



Sustainable Luangwa: Securing Luangwa's water resources for shared socioeconomic and environmental benefits through integrated catchment management

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10412

Countries

Zambia

Project Name

Sustainable Luangwa: Securing Luangwa's water resources for shared socioeconomic and environmental benefits through integrated catchment management

Agencies

WWF-US

Date received by PM

8/18/2021

Review completed by PM

10/7/2021

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-26-21: The proposed project remains aligned with focal area elements BD 1.1 and 2.7, and LD 1.4

9-20-21: Expected implementation start and end date gives a total 60 months of implementation, but not 48 months as in Portal entry. Please revise.

Submission Date 10/11/2019	Expected Implementation Start 3/1/2022	Expected Completion Date 3/1/2027
Duration ⓘ 48 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 260,023.00
Submission Date 10/11/2019	Expected Implementation Start 3/1/2022	Expected Completion Date 3/1/2027
Duration ⓘ 48 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 260,023.00

10-12-21: Cleared.

Agency Response

10/6/21

The project duration was initially envisioned at 48 months during the project identification stage, but changed to 60 months during development stage to take potential COVID19 related delays into account, particularly for project start up and closing phases. However, we are unable to change this in Portal from the Agency side, and may need to be done on backend.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8-26-21: Proposed project design and structure is adequate.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-26-21: The project has mobilized substantial co-financing from government, private sector and local NGOs. The co-financing letter of USD 12,345,970 (investment mobilized) from the Ministry of Agriculture regarding the GCF Project is missing. Please attach letter for review.

9-20-21: 1. The Investment mobilized by WWF Zambia has not been described. Please add description at the bottom of Table C.

Civil Society Organization	WWF Zambia Country Office	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	600,000.00
Civil Society Organization	WWF Zambia Country Office	Grant	Investment mobilized	480,100.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified
 Co-financing type has been allocated in accordance with GEF co-financing policy, using conservative estimates and definitions. Any budget that cannot be expected to be repeated annually into the future is considered as Investment Mobilized. "Investment Mobilized" figures include budget for related development / conservation / sustainable agriculture projects and for repair or improvement of relevant infrastructure. Investment Mobilized funds include new support from COMACO for conservation agriculture and marketing that will contribute towards sustainable land use and biodiversity conservation, project-related support from WECSZ for biodiversity conservation and community engagement, and support from the Ministry of Agriculture associated with the GCF project Strengthening Climate Resilience for Agricultural Rural Livelihood in Agro-ecological region I and II (SCRALA). This was identified as public investment in the form of a GCF grant.

2. Please also correct the Grant co-financing from WECSZ for the amount of \$702,000 from ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?**Investment mobilized?**.

Civil Society Organization	WECSZ	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,359,431.00
Civil Society Organization	WECSZ	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	702,000.00

Name of Partners	Type of co-financing	Type of Investment	Amount (US\$)
WECSZ	In-Kind	Recurrent Expenditure	1,359,431
WECSZ	Grant	Investment Mobilized	702,000
Total			2,061,431

3. The name of the below co-financier should be corrected to GCF considering that the Ministry of Agriculture has mobilized resources, but the public investment was identified in the form of a Grant from GCF.

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture (GCF) Strengthening Climate Resilience for Agricultural Rural Livelihood in Agro-ecological region I and II (SCRALA)	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	12,345,970.00
------------------------------	--	-------------------	----------------------	---------------

4. COMACO should be categorized as an NGO and not the Private Sector. Please adjust table and document.

10-21-21: Please, while the name of the co-financier was corrected to GFC (as opposed to the Ministry of Agriculture), the type of co-financing was kept as public investment. However, as mentioned in the comment, the type of investment was identified in the form of a Grant form GCF. Also, GCF is not 'Recipient Country Government' but Donor Agency. Please amend and resubmit.

Recipient Country Government	Green Climate Fund	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	12,345,970.00
------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------------	---------------

Agency Response

9/10/21

The Ministry of Agriculture co-financing letter has been attached.

10/6/21

1. Investment mobilized by WWF Zambia has been added to the description below table C.
2. Grant co-financing from WECSZ has been corrected from 'recurrent expenditures' to 'investment mobilized' as per the co-finance letter.
3. Co-financier name for SCRALA project has been changed from Ministry of Agriculture to Green Climate Fund.
4. COMACO was categorized as NGO. 4. COMACO was categorized as NGO.

10/13/21

The Green Climate Fund entry has been changed to include Donor Agency and Grant.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8-26-21: The proposed financing presented in Table D is adequate.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8-26-21: Status of PPG utilization is satisfactorily reported in Annex C.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8-30-21: The core indicators have been adjusted as recommended at PIF stage. The number of beneficiaries has been increased to 2,600 people. Proposed indicators are technically sound.

9-20-21: Please align all targets in the Core Indicator table with the targets in Annex A Project Results Framework.

10-12-21: Cleared.

