learn activities. Please note that this should include a project website, at least two experience notes, and participation in IW learn global biannual conferences and in relevant regional/thematic meetings. Cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

UNDP Response, 16 July 2019

Dedicated project website and at least two experience notes added as part of the targets for Component 5 in the RF.

**Agency Responses**

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

**GEFSEC**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/7/2019

Yes, done. Comments related to involvement of local stakeholders e.g. in pilots are being addressed - see also more detail under question 2.

Cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

UNDP Response, 16 July 2019

No further action needed; responses given to question 2

## **STAP**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/7/2019

Please include STAP comments which were minor in Annex B of the endorsement request. While the prodoc addresses these minor comments, STAP comments also should be noted in Annex B.

(7/24/2019)

STAP comments and responses were added. Please also note that in terms of GEF strategies and policies this project is not operationally linked, nor a second phase of an earlier, basin-wide UNDP implemented project addressing groundwater.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

UNDP Response, 16 July 2019

Annex B of CEO ER is now updated

## **GEF Council**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

## **Convention Secretariat**

## **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

#### **Recommendation**

#### **12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

## **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/7/2019

Please make sure to enter the GEF core indicators in the endorsement request and address the comments above.

(7/24/2019)

Please list the same executing entity in the UNDP prodoc and in the Portal endorsement request. In the UNDP prodoc and project design the NBI is designated as the executing agency. Please revise and resubmit asap.

(7/24/2019)

Comment above addressed by the Portal team. All comments have been addressed and the project is technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.

(8/21/2019)

Please address the comments below based on GEF PPO review and resubmit.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Best regards.

**Henry Salazar**

PPO

Action Performed: send back to manager

Project to be returned to the Agency due to: 1- There are some sections in the ProDoc that show executing activities that could be performed by UNDP, who is the Implementing Agency. In these sections the Agency has to remove the possibility of a UNDP staff to fill out some of the key positions for the execution of the project. 2- When reviewing the budget, we found that the Agency charged \$151,602 for ‘Local consultants’ for the Project Management Unit (see section IX. Financial Planning Management of the ProDoc). Footnote 35 that explains the detail of this describes the following: “Local consultants. Project support costs for Procurement Assistant to be employed for first 2.5 years at USD 27,041 USD p.a and a Finance and Admin Assistant to be mobilized on part time (on call) basis to support NBI finance team during critical periods at 12,000 USD p.a.” Salaries/honoraria for the Project Management unit staff are to be paid from the Project Management Cost (PMC), not from the project components. These charges have to be removed from the budget and charged to the PMC.

(9/25/2019) the three remaining comments have been partially addressed. Please address the remaining point as per discussion:

(1.)

*Para 243: “Senior Supplier: The Senior Supplier is an individual or group representing the interests of the parties concerned which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project (designing, developing, facilitating, procuring, implementing). The Senior Supplier’s primary function within the Board is to provide guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project. The Senior Supplier role must have the authority to commit or acquire supplier resources required. If necessary, more than one person may be required for this role. Typically, the implementing partner, UNDP and/or donor(s) would be represented under this role. The Senior Supplier is: **UNDP***

(i) The sentence: “The Senior Supplier role must have the authority to commit or acquire supplier resources required” still needs clarification: The term senior supplier – held by UNDP – needs to be clarified to assure that it aligns with GEF’s policies defining the role of the implementing agency. UNDP is the implementing agency (in GEF language; not UNDP language) and hence there needs to be a clear statement that UNDP will not perform any executing functions (i.e. UNDP does not e.g. spend project funds or perform any procurement functions with regard to project funds) and UNDP staff cost will be covered by the agency fees. I assume that the term “commit or acquire supplier resources” means UNDP resources not project resources/funds (as UNDP is the supplier). **Please confirm.**

(ii) Please add a sentence that the senior supplier (i.e. UNDP) will **not** perform any executing functions (in GEF definition of the word) and not handle any project procurement. The bracket stating that the senior supplier would perform “...,procuring, implementing” is not consistent with the GEF policies of the role of GEF agencies (here: **NBI** is the ‘implementing agency’ as per the UNDP prodoc).

(iii) If there is a standard TOR or UNDP policy/definition for the ‘senior supplier’ function, could you please append a TOR for the senior supplier? Thanks.

(2.) We strongly recommend to also revisit the definition and description of the functions (para 248) of the **Project Manager**. Per the project description this person is hired as a Technical Expert/Technical Lead to guide the technical design of groundwater assessments and models, databases and similar technical functions. Only a small percentage of his/her time will be spent on project coordination/admin. Please clarify and make sure that staff and/or staff time dealing with project admin functions is charged to the project management cost (PMC) and technical staff/staff time is accounted for in the project components.

(10/28/2019)

The comments above have been addressed. The split of the Technical Lead (Project manager) functions into his/her technical functions and roles in the project and the admin/project management functions make sense and provide for transparency.

The project is cleared based on technical considerations and recommended for endorsement.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

#### **UNDP Response, 16 July 2019**

Included already in the CEO ER.

