



# Strengthening integrated transboundary management of the Incomati and Maputo river basins

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11180

**Countries**

Regional (Eswatini, Mozambique, South Africa)

**Project Name**

Strengthening integrated transboundary management of the Incomati and Maputo river basins

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

6/28/2024

**Review completed by PM**

11/20/2024

**Program Manager**

Astrid Hillers

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF  
CEO**

**Part I - General Project Information**

**1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(8/5/2024)

1. Is the the Global Water Partnership in Southern Africa ?

(10/28/2024)

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

UNDP Response, 16Oct2024

Global Water Partnership headquarters are in Sweden. The Southern Africa Regional Office is in Pretoria, South Africa since 2000.

**b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024) Yes

## Agency Response

### 2. Project Summary.

**a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024) Please add a little more context specific to the Inkomati- Maputo basin and the Lubombo TFCA and how the project is environed add to water-food- energy-environment security.

(10/28/2024)

Comment addressed.

## Agency Response

UNDP, response, 16Oct2024

This text was added to address the comment: "Collaboration between the Incomati and Maputo River Basin Commission, Lubombo Transfrontier Conservation Area, Nairobi Convention Secretariat and relevant ministries and departments in the three participating countries will be strengthened to ensure interventions on water resources management are well linked with priorities for biodiversity conservation in the area to contribute to improved management of coastal areas and reduce pollution of marine ecosystems from land sources?". See page 2 of the CEO ER.

### 3. Project Description Overview

**a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**

**b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

**c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**

**d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024)

1. PDO: The coordination and synergies with the TFCA management is another major aspect that may warrant mentioning (?)

2. PMC to its co-finance should be in the same pro-portion as the overall GEF grant to co-finance ratio. Please note: if the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$57,458,313 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,872,915 instead of \$248,000 (which is 0.4%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-

financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level.

Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion

(10/28/2024)

1. Addressed.

2. Noted. Addressed.

#### Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16Oct2024

1. The Project Description Overview (PDO) has been updated to read: To promote integrated source-to-sea management of the Incomati and Maputo River, Basins, Lubombo Transfrontier Conservation Area and coastal zones to ensure environmental security and inclusive livelihoods. See page 3 of the CEO ER.

2. There was an error in the calculation of the co-financing portion. This has now been corrected to \$3,235,750 which 5.05% of the total co-financing, now \$64,036,313, due to inclusion of co-financing letter from Government of South Africa and correction of highlighted errors. See changes under the PDO pages 3-7 of the CEO ER.

#### 4. Project Outline

##### A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024)

1. Please describe how the drivers of degradation and root causes identified in the rationale link to the barriers in the project description section. There seems to a large disconnect.

(10/28/2024)

1. Comment has been addressed with added text.

## Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16Oct2024

Explanatory text has been added within the section introducing the Theory of Change. It clarifies the relationship between the removal of the barriers and addressing the drivers and root causes of degradation and the identified environmental issues in general. See pages 10-11 of the CEO ER.

### 5 B. Project Description

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**

**b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**

**e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**

**g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**

**h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**

**i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**

**j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**

**l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024)

1. See comment above: please link the barriers and the components/actions suggested by the project which are mostly on regional level more clearly to the drivers which originate on national level and have regional implication. This will be key in order to understand the logic of the ToC. **As it stands it is not clear how the project design responds to the drivers of environmental degradation and their root causes.**

2. The **component descriptions are missing in the ER.** I also do not see the UNDP prodoc uploaded in the portal to see if this was just an omission while pasting the document into the portal.

Several annexes to the UNDP prodoc are in fact uploaded in the portal, incl. e.g. the Annex on the demonstration projects (component 4).

The two comments above limit the review and full comments at this time. Further review (and comments) will be done after resubmission. Please in the project component description touch on issues of policy coherence on national and regional levels in addressing WEF Nexus and other competing pressures. How is the project addressing these - among other. Does the SADC Nexus guidance or the ISWEL tools provide any entry points to bridge sectors ?

Please also make sure to describe the roles of specific stakeholder groups and partners (incl. those mentioned in the institutional arrangement section) and include gender considerations across all relevant outputs.

Please also include lessons learned that the project will build on , incl. other regional river basin projects in the SADC region and experiences of GWP and their support role to other projects.

Please also upload the UNDP project document in the portal.

(10/28/2024) The comments have been fully addressed and the project design description including lessons learned is sound.

## Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16Oct2024

1. As indicated above, explanatory text has been added in both the CEO ER and the ProDOC within the sections introducing the Theory of Change. It clarifies the relationship between the removal of the barriers and addressing the drivers and root causes of degradation and the identified environmental issues in general. See pages 10-11 of the CEO ER.