Agency Response 10/6/21: Results Framework has been updated and re-uploaded to align with targets in Core Indicator Table.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8-30-21: The proposal presents substantial elaboration on threats, root causes and impacts of environmental degradation to be addressed by the project.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-30-21: Baseline scenario and associated projects are well described.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8-30-21: Components and proposed outcomes are adequately described.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-30-21: The alignment with the strategies of the BD and LD focal areas is satisfactory.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-2-21: Incremental reasoning is satisfactory.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-2-21: The proposed project design has improved meaningfully from PIF stage and the proposal has addressed the comments received satisfactorily. The project represents a good opportunity for addressing key drivers of forest and land degradation and biodiversity loss in the headwaters of the Luangwa river catchment and securing important global environmental benefits.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-2-21: Description of innovation, sustainability and scaling up aspects is adequate

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-2-21: Document provided detailed geo-referenced maps of project areas.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-2-21: The proposal includes a description of stakeholder consultations conducted during preparation and a comprehensive stakeholders engagement plan for project implementation.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-2-21: The project conducted extensive gender analysis and includes gender-sensitive activities and indicators linked with project objectives.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-2-21: Elaboration on private sector engagement is adequate.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-2-21: The risk analysis is comprehensive and includes considerations in regards to the COVID-19 situation.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-7-21: The proposed institutional arrangement is adequate. Given that the project also involves actions in the Miombo ecosystems, it will be important to coordinate with the GEF7 Drylands IP and explore potential areas for collaboration, particularly in the knowledge management aspects.

9-20-21: Other executing partner should also include WWF-Zambia as indicated in section 6 of the Portal entry. Please revise.

Other Executing Partner(s) ⓘ	Executing Partner Type
Ministry of Water Development, Sanitation and Environmental Protection - Environmental Management Department	Government

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Overview of Implementation Arrangements

The proposed executing structure (Figure 7) includes WWF as the GEF Agency, the Ministry of Water Development, Sanitation and Environmental Protection (MWDSEP) as Lead Executing Agency and WWF Zambia Country Office (WWF ZCO, a program office of WWF International) to provide technical support for delivery of outputs as well as financial and administrative management. On behalf of government with approval from the project National Steering Committee, WWF-Zambia will sub-grant to potential project delivery partners such as the Water Resources Management Authority (WARMA) to guide the participatory process leading to gazettement of the Luangwa headwaters as a Water Resource Protection Area (WRPA), the Wildlife and Environmental Conservation Society of Zambia (WECSZ) for awareness raising and capacity building activities for local communities in Mafinga District, and Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO) for support to farmers on conservation agriculture practices and linkage to markets, and others.

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Overview of Implementation Arrangements

The proposed executing structure (Figure 7) includes WWF as the GEF Agency, the Ministry of Water Development, Sanitation and Environmental Protection (MWDSEP) as Lead Executing Agency and WWF Zambia Country Office (WWF ZCO, a program office of WWF International) to provide technical support for delivery of outputs as well as financial and administrative management. On behalf of government with approval from the project National Steering Committee, WWF-Zambia will sub-grant to potential project delivery partners such as the Water Resources Management Authority (WARMA) to guide the participatory process leading to gazettement of the Luangwa headwaters as a Water Resource Protection Area (WRPA), the Wildlife and Environmental Conservation Society of Zambia (WECSZ) for awareness raising and capacity building activities for local communities in Mafinga District, and Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO) for support to farmers on conservation agriculture practices and linkage to markets, and others.

Agency Response

9/10/21

Thank you. The project team will explore opportunities for coordination and knowledge management with the GEF-7 Drylands Impact Program and associated child projects during implementation.

10/6/21

WWF Zambia has been added to the list of 'Other Executing Partners' (kindly note the 'Executing Partner Type' drop-down only allows one option, so this was not changed).

In addition, kindly note that due to the recent elections in Zambia (August 2021, after first submission of the CEO Endorsement Request), and in accordance with the government gazette notice No. 1123 of 2021 on the statutory functions, portfolios and composition of government, the Environmental Management Department (EMD) formerly under the Ministry of Water Development, Sanitation, and Environmental Protection (MWDSEP), has moved to the Ministry of Green Economy and Environment (MoGEE). The Ministry of Green Economy and Environment will replace MWDSEP as Lead Executing Entity for the project. A footnote has been added to the CEO Endorsement Request and Project Document and the institutional arrangements sections have been updated to reflect these changes.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-7-21: The proposed project is well aligned with national priorities.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-7-21: Project includes a Knowledge Management strategy integrated with the monitoring/evaluation and communication activities, including specific deliverables and timeline

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-7-21: The project includes an environmental and social management plan, where risks, impacts and mitigation measures are described.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-7-21: Project includes a satisfactory M&E plan with indicators, targets and budget.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-7-21: Social and economic benefits are adequately described.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-7-21: A summary and a detailed budget are lacking in the portal (Annex E). Please, make sure the technical glitches are fixed and make the tables directly available in the portal in addition to the documents attached. Please also include a justification for the 4x4 vehicles, motorbikes, and bicycles to be financed with the GEF grant.

10-12-21: Cleared.

Agency Response
9/10/21

The detailed budget has been uploaded to the Portal (Annex E), including justification for the 4x4 vehicles, motorbikes and bicycles to be funded by the GEF grant.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 9-7-21: Proposed results framework is satisfactory.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9-8-21: Please address the minor comments above and resubmit.

9-20-21: Please respond to the comments above and resubmit. Thanks!

10-12-21: Proposal is technically cleared, please address minor remaining comment on Part 1 #4 and resubmit. Thanks!

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 9-7-21: Status of PPG utilization is satisfactory.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 9-7-21: Maps and coordinates provided are adequate.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations