

# Enhanced Water Security and Community Resilience in the Adjacent Cuvelai and Kunene Transboundary River Basins

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10565

**Countries**

Regional (Angola, Namibia)

**Project Name**

Enhanced Water Security and Community Resilience in the Adjacent Cuvelai and Kunene Transboundary River Basins

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

3/31/2022

**Review completed by PM**

7/15/2022

**Program Manager**

Astrid Hillers

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**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**

(4/29/2022) Yes, the project remains aligned with the GEF IW FA.

(7/6/2022) Cleared

**Agency Response**

**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**

(4/29/2022)

1. The overall project structure is appropriate. For more detailed comments see question 3, Part II.

2.. The GEF project policy guidelines require a consistent proportionality for PMC and co-finance in line with the overall GEF grant to co-finance. Please address. Please also see comments on co-finance which appears very high (see below section on co-finance).

(7/6/2022)

Comment on PMC addressed. Comment on co-finance addressed below.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### UNDP Response, 21 June 2022

2. The PMC co-finance amount has been increased to 5% under table B: Project description summary in the CEO ER. The co-financing for the government of Angola has been reduced from USD 190 million to USD 54 million.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

#### 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

<< Review to be completed based on Letters of co-finance>>

(4/29/2022)

1. BGR - there is no letter of co-finance from BGR though the work of BGR is highly complimentary to the project.

2. NamWater - please provide some information (informal and from agency side) about the type of canals the co-finance refers to. Is this part of water transfer, part of irrigation works ? Please confirm that these initiatives take place in the basins and are complementary in nature and aligned with GEF goals aiming at sustainable, nature-positive development support. Please confirm that these projects do not have high environmental and social risk.

3. MINEA - The Angola co-finance appears very large. Please review if all of the co-finance is realistically aligned in objective and location and intend of the GEF project. We cannot review the letter and table without translation into english. An in-house informal translation by UNDP staff will be sufficient.

4. SADC-GMI - table C states that this grant and investment mobilized. Text of the letter states that it is in-kind. Please revise. Also, please confirm that this co-finance is not part of the GEF and CIWA support to SADC-GMI or counted towards the to be endorsed phase 2.

5. WB - is there a reason for not seeing co-finance from the WB work on drought resilience in the the South of Angola ? There have been several consultations with that team with regard to synergies of the work.

6. SASSCAL letter of co-finance - table C states that this grant and investment mobilized. Text of the letter states that it is in-kind. Please revise.

(7/6/2022)

1. BGR - please submit letter. Please note that the co-finance is "in kind" and "recurring expenditures" and not "Investment mobilized" Please address.

2. Thanks for confirmation that these investment are addressing/enhancing water security and are not having environmental or social adverse effects or risks.

3. Thank for the translation. Did you upload the original ?

4., 5. and 6. Noted

(7/13/2022) Comments addressed including the submission of the revised MINEA letter of co-finance (translation was already provided), the BGR letter and email to elaborate the nature of co-finance, and revision to in-kind/recurring for the BGR co-finance. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

1. BGR have confirmed by letter their commitment to support the UNDP/GEF project, Enhanced water

security and community resilience in the adjacent Cuvelai and Kunene transboundary river basins?. They have indicated that ?support given will be in-kind and that it may include the participation of BGR staff in support of the project activities; supporting and organizing meetings or workshops and further measures, in line with a jointly developed working plan of CUVECOM and BGR?. The value of this in-kind support has not been provided and has been assumed, conservatively, at \$US 100,000.

2. NamWater- These are not irrigation canals. All transfers are for potable water in a region which is highly drought prone with no perennial streams. A number of projects around the existing water supply system in the Central Northern part of Namibia are planned. The following text with details about the projects indicated in the co-finance letter have been added in the CEO ER under G: ?Confirmed sources of co-financing for the project by name and type? and under Para 80 and Para 82 in the Prodoc:

? **Omahanene to Olushandja Canal Refurbishment.** The replacement and repair of the 10 km long concrete lined canal running from the Namibian border with Angola to the Olushandja balancing dam

o *This intervention concerns the refurbishment of an existing water supply canal taking water from the Kunene River to the Olushandja dam from which the main supply canal to Ogongo starts. The intervention is aimed at reducing losses and regular maintenance. This canal can carry the future potential potable water requirements for the central northern part of Namibia.*

? **Ogongo to Oshakati Canal Rehabilitation.** A reinvestigation of the capacity and upgrading of the 54-km-long concrete canal between Ogongo and Oshakati, together with replacement of a 10-km section in the vicinity of Oshikuku with a pipeline/pumping system

o *This intervention is aimed at improving the conveyance of raw water (for water supply) from Ogongo to Oshakati. Conveyance will be further improved by converting 10km from canal to pipeline.*

? **Replacement of Olushandja-Oshakati Canal.** KfW have made funding available (Euro 2.1 million) for feasibility study into replacement of existing Olushandja-Oshakati canal (transferring water from Kunene-Cuvelai) with a pipeline, in order to reduce evaporation and damage (from cross-drainage flooding and vandalism)

o *The main part of this water supply canal was constructed in the 1980s across very flat land and crossing several of the Cuvelai River channels (?Osahana?). The canal has been beset with flood damage and maintenance channels and has significant evaporation losses. Given its current age there is a choice that has to be made between major refurbishment or replacement with a pipeline. The pipeline is considered to have the advantage of reducing evaporation and seepage losses, as well as reducing maintenance challenges and costs.*

3. MINEA- The letter of co-finance has been revised to focus on co-finance well aligned in objective and location and intend of the GEF project. Also, a translation of the co-finance letter is submitted.

4. SADC-GMI- The letter has been corrected to indicate that this is grant co-financing and an e-mail confirming that this co-finance is not part of the GEF and CIWA support to SADC-GMI or counted towards the to be endorsed phase 2 has been shared by SADC-GMI.

5. The World Bank plans working with the French Development Agency, to support Climate Resilience and Water Security in Angola. The budget (a loan) is 300 million USD. However, this support has not yet been finalised and not yet approved by the government of Angola. Thus, no co-finance letter has been provided at this stage. A text

describing synergies between these two projects has been added in the CEO ER under ?II: Project description, The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects? and under ?G: Confirmed sources of co-financing for the project by name and type? and under para 85 of the Prodoc.

6. SASSCAL confirmed that their co-financing is grant.

UNDP Response, 8 July 2022

1. BGR co-financing letter has been submitted and the description of the co-financing type has been changed from "Investment mobilized" to "recurring expenditures" in the CEO ER under table C: **?confirmed sources of Co-financing for the project by name and by type?.**

3. The original letter will be uploaded as soon as received from the government of Angola. We continue to follow up with them.

#### 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

(4/29/2022) Yes, the table is adequate. The project is well designed and creates synergies and supports co-location and cooperation between the two river basin management institutions, as well as cooperation with efforts funded by development partners, such as BGR and UNESCO.

(7/6/2022) Cleared

#### 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

(4/29/2022) In principle yes, but there are no categories/detail of expenditures provided which is unusual. Was this one lumpsum contract? Please address.

(7/6/2022) Comment addressed

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response, **21 June 2022**

Details of expenditures have been added in the table under ?Annex C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG)? in the CEO ER.

**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

(4/29/2022)

1. The changes in the indicators are minor and remain consistent with the PIF and realistic.
2. Please assure that the core indicators in table E are consistent with the targets and core indicators listed in the results framework. There are discrepancies at present.

(7/6/2022) The comments have been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

2. These discrepancies have been addressed in the Project Results Framework and in the core indicators in table E.

**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

(4/29/2022)

Specific issues are overall explained.

1. Please summarize the major uses of water in the basins as well as major development plans that may alter the flows of the river. Please summarize main water-energy-food-environment nexus challenges in the two basins (which differ). Especially comment on hydropower-e-flow for wetlands trade-offs in the Kunene which are briefly mentioned in the prodoc.

2. Please explain the statement (prodoc para 19) that "complex community based interventions" should be initiated on a smaller, pilot scale. How can this be scaled up if community informal or formal decisions and planning structures are not involved in implementing such pilots ?

(7/6/2022)

The agency responses are noted and address the comments.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### UNDP Response, 21 June 2022

1. Text summarizing the major uses in each of the basins has been added in the CEO ER under **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION, ?Global Environmental (and Transboundary) Problems and their Immediate Causes, Overview?** and in the Prodoc under **?II the Development Challenge?** in (now) Para 7 and 8. The potential impacts on the water-food-energy-environment nexus is also discussed here. Additional explanation on the trade-offs is provided in CEO ER under **3) The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes**, where the role of scenario evaluation that integrate resource quality objectives into the evaluation process is a part of the alternative scenario.

2. The text reads ?small-scale? not ?smaller?. It is not suggested that the pilot projects should be initiated at a scale smaller than the community. Indeed, the pilot projects will generally be initiated across more than one community or settlement. What the text aims to say is that the planning and design process should be community-based, and community driven rather than imposed from outside (by regional government or and NGO, or CUVECOM for example). This has been clarified in the revised version of the Prodoc (now Para 21) and in the CEO ER under **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION, ?Global Environmental (and Transboundary) Problems and their Immediate Causes, Root Causes of the Problem?** (para 1). It has also been emphasized that local government, CUVECOM, Ghabic and the PJTC will have a key role to play in terms of technical support, contract management, organizing experience-sharing and peer-to-peer networking in support of scaling up.

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



## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/29/2022)

1. Please integrate/repeat some of the key baseline initiatives outlined in the prodoc in the endorsement request.
2. In the project description aquaculture investments are noted among pilots. Please explain experiences in the country/ies with this. Are there extension agents familiar with this which would aid in dissemination of experiences and scale-up in the medium term? The results framework on the other hand does not mention aquaculture.
3. What experiences in the SADC region can the pilots on floodwater harvesting build on and on what scale?

(7/6/2022)

The agency responses address the comments above. Please assure that the ESMFs for aquaculture specific pilots identified during project implementation address sustainability in terms of location, use of non-invasive species, managing effluent BOD, Suspended Solids and minimize antibiotic use etc.

(7/13/2022) Thank you for addressing this during project implementation. Cleared.

## Agency Response

### UNDP Response, 21 June 2022

1. A short summary has been added in the CEO ER under **2) The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects.**

2. This text has been added in the CEO ER under potential for scaling up and to Para 6 in the Project Document and the CEO ER under **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION, ?Global Environmental (and Transboundary) Problems and their Immediate Causes, Overview?:**

In Namibia, the Aquaculture Act 18 of 2002 came into effect in 2003 followed by the quick implementation of aquaculture government farms, offices, and community projects in almost every corner of the country. Initially uptake was poor, but more recently a move towards a bottom-up community-based approach is proving more successful. Aquaculture production has increased from less than 100 tons in 2000 to more than 600 tons today. The technical expertise is available but there are significant challenges in management, provision of capacity-building and uptake by some communities. In general, interest is greater in the Cuvelai basin than in the Kunene. Production levels were similar in Angola but are growing. The 2012-17 NDP predicted production of 60,000 tons from the country's aquaculture programme. There is significant private sector in the sector aimed at higher levels of commercialization. Although this activity is currently outside of the basin, the project plans to replicate the experience gained in the basin.

3. In fact, there is considerable experience on floodwater harvesting in the Cuvelai basin itself, on both sides of the border. One of the first activities (as part of the TDA work) will be to investigate and assess this experience and to compare with other experiences in the region. Related text has been added under Table 2: Gender Action Plan in the CEO ER and under Para 44 of the Prodoc.

#### **UNDP Response, 8 July 2022**

Thank you. We will assure that the ESMFs for aquaculture specific pilots identified during project implementation address sustainability in terms of location, use of non-invasive species, managing effluent BOD, Suspended Solids and minimize antibiotic use, etc.

**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

(4/29/2022)

The GEF alternative is overall well designed. Please address a few comments and questions below:

1. Output 1.1.1 - Please clarify what budget is set aside for geo-physical investigations, which require quite some budget. Is it 300 K? Is that sufficient and what assumptions are behind it?
2. Output 1.1.3 - recommendations on floodwater harvesting on different scale as a possible approach to nature based solutions for flood management is an interesting approach that has lots of experiences to learn from across the globe. [IW:Learn](#) may have opportunities to assist with some twinning to other basins and expertise. Will there be any consideration to couple this with managed aquifer recharge and quantify effectiveness of these measures?
3. Flood early warning and Gender (1.1.4 and 5.1.3.): Flood warning will be relayed to community level etc. Is there any consideration of differentiated needs of women, elderly and youth in flood risk management ?
4. Please also address gender - and in this in fact participation of women - in the design of the community level interventions (component 5) as well as capacity building and training (incl. component 4) to assure access and participation to women.
5. Upgrading the Kunene PJTC into a tb commission (output 3.1.1): Please explain or annex the cited article 2.2. ...(see footnote 7 in prodoc) that the PJTC gets its mandate from. Does this legal base provide for a secretariat ? What revision to whatever form of legal and institutional base exists in the Kunene would be needed to establish a functional framework and RBO for the basin? Please build the process for a drafting,

negotiation and adoption process into the project, as relevant, and budget for associated facilitation and meetings.

6. Output 4.1.3: Note/comment: IW funds do not regularly provide funds for national climate and hydromet installations. Given that this component is to strengthen Angola to be able to fully participate in the transboundary process and assess its resources more fully, this is supported with the view of this being a fragility related pilot as outlined in the GEF 7 IW strategy.

7. Output 4.1.4: Please consider dialogue and inclusion of forest and mining related agencies in Angola in this effort as these - among other - have substantial economic interest for Angola in the upstream watershed.

8. Output 5.1: Please again note the earlier question on the formulation that "complex community based interventions" should be initiated on a smaller, pilot scale, which is repeated here and needs to be unpacked.

(7/6/2022)

1. Can you please point to the budget notes that detail this? This would be very helpful.

2. - 4. All addressed.

5. Can you address the question of any agreement including a provision for a secretariat or is it expected that the countries are well on the way to adopt similar provisions as for the Cuvelai to establish such legal entity and its mandates?

6. - 8. Comments are addressed.

(7/13/2022) Agency response is noted. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

##### **UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

1. The budget for the groundwater quality and availability assessment in the Cuvelai Basin is 1.25 million USD. 300,000 USD has been allocated for the geophysical investigations, but the analysis and application of the findings will be carried out by the Consulting Team whose cost is not included in the 300,000 USD. It should also be noted that BGR will be carrying out Phase 2 of their groundwater investigations, so synergies of effort are assumed.

2. These considerations and the possibility of applying them (for example managed and artificial recharge) will come out of the assessment work included under Component 1 and the BGR studies. Namibia has considerable expertise in artificial recharge as part of the Windhoek conjunctive use water supply scheme and in the OMDEL recharge enhancement scheme. These points have been added in the CEO ER under 3) the proposed alternative scenario and in the Prodoc under Para. 44 on Output 1.1.3, under

the existing bullet point heading 'Assessment of opportunities for conjunctive use of surface and groundwater'.

3. There is, but this was not adequately stressed. This has been rectified in the CEO ER under the Gender Action Plan and the section on potential for scaling up; and in the Prodoc under Output 1.1.4, Para 45 and Output 5.1.3, Para 71.

4. These points have been emphasized under 'Heightened visibility for greater support' and under the proposed alternative scenario in the CEO ER and under Output 5.1.1 (Para 69) and under Output 4.1.2 (Para 64) in the Prodoc by adding this text among others: 'The community level committees that will be set up at during project inception and must include adequate representation of the elderly and the youth and include equal membership of women'.

5. The footnote mentions the 1969 agreement in which the PJTC was established (an agreement between South Africa and Portugal). However, this was updated in 1990 soon after Namibia's independence in the Agreement of Co-operation between the two countries and the Angolan-Namibian Border Security Agreement in 1990. One of the first concrete steps following this agreement was the creation of Permanent Joint Technical Commission on the Kunene River (PJTC) that was created in the same year. Both countries have extensive experience in establishing this legal basis, having gone through the process for the Cuvelai basin (forming CUVECOM) and OKACOM (Botswana, Namibia and Angola). The structure of the PJTC is already the same as that of CUVECOM and includes legal representation amongst its commissioners. The proposed budget for the process is considered adequate, especially bearing in mind that the PJTC and CUVECOM meet on a regular basis to discuss whatever issues are on the table.

This has been explained in the CEO Endorsement Request under the 'proposed alternative scenario' and in the Prodoc through expansion of the footnote.

6. Well noted with thanks.

7. This is indeed an important point and is now captured under the 'proposed alternative scenario' in the CEO ER and under Outputs 4.1.2 (Para 64) and 4.1.4 (Para 66) in the Prodoc using this text: 'Analysis of the current use of natural resources, for agriculture, livestock, forestry (including logging) and mining and the impacts of these activities'.

8. Reflecting the response provided earlier above, the text under II. Project description, Water quality degradation: 'Root causes of the problem' and in the Prodoc under 5.1 (Now Para 68) has been modified.

#### UNDP Response, 8 July 2022

1. This is indicated under Budget Note 5.

5. The countries are indeed well on the way to adopting similar provisions as for CUVECOM (Cuvelai Basin). This has been discussed by the Kunene PJTC as has the solution of a joint (Cuvelai and Kunene) Secretariat. This text indicating this has been added in the CEO Endorsement Request under the 'proposed alternative scenario' and in the Prodoc under Para 54: 'The countries are well on the way to adopting similar provisions as those in place for CUVECOM (Cuvelai Basin). This has been discussed by the Kunene PJTC, as has the solution of a joint (Cuvelai and Kunene) Secretariat'.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/29/2022) Yes, the project is fully aligned with the GEF 7 IW focal area strategy.

(7/6/2022) Cleared.

#### Agency Response

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/29/2022)

In general, the incremental reasoning is clear.

1. Contribution from baseline via e.g. BGR and UNESCO is appreciated. Please also elaborate how the project will build on the WB support in the basins which was discussed with the country office at some stage.

2. Co-finance: Please note the earlier questions on co-finance (no need to repeat).

(7/6/2022)

Comments have been addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### **UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

1. This text on synergies with the WB project has been added in the CEO ER and the Prodoc (Para 85):

**Although the World Bank Board of Directors** approved a \$300 million loan to support the Government of Angola to improve water supply and strengthen water resource management for greater climate resilience in Angola, the funding has not yet been finalised. If the support comes into fruition, there will be significant synergies with the project through physical investments in urban and rural areas as well as institutional development activities to increase water security and help manage climate extremes, from the national and basin levels to the municipal level. The majority of support will be in the south of the country and will include the provinces of Huila and Cunene. Three components are envisaged:

- Component 1 is aimed at strengthening Water Services for Water Security in Urban and Rural Areas. These works will contribute to **water security** (I-W3.7), strengthening water supply and sanitation service provision in urban and rural areas of selected provinces, including rehabilitation and expansion of water supply services in urban and peri-urban areas, maintenance and repairs of rural water supply systems. A major sub-component is focused on strengthening of rural water services to build drought resilience in the South of Angola. The envisaged work on groundwater assessment under this project can enhance the knowledge base for the planning and design of rural water supply infrastructure.