2. Component descriptions have been added to the CEO ER. See pages 13-20 of the CEO ER.  
a) The Prodoc and annexes are now uploaded in the Portal.

b) Issues of coherence with national and regional policies on the WEF nexus and the competing pressures, especially for water are now included. See pages 22-23 of the CEO ER.

c) The roles of specific stakeholder groups and partners have been added across all relevant outputs. Further details on gender consideration across all relevant outputs have also been added. See PDO on pages 3-7

d) A section has been added on lessons learnt that the project will build on from GWP-SA execution and other transboundary projects implemented in the SADC region. See pages 22-23 of the CEO ER.

e) The latest version of the Prodoc including responses to the points raised in this review, has been uploaded to the Portal.

## **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**

**a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**

**b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**

**c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024) The institutional arrangements are adequately outlined.

1. Please answer the question if UNDP will take an executing role (it appear to be "no") based on the text.

2. The detail on important partner institutions in the region described under "cooperation with other initiatives" shows the broad partnerships and innovation the project is aiming for. Please mention the key partners in the description of relevant components.

3. Please also list other projects and initiatives the project will cooperate with, incl. e.g. such the SADC-GMI, but also other projects and initiatives supported by development partners (e.g. GEF agencies and/or bilaterals) and /or the governments.

4. How and by who will the pilot activities be implemented and how will that implementation modality contribute to the scale-up of successful pilots?

**(10/28/2024 and 11/7/2024)**

1. This is answered in the agency response clearly as NO and also evident from the description of the institutional set-up. The portal appears to have issues in saving late responses as we have seen in other submissions/other projects. Hence this is cleared.

2. Addressed.

3. This has been added and also is incorporated with project component descriptions in the UNDP project document. addressed

4. Addressed in the prodoc.

**(11/7/2024)**

**Institutional arrangements (new comment):** As per our discussion on the budget (which is now attached), the majority of staff should be located at INMACOM and not as a service by the executing agency (GWP-SA). Currently, there are a lot of GWP-SA staff involved which does not build capacity in the RBO and also drives up costs (see comments on the budget). Location of staff at INMACOM with only back-up by GWP-SA is in the interest of building capacity at INMACOM itself so that the RBO in future will be able to receive and administer a greater amount of funds and execute itself. This capacity building of RBOs for which GWP-SA is the executing agency has been discussed and agreed e.g. in the case of LIMCOM before. Please confirm that this point is part of the agreement with GWP-SA. One of their indicators of success should be to leave behind such capacities at INMACOM which could be verified by an end of project outside assessment..

**(11/13/2024)**

- Please recheck figure 2 "Project Institutional Structure" in the endorsement request. The number and type of GWPSA staff listed as part of the Project Management unit is the same, while - per the budget - time inputs and daily rates have been substantially reduced. Also, some of the positions TORs , such as for the GWPSA Regional Gender Specialist, are no longer part of the list of TORs, yet that position is still listed in **figure 2 in the ER. Please comment/address**. It appears that the same figure in the prodoc (figure 4 in the prodoc) has in fact been updated.

- Also, in the endorsement request the question of "**Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this project? If so, please describe that role here and the justification.**" is not answered. We know that the portal on your end often only shows the option to select "yes" which is not what you want here. Just not to leave this in limbo, please add a brief sentence confirming that UNDP will have no executing role in the project after the prompt" "**If so, please describe that role here and the justification.**"

**(11/15/2024)**

Comments addressed.

Agency Response



#### Agency Response

12 November 2024

The comment has been addressed. The organizational structure and the budget have been updated. Now most of the positions are now in INMACOM. Also, the daily fee of remaining back-up staff of GWPSA is USD 500 or less. These changes availed USD 158,962 from staff salaries that have been allocated to mainly component 4 to increase the budget for on-going activities under demonstration projects.

#### UNDP Response, 16Oct2024

1. UNDP will not be taking an executing role. ?No? is now selected. See page 22 of the CEO ER.
2. Information on partners has been added into each component ? including clarifying how projects will be scaled up through working with catchment management agencies and private sector to build sustainable business models that will ensure water, food and environmental security. See pages 13-20 of the CEO ER.
3. Other projects and initiatives the project will cooperate with have been added. See pages 22-23 of the CEO ER.
4. Information on how and by who will the pilot activities be implemented and how will that implementation modality contribute to the scale-up of successful pilots has been added. See the last paragraph of page 11 of the CEO ER.

#### UNDP Response 15 Nov 2024

Project Institutional Structure has been updated in the CEO Endorsement Request.

A statement is added into the portal and CEO Endorsement request that UNDP will not have any execution role for the project.

#### 5.3 Core indicators

**a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

**Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024)

Indicator 3, 4 and 11 are in general provided and are increased compared to PIF value (yet, see comment 2. below).

1. Indicator 7 and sub-indicators need to be filled out with values AT ENDORSEMENT stage.

2. under indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification, please indicate the name(s) of the third-party certification as available.

(10/28/2024)

**1. Not addressed in the endorsement request.** Values are still zero or not filled out in the column "Number(Expected at CEO Endorsement stage)" of the Core Indicator Table **in the endorsement request. The values are indicated in Annex 13 of the prodoc !**

**Please get in touch with GEF IT (Wanderson or Priyanka) if this is a portal problem and you are not able to save the updated values in the CI table of the ER.**

2. Noted. Cleared.

**(11/4/24) Comment addressed.**

#### Agency Response

UNDP, response 16Oct2024

1. The missing value for Indicator 7 has been included in both the table of core indicators in the CEO Request, and in Annex 13 to the ProDOC2. See Page 24 of the CEO ER.
2. Names of the third-party certification are not available.

UNDP, response 4 November 2024

Comment addressed in the portal.

#### 5.4 Risks

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024) The risks were overall well articulated.

1. The Environmental and Social Risk rating by UNDP's assessment (Annex 8) is substantial. The rating in the risk table and the E&S rating should be consistent. Please make the risks consistent with ESS risks and revise. Doing so would be in line with the description of the "Environmental and Social" risk category in Annex B of the GEF Risk Appetite document (GEF/C.66/13) stating that: "The rating reported by project under this category is identical to the Overall Safeguards Risk rating provided at PIF, CEO Endorsement, MTR and TE stage."

2. Also, Mozambique is one of the countries under conflict in the WBG FY24 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations. Please ensure that conflict assessment and analysis are conducted and that a clear risk management plan with mitigation measures and budgets is identified.

3. Please give the risk under "other" a topic/title. Also, there seems to be a first sentence missing at the beginning of the assessment for the "Other" risk category as the paragraph starts with "This would pose..." without specifying what "This" is about. Please edit as appropriate.

4. Under "Overall Risk", please edit "string" as appropriate in the following sentence: There is a strong political will

(10/28/2024)

1. Addressed.

2. Noted and cleared.

3. and 4. Addressed.

#### Agency Response

UNDP, response 16Oct2024

1. This has been corrected to read "substantial" in the CEO Endorsement Request. See Page 25 of the CEO ER.

2. It is correct that Mozambique is listed by the WBG as part of the Fragile and conflict-affected Situation (FCS) country. However, this is due to the conflict in Cabo Delgado province as documented in the WB Country Partnership Framework for Mozambique 2023-2027. None of the activities of the current project are located in this region.

3. Other is supposed to read "Inter-country and sector cooperation" and other text has been corrected. See page 27 of the CEO ER.

4. "string" has been changed to "strong". See page 28 of the CEO ER.

**5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

#### Agency Response

**6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024)

1. Please delete the reference to ABNJ.

(10/28/2024) Addressed.

#### Agency Response

UNDP, response 16Oct2024

Reference to ABNJ has been deleted. See page 28 of the CEO ER.

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024) Yes, though the ER only outlines consistency with regional policies and strategies.

Please add sections to show the link to national priorities.

(10/28/2024) Addressed.

#### Agency Response

UNDP, response 16Oct2024

The section has been added to link to national priorities. See pages 28-29 of the CEO ER.

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(10/28/2024) Addressed

#### Agency Response

UNDP, response, 16Oct2024

The text showing how the project will contribute to the GBF has been added ? See pages 30-31 of the CEO ER.

#### 7 D. Policy Requirements

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024) Yes, but as the project component description was not included in the ER review of several of the documents isn't very meaningful in the abstract. To be revisited in the resubmission.

(10/28/2024) Detailed text and the prodoc have been provided in the resubmission and the policy sections and requirements fulfilled.

### Agency Response

UNDP, response 16Oct2024

As indicated earlier, the project component description is now included. See pages 13-20 of the CEO ER.

#### 7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024) Yes, an extensive gender analysis and action plan has been uploaded (Annex 9)

The Gender Action Plan is costed and includes clear targets and indicators.

1. Please reflect in the Project Overview table, relevant gender dimensions in each component developed in the Gender Action Plan. Please ensure that the data collection and the frameworks developed are gender-responsive (Outputs 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3) and that the trainings and knowledge exchange activities target women and women led organizations (e.g. Output 2.1.1., 2.2.4). Please, also ensure that the project description integrated the support and access to business opportunities (Outputs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2).

2. Ensure that all KM products highlight gender dimensions, best practices and lessons learned. During project implementation, the PIRs, the MTE and the TE should include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

(10/28/2024)

1. Addressed - incl. clear indicators on gender dimensions in the Results Framework.

2. Noted. Cleared.

### Agency Response

UNDP, response 16Oct2024

1. These gender dimensions are now included in the Project Overview table and under components and now the project description integrates the support and access to business opportunities (Outputs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2). See pages 3-7; Pages 13-20 of the CEO ER and Pages 13-27 of the Prodoc.

2. 2. All KM products now highlight gender dimensions, best practices and lessons learned. See Pages 13-20 of the CEO ER and Pages 13-27 of the Prodoc. During the project implementation, the PIRs, MTE and TE will include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024) I do not see it in the portal. Please advise or upload.

(10/28/2024) This is indeed now uploaded and is in content and detail fulfilling the GEF guidance on this.

Agency Response

UNDP, response, 16Oct2024

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan has now been uploaded to the portal.

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(8/5/2024) Yes.

Agency Response

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(8/5/2024) Yes

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(8/5/2024) Yes

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response  
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response  
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response  
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response  
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(8/5/2024)

1. Overall , yes, but please note that " Miscellaneous expense" is not an eligible category ? please ask the Agency to remove it.

(10/28/2024)

1. Noted and confirmed that this is according to UNDP rules. Cleared.

Agency Response  
UNDP, response 16Oct2024

Miscellaneous expenses are under UNDP's eligible category to cater for costs such as bank charges. Therefore, a commitment of \$1,000.00 is still reflected in the PPG Fund Utilization.

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(8/5/2024) NA - no STAR

#### Agency Response

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(8/5/2024)

1. Please link the letters of co-finance to the respective row in the co-finance table.
2. Please note: In-kind co-finance cannot be labeled as investment mobilized. Please label all "*in-kind*" contributions (as per respective letters of co-finance) as "*recurrent expenditures*".
3. Please review the letters of co-finance and label the type of co-finance in accordance as stated in the letters; e.g. all three UNDP country offices' co-finance are labeled as *in-kind* (**not grant**) and are therefore *recurring expenditures* (**not investment mobilized**).
4. SADC GMI is providing in their letter confirmation of two contributions 100 k as grant/investment mobilized and 100 K as in-kind/recurring expenditures. Currently only one contribution is included in the table. Is there a reason for this?
5. Please spell out acronyms in all tables, e.g. IUCMA, UKZN etc.. Please also note that the IUCMA in-kind contribution is wrongly labeled as investment mobilized.
6. IUCN co-finance: Please confirm that the IUCN co-finance is not counting all of the BRIDGE resources OR secure that none of these have already been counted as co-finance for other IUCN projects in Africa. Please ask the IUCN GEF unit for an email confirming this in writing.
7. University of Kwazulu Natal ( UKZN) - in kind portion of their co-finance should be labeled as "recurring expenditure" not 'investment mobilized'.

In addition - and as not already addressed above - please note the following comments:

a A grant financing of EUR 5,900,000 is indicated in the cofinancing letter from the Peace Park Foundation. However, the CEO Endorsement form reflects this amount as USD 6,415,000. Please provide the conversion rate from EUR to USD, along with the date and source (e.g., UN Operational Rates of Exchange). This information should be included in the cofinancing letter or described in the CEO Endorsement form.



b The cofinancing letter from UKZN states in-kind financing of USD 2 million, covering costs related to office space, staff, and student time. As per the GEF co-financing policy, this contribution should be categorized as "Recurrent Expenditures (i.e., operational/operating expenditures)? rather than "Investment Mobilized."

c Similarly, the cofinancing letter from Kruger to Canyons specifies an in-kind financing of USD 1,500 to cover staff travel and work time. This contribution should also be categorized as "Recurrent Expenditures." Likewise, the cofinancing letter from IUCMA indicates an in-kind financing of USD 115,789, covering office space and staff time, which should be categorized as "Recurrent Expenditures."

d The co-financing amounts of USD 100,000 each from UNDP Eswatini and UNDP South Africa (UNDP SA) are accurate. However, their type of co-financing should be noted as in-kind rather than grants, as these contributions involve using UNDP facilities and services and technical assistance from the regional offices. Consequently, these should also be categorized as "Recurrent Expenditures."

e There seems to be no co-financing letter provided to substantiate the USD 100,000 in-kind co-financing from UNDP Mozambique. Please submit the required documentation.

f The co-financing letter from SADC-GMI indicates both a grant of USD 100,000 and in-kind co-financing of USD 100,000 for staff time. However, the CEO Endorsement form only reflects the grant. Please include the in-kind co-financing (recurrent expenditures) of USD 100,000 in the form, if relevant.

g The ESWADE letter indicates grants of USD 185,000,000 and in-kind financing of USD 15,000,000, which is not listed in the CEO Endorsement form. Please include this information in the form, or if it is irrelevant, refrain from submitting this letter. Additionally, there is an inconsistency within the ESWADE letter. While it correctly states USD 185,000,000 for grants, the annex lists USD 3,000,000 instead of USD 15,000,000 for in-kind contributions related to water resources monitoring and management. This discrepancy should be addressed if the letter is to be submitted.

h Please upload the co-financing letters corresponding to each co-financing entry in the "Confirmed Co-financing" section. Use the "Upload letters of co-finance" button to attach these documents.