#### **UNDP Response, 8 October 2019**

The Prodoc has been revised as follows

1. Paragraph 240 has been edited to remove reference to UNDP
2. Paragraph 243 has been edited to clearly specify UNDP as the Senior Supplier
3. The Prodoc has been further reviewed to ensure that there are no other instances where it implies a possibility of UNDP staff to fill out some of the key positions for the execution of the project

The budget code for Budget Code 36 has been changed to 71800 - Contractual services -Implementing Partner

1. Para 243 has been re-written to address the comment from GEFsec. The para now clearly states that the Senior Supplier (UNDP) doesn't perform execution functions. References to procurement and implementing functions have been removed.

1. Comments on Project Manager: the title has been changed to Project Technical Lead to signify the substantial technical scope of the work. Further, the terms of reference for the Project Technical Lead have been expanded to include technical tasks in addition to project management tasks. The PTL is envisaged to spend 80 % of his/her time on technical matters and 20 % on project management tasks.

To reflect the two broad categories of functions of the PTL, i.e. technical (80 %) and project management (20 %), the total cost of the PTL has been split into two, i.e. technical (80 %) and project management (20 %) and reflected in the budget for Components 1-5 (80 %) and PMU (20 %).

#### **UNDP Response, 22 Oct 2019**

The budget code for Budget Code 36 has been changed to 71800 - Contractual services -Implementing Partner

1. Para 243 has been re-written to address the comment from GEFsec. The para now clearly states that the Senior Supplier (UNDP) doesn't perform execution functions. References to procurement and implementing functions have been removed.

All execution transactions/activities will be handled by the IGO which is the IP, except the oversight services by UNDP CO covered by the Fee. Also, all M&E related project activities will not be handled by UNDP CO, they must be done by the IGO, except the supervision services (oversight) on M&E.

The IGO representatives understands, that UNDP will not provide any execution services, therefore, IGO is currently working on strengthening of financial/procurement capacity of the PMU, to ensure timely and quality delivery of the project activities.

Following text was added to para 2018 “UNDP do not hire/appoint project staff, do not handle project procurement functions, and do not handle M&E activities, except providing oversight to those activities, according to the GEF Financial Procedures Agreements”.

2. Comments on Project Manager: the title has been changed to Project Technical Lead to signify the substantial technical scope of the work. Further, the terms of reference for the Project Technical Lead have been expanded to include technical tasks in addition to project management tasks. The PTL is envisaged to spend 80 % if his/her time on technical matters and 20 % on project management tasks.

To reflect the two broad categories of functions of the PTL, i.e. technical (80 %) and project management (20 %), the total cost of the PTL has been split into two, i.e. technical (80 %) and project management (20 %) and reflected in the budget for Components 1-5 (80 %) and PMU (20 %).

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

**Background.** In the countries that will be covered by the project, each of the countries regard groundwater as an insufficiently understood asset that can contribute to climate resilience to droughts as a supplement to surface waters. The importance is reflected in the significant populations that are dependent on groundwater in many parts of the select basin areas (for example, 80% of the rural population in Ethiopia and 36 million inhabitants in Uganda; 86% of safe drinking water supply for rural areas of Rwanda). The regional and national importance of groundwater is further emphasized by the lack of knowledge, at all levels of society, about the extent, problems and solutions facing groundwater resources. There are clear indications that groundwater is under threat from unsustainable exploitation with increasing use of the resource for irrigation, mining, and other uses and additional pressures on water being felt by increasing climate variability and change. These pressures are most prominently felt in the small transboundary constellation of aquifers of enormous local importance.

**The project.** The project aims to attain more effective utilization and protection of selected shared aquifers in the selected sub-basin in the Eastern Nile and the Nile Equatorial Lakes region through further improving the understanding of available groundwater resources and demonstrating ‘conjunctive management’ that optimizes the joint use of surface and groundwater. The project is structured in 4 components to (i) enhance current understanding of available groundwater resources and groundwater-surface water interactions; (ii) develop and initiate implementation of action plans to enhance groundwater governance and support measures to sustain groundwater dependent ecosystems; (iii) support to innovative pilot such as for managed aquifer recharge, water funds to maintain sustainable watershed services, use of advanced remote sensing techniques for groundwater monitoring, the use of isotope techniques to define surface – groundwater interactions for selected wetland ecosystems, and mainstreaming this information into the Nile Basin Decision Support Systems (DSS); and (iv) enhancing capacity, awareness and communication on the role of groundwater and conjunctive uses. The project will also contribute to aid the national achievements and reporting of water-related Sustainable Development Goals.

**Innovation, sustainability and scale-up.** The project is the first of its kind in dealing with specific shared groundwater aquifers in the Nile Basin. Given the complex surface water management issues in the Nile Basin, this project forms an essential first phase to build capacity for future scale-up to other shared aquifers by engaging in depth in a limited set of selected transboundary aquifers within parts of the Nile Basin watershed. The present project is addressing three aquifers and is estimated to benefit ~ 1 million rural inhabitants.