(10/28/2024)

- 1., 2, 3. Addressed.
4. SADC GMI : addressed.
5. Split between grant and in-kind in the letter is now correctly reflected.
6. Noted. Cleared.
7. University of Kwazulu Natal - now correctly labeled as grant or in-kind in accordance with the letter of co-finance. Addressed.

in addition, comments a. to h. have been addressed.

## Agency Response

UNDP, response 16Oct2024

The comments below on co-financing are addressed on pages 31-32 of the CEO ER:

1. The letters of co-finance are now linked to the respective row in the co-finance table.
2. The correction has been made. All "in-kind" contributions are now labelled as "recurrent expenditures". See co-financing table
3. Corrections have been made.
4. SADC GMI100 K as in-kind/recurring expenditures has been added.
5. Acronyms are now spelled out in all tables and the IUCMA in-kind contribution corrected to recurrent expenditures.
6. Email confirming that IUCN co-finance is not counting all of the BRIDGE resources and none of these have already been counted as co-finance for other IUCN projects in Africa has been provided.
7. University of Kwazulu Natal Co-financing is now labeled as "recurring expenditure".
  - a. The conversion rate from EUR to USD, along with the date and source has been added in the CEO Endorsement form. A footnote reflecting the exchange rate has been added.
  - b. The in-kind co-financing of UKZN has been changed to recurrent expenditure.
  - c. The co-financing from Kruger to Canyons has also been changed to recurrent expenditure.
  - d. The UNDP co-financing has been changed to in-kind and recurrent
  - e. The UNDP Mozambique letter is included
  - f. The SADC-GMI USD 100,000 in-kind co-financing omission was an error. This has been rectified.
  - g. The ESWADE letter has been withdrawn.
  - h. This upload has been done in the portal.

### Annex B: Endorsements

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024) Yes, all LOEs were provided at PIF stage.

(10/28/2024) Addressed.

Agency Response

**b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(8/5/2024) Yes

Agency Response

**c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(8/5/2024) Yes

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)**

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

**d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024)

1. Please include gender differentiated indicators and target for all relevant indicators in the Results Framework as well as other relevant actions and their metrics from the Gender Action Plan.

For *example*,

- consultations on the TDA and SAP should track number of people consulted/engaged and track gender; same of all committees established, etc.

- while there is no gender target for INMACOM staff at this point, gender balance should be reported as measure of good practice

(10/28/2024)

Addressed.

#### Agency Response

UNDP, response 16Oct2024

1. The wrong version of the results framework was included. This has now been replaced with the correct version and additions on gender have been added. See pages 37-47.

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(8/5/2024) Yes

#### Agency Response

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(8/5/2024)

1. The Budget table is not uploaded/linked in the Portal view, neither pasted in the Review form ? please amend. Per the resubmission, we will review the Budget table and provide comments as appropriate.

2. Please provide TORS for the key staff charged to the project. Annex 12 only includes TORS for the project board which indicates the percentage of admin and technical time spent in this project and which aligns with the percentages charged to PMC per the budget.

(10/28/2024)

1. The budget table is uploaded in the portal. It **ALSO needs to be linked/attached as Annex G to the endorsement request form.**

**When attaching in the portal and to aid readability, please keep column (level of detail) to component or sub-component level but not down to the outputs level. This will reduce the number of columns and therefore readability in a pdf format of the endorsement request.**

**Please address.**

2. TORs have been provided and % of time substantiated that are expected to be spent on specific technical tasks (components and outputs) and what percentage is allocated to PMC. Thanks for distinguishing clearly between the financial specialist - e.g advising on private sector finance - and the the financial management officer. Also good to see that there economies of scale and co-finance of positions withing GWP SA given their role in other projects and hence some part-time positions can be used across several projects.

**(11/4/24)**

Please link the GEF budget template to the endorsement request as Annex G (see also comment 1 above and assure that it readable for circulation to Council).

**(11/7/24)**

Thank you for linking the budget to the endorsement request.

- As mentioned before, per the resubmission of the budget table, we would review it and provide comments as appropriate. The way the budget is presented by merging several positions in one budget line and presenting a single cost (see screenshot below) impedes to understand the individual costs of important positions mapped to the Project Management Unit such as the Project Coordinator, Project Officer, Senior Climate Advisor, Communications and KM Officer, etc. Hence, it is not possible to assess the reasonability of these positions being charged to the project components, M&E and/or PMC even if we reviewed the TORs included in the ProDoc (see comments on the TORs below). This budget table is presented in the CEO Endorsement Request Portal view throughout 56 pages, making it unreadable (see attached file). Please ask the Agency to amend the budget table by (i) itemizing the positions included in the TORs; (ii) presenting the budget table in a readable form in the CEO Endorsement Request Portal view (hint: present the budget per components, removing the outcomes); (iii) present the detailed description of the budget lines in a reasonable manner to understand what the activity/position intends to achieve (i.e. an explanation like that presented in the screenshot sent by email does not explain anything).

- TORs: while it is not possible to assess the adequacy of the TORs included in the ProDoc (attached ? see page 147 onwards) *vis-?-vis* the different sources (project?s components, M&E,

PMC) that may cover these positions, we have some observations regarding the costs (we will be in a position to assess this per the resubmission of the Budget table following the requirements presented in the above bullet point):

- Senior Technical Adviser: daily rate of US\$ 770 X 300 days (nearly 1 year) = US\$231,000. The total amount is as costly as similar positions that last for the whole duration of the project (5 years). One wonders why similar positions that would cost US\$126 dollars per day, in this case the Senior Technical Adviser cost 6 times more. Please ask the Agency to revise.
- GWPSA Transboundary Water & Environment Specialist: daily rate of US\$ 605 X 450 days (1.5 years) = US\$272,000. The total amount is as costly as similar positions that last for the whole duration of the project (5 years). One wonders why similar positions that would cost US\$149 dollars per day, in this case the GWPSA Transboundary Water & Environment Specialist cost 4 times more. Please ask the Agency to revise.
- Finance Specialist: daily rate of US\$ 500 X 360 days (1 year) = US\$180,000. The total amount is as costly as similar positions that last for the whole duration of the project (5 years). One wonders why similar positions that would cost US\$98 dollars per day, in this case the financial specialist cost 5 times more. Please ask the Agency to revise.
- Procurement and Operations Specialist: daily rate of US\$ 350 X 450 days (1.5 years) = US\$157,000. The total amount is as costly as similar positions that last for the whole duration of the project (5 years). One wonders why similar positions that would cost US\$ 86 dollars per day, in this case the Procurement and Operations Specialist cost 4 times more. Please ask the Agency to revise.
- Regional Gender and Safeguards Officer: daily rate of US\$ 450 X 450 days (1.5 years) = US\$202,000. The total amount is as costly as similar positions that last for the whole duration of the project (5 years). One wonders why similar positions that would cost US\$110 dollars per day, in this case the Regional Gender and Safeguards Officer cost 5 times more. Please ask the Agency to revise.
- Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist: daily rate of US\$ 450 X 300 days (nearly 1 year) = US\$135,000. The total amount is as costly as similar positions that last for the whole duration of the project (5 years). One wonders why similar positions that would cost US\$74 dollars per day, in this case the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist cost 6 times more. Please ask the Agency to revise.

We can't make a precise estimate of the costs of all consultants in relation to the project cost, but on the six consultants above working in average less than one fifth of the project's duration, the cost is 14% of the project's financing ? please revise and also note the earlier comment on institutional arrangements.

We may provide further comments per the resubmission of the revised budget and costs in the TORs.

**(11/13/2024)**

1. Most positions are in majority now located in the INMACOM office the support by GWPSA has been substantially reduced in terms of time allocation and salary (with the exception of the Senior Technical Advisory for which the rate was reduced but days increased which still results in a USD 31,000.- reduction in cost for this position).

2. Please restructure the GEF budget template so that for each position paid by the project there is one budget line. For each position= budget line show dollar amounts per component, M&E and/or PMC in line with the same percentage that is given in that position's TOR. This change should be straightforward as the TORs already provide the percentage of time for each component/sub-component.

*[Please note: after restructuring the GEF template lines by position, please double check that the component totals, the PMC and M&E figures are consistent between the budget template and the Project Description Overview table (formerly called "table B") in the endorsement request.]*

3. The TORs currently do not allocate any project management time (and hence PMC budget) for the project coordinator. This does not align with the purpose of that position and needs addressing both in the TORs and the budget.

Please note that there will be another combined GEF review after your resubmission of the revised budget. Further comments may arise.

**(11/15/2024)**

1. Addressed.

2. **Not addressed.** As discussed with the RC again today, please:

- **List one budget line PER position.** [So, for example: the *Environment/Water Resources Management Officer* should therefore only appear ONCE in ONE budget line. Across that line list how much for THIS position is charge to each component and then show totals etc.].

Currently, the GEF budget still shows one budget line *per subcomponent* or *PMC* (as the case may be) with a mix of % positions charged to it. That does not work as it does not allow us to assess how each position is budgeted and hence cannot clear the budget.

- Please **delete** the old versions of the budget when resubmitting so there is **only the most recent budget file attached**.

3. Per the TORs 20 % of his/her time is now charged to PMC and 1% to M&E. Addressed.

(11/19/2024)

Please attach the revised GEF budget template for our review and resubmit.

(11/19/2024)

Comment has been addressed and one budget line per project position provided. Charges are aligned with the TORs. Thanks for providing the footnote on the M&E positions in GWPSA and INMACOM.

**Please note that you missed to update the revised GEF budget template in the Annex to the prodoc. Please address.**

(11/25/2024)

Please note that the project went through another comprehensive GEFSEC review and following comments arose on how the project budget for GWP - SA and INMACOM staff is presented. Please respond and provide a better presentation and justification and suggestions for possible savings. If separate file is needed, please do so. This is a six year project and unbundling costs in per annum terms may aid.

*While we appreciate that the Agency presented the budget itemized, unfortunately the comments provided on November 7th were not fully addressed:*

*- The TORs included in the ProDoc (page 132 in the attached) presents an outrageous salary for a GWPSA Finance Specialist for US\$750,000, that would work 24% of the time, costing the project US\$180,000 (this is in the budget table included in the CEO Endorsement request Portal view also attached). Similarly, in the ProDoc the salary for the GWPSA Finance Officer is US\$285,000, also working 24% of the time, costing the project US\$68,400 (this is in the budget table included in the CEO Endorsement request Portal view). This means that for two financial people working one quarter of the time, the project would pay nearly US\$250,000. After reading (i) the project components / outcomes / outputs; and (ii) the TORs of both positions (GWPSA Finance Specialist and GWPSA Finance Officer), there is no justification for having two people carrying out financial responsibilities, being the main reason that this project does not aim to create a financial mechanism or similar, so there is no merit for having such positions. Please ask the Agency to reduce this to one position ? a financial officer for 5 years full time normally costs US\$200 to US\$250 K, if what is needed is a person working 50% of the time, the cost of this position can't go beyond US\$100K - US\$125K.*

*- Similarly to the above, there are two Procurement and operations Officer (one for INMACOM, another for GWPSA). The Procurement and operations Officer for GWPSA would only work 20% of the time with a salary base of US\$520,000 (very expensive), costing the project US\$105,000 (the Procurement and operations Officer for INMACOM would work for 72 months costing the project US\$144,000) The TOR's do not do justice to have two positions doing similar tasks ?*



*please ask the Agency to have only one position ? we will re-assess the cost of the position per the resubmission.*

*- Regarding the TORs of two positions namely INMACOM Project Coordinator (US\$396,000 full time) and GWP SA Senior Technical Advisor (US\$200,000 25% of the time, which means that full time would cost US\$800,000), please ask the Agency to merge these two positions considering that other non-UN Agencies only have one managerial position for managerial and technical roles - we will re-assess the cost of the position per the resubmission.*

*- The TORs of the two positions namely INMACOM Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (US\$ 180,000 full time) and GWPSA Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist (US\$52,500 corresponding to 150 days of a full-time salary of US\$250,000) neither justify having two positions for the project. Please ask the Agency to only consider one position for Monitoring and Evaluation - - we will re-assess the cost of the position per the resubmission.*

*Regarding the above positions that should be mapped to the Project Management Unit, if they are charged to the PMC and project components, per Guidelines ?Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required?. We will review the TORs of the final positions per the resubmission.*

(11/27/2024)

Thank you for working with the Global Water Partnership - South Africa Office (GWP SA) as the executing agency on a way forward to allow cost reductions but at the same time maintain their essential support to create capacities at the River Basin Organization for the Inkumati-Maputo Basins (INMACOM) on technical and administrative dimensions. INMACOM is the most recent RBO in the SADC region and the goal is to not only specific project activities but at the end of the 6 year period have their procedures and experiences build up to international standards by which they will start to be able to receive and administer funds up to a decent threshold in future without the support of INGO or other partners. We acknowledge that GWP has a solid track record to deliver in this function in the region and also note that GWP salaries and staff costs are subject to their global board but meanwhile staff time allocations have been reduced on both technical and especially on GWP financial, procurement and M&E side to hand over most of these function to INMACOM staff after three years.

The revisions are well documented and cleared from a technical expertise and review.

## Agency Response

UNDP response, 16Oct2024

1. The budget is now uploaded to the portal
2. Annex 12 is now complete with these key staff TORs.

UNDP, response 4 November 2024

Comment addressed.

UNDP Response 15 Nov 2024

1. Noted.
2. Budget descriptions have been updated to show percentages and costs per position.
3. TORs have been updated.

### **UNDP Response, 20 Nov 2024.**

The revised budget has been inserted into both the CEO Endorsement and UNDP's Project Document. Additionally, formatting adjustments have been made to condense the GEF budget from the previous 14 pages to 6 pages. The formatted GEF budget has also been uploaded to the Annexure Section of the GEF Portal.

The revised budget has been inserted into both the CEO Endorsement and UNDP's Project Document. Additionally, formatting adjustments have been made to condense the GEF budget from the previous 14 pages to 6 pages. The formatted GEF budget has also been uploaded to the Annexure Section of the GEF Portal.

### **UNDP Response, November 2024**

The annual budget of the 4 officers in INMACOM are reduced from USD 2500 to USD 2000 each; the GWPSA STA and Finance Specialist time is reduced from 25% and 24% respectively to 20% over the 6 years (these two staff are key for capacity building of INMACOM and compliance of the project with UNDP and GEF policies, therefore their support will be needed for the project lifetime) and ; the time of GWPSA Finance Officer, Procurement and Operations Specialist and M&E Specialist is reduced from 6 years to 3 years. The GWPSA staff will build the capacity of INMACOM staff in similar positions during the first 3 years of the project implementation for them to gain the necessary skills and experience to undertake activities by their own during the last 3 years of the project implementation and onward. Also, staff ToRs have been updated to reflect the changes made and to clarify different roles and responsibilities. The table below shows details on staff budget:



Staff	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Total
GWPSA Finance Officer	11400	11400	11400				34200
GWPSA Procurement and Operations Specialist	17500	17500	17500				52500
GWPSA Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist	8750	8750	8750				26250
<b>Total GWPSA</b>	<b>87650</b>	<b>87650</b>	<b>87650</b>	<b>50000</b>	<b>50000</b>	<b>50000</b>	<b>412950</b>
<b>Total project</b>	<b>294650</b>	<b>294650</b>	<b>294650</b>	<b>257000</b>	<b>257000</b>	<b>257000</b>	<b>1654950</b>

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
(8/5/2024) Not cleared yet.

- Please address comments and resubmit, Specifically, please assure that the ER resubmission includes the project component descriptions to allow for a comprehensive review and please attach the UNDP prodoc.

- Please include responses to Council comments in Annex I (German Council member comments)

**(10/28/2024)**

Nearly everything is addressed. Please though address a couple of remaining items:

- Comment on core indicator table for CI 7 in the endorsement request (see earlier comment; prodoc is fine)

- Link a simplified budget to the endorsement request as table G (see comment above)

>>>> Lastly, when resubmitting the updated endorsement request, please ***ALSO upload one consolidated file with all latest version of annexes to the project document in ONE file (please classify as "public")***. This way we can circulate just three files/links - the endorsement request, the UNDP prodoc and the file with all annexes. Thank you !

(11/4/2024) Please **link the GEF budget template to the endorsement request**. See comment.

**In order to circulate the project to Council please:**

1. Please include the budget template as part of the circulation package and upload in the portal. (missing on pg. 113 of prodoc)
2. Please upload another merged file of the remaining/separate annexes (see list on pg 247 of prodoc)

11/5/2024

to 1. above: As discussed via email, please try to adjust the formatting of the budget table (pg. 113 onwards) so that it does not run across more than 50 pages. Thank you.

(11/7/2024) Please note the comments on the budget and related comment on institutional arrangements.

(11/13/2024) Please note the remaining comment on institutional arrangements (figure 2 in the ER) and comments on the budget and GEF budget template and resubmit as this project requires four week circulation to Council before endorsement.

**(11/14/2024) Please address the comments pertaining to the budget and resubmit.**

(11/19/2024)

Please attach the revised GEF budget template as Annex G to the endorsement request for our review and resubmit.

(11/19/2024)

**Please update the GEF budget template in the UNDP prodoc** to have it consistent to the updated one in the endorsement request.

**(11/25/2024)**

Please see the comment on the budget given GEFSEC-wide comprehensive review. We would be happy to discuss in person, but a written response from your side would be helpful as input.

**(11/27/2024)**

Thank you for working with the Global Water Partnership - South Africa Office (GWP SA) as the executing agency on a way forward to allow cost reductions but at the same time maintain their essential support to create capacities at the River Basin Organization for the Inkumati-Maputo Basins (INMACOM) on technical and administrative dimensions. INMACOM is the most recent RBO in the SADC region and the goal is to not only specific project activities but at the end of the 6 year period have their procedures and experiences build up to international standards by which they will start to be able to receive and administer funds up to a decent threshold in future without the support of INGO or other partners. We acknowledge that GWP has a solid track record to deliver in this function in the region and also note that GWP salaries and staff costs are subject to their global board but meanwhile staff time allocations have been reduced on both technical and especially on GWP financial, procurement and M&E side to hand over most of these function to INMACOM staff after three years.

**The revisions are well documented and cleared from a technical expertise and review.**

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9.3 Review Dates**

**CEO  
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>8/6/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/28/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/4/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/5/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/7/2024</b>