- Component 2 concerns Strengthening Water Resources Management for Climate Resilience. A key part of the proposed works includes community-level infrastructure investments to increase reliable access to water resources. There are significant synergies with Component 5 of this project and the World Bank project could support the process of taking to scale. Component 2 will also provide institutional support for water resources management. The support will include capacity building and support to improving monitoring of climate hydrology, groundwater. The creation of basin councils is also foreseen, echoing the approach in Namibia.

2. Noted with thanks and the questions have been answered above.

**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

(4/29/2022) Yes, the GEBs are outlined and detail added from PIFstage.

(7/6/2022) Cleared

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

(4/29/2022) Yes, establishment of mechanisms for cooperation between the two countries will enable transboundary investments that are agreed, sustainable and do not cause significant harm on either side, and therefore attract scaled up finance in the basin. Furthermore, the fact that the project includes additional funds to create a more level playing field to allow Angola to strengthen their information base and institutional capacity benefits not only Angola but also Namibia in terms of better forecast and collaboration during extreme weather events. The support to ecosystem valuation in Angola also encourages and enables Angola to make informed decisions to manage the upstream watersheds in Angola which are essential for a number of downstream ecosystems and services they provides to humans and wildlife.

(7/6/2022) Cleared.

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  
(5/2/2022) Yes. Geographic coordinates and maps have been provided.

Cleared

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  
NA

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  
(5/2/2022) Yes, the annexed Stakeholder Analysis and Stakeholder Consultation Plan (Annex 7) provides adequate detail on the engagement during preparation and during project implementation.

Cleared

## 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

(5/2/2022) The gender analysis and gender inclusion is well detailed and annexed to the prodoc.

1. Please include key actions and targets of the Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Plan for the CUVKUN Project (section 3.1 in the Gender Action Plan) in the project's results framework to assure gender actions are mainstreamed in the project management and implementation.

2. Please also make reference to gender consideration for staffing - which are laid out in the gender action plan - in the prodoc section on the project's organizational structure and especially the description of positions included in paras 124 to 140 (as relevant and indicated in the gender action plan).

(7/6/2022) Thank you for addressing the comments re gender considerations in the results framework and the staffing guidance.

(7/25/2022) **Please address the following:**

1. To better reflect and capture gender perspectives and mainstream gender throughout the project, please reflect the following proposed changes in section B. Project description summary - Project component table: Under output 6.1.1: Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Strategy to be developed, Agency is requested to reflect women's and gender experts' participation; In Component 5 - Outputs 5.1.1 and 5.1.3, please integrate gender perspectives and/or ensure that these are gender-responsive.

**(8/10/2022)** Gender responsiveness and mainstreaming have been incorporated in Section B. Project Summary/Project Component table in the ER and in the agency project document. Cleared.

## Agency Response



#### UNDP Response, 21 June 2022

1. These key actions and associated indicators have been added to project's results framework:

- o 100 % of personnel within Intergovernmental institutional structure trained in Gender Equality Capacity needs

- o At least 50 % of personnel within Intergovernmental institutional structure trained in Gender Equality Capacity needs

- NASCs to comprise at least 50% women

- BASC to comprise at least 50% women

2. The need for gender inclusion and equity is stressed under Project Organization Structure in the CEO ER and under Paras 127 and 134 in the Prodoc as follows:

- Representation should take into account the need for gender equality as laid out in Section 3.1 of the Gender Action Plan.

The selection and appointment process should take into account the need for gender equality as laid out in Section 3.1 of the Gender Action Plan, so that the PCU has a high level of gender equality.

#### UNDP Response 28 July 2022

The text in Table B of the CEO ER has been modified to reflect these points under 6.1.1, 5.1.1 and 5.1.3 and also in the ProDoc under IV Results and Partnerships. The results framework has also been modified in both CEO ER and the Prodoc for Project Component 6. For Project Component 5, gender-related indicators were already included.

#### 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

(5/2/2022) Given this is a first IW project and mainly targeted at strengthening the legal and institutional mechanisms for cooperation plus the identification of shared opportunities and agreed actions the private sector does not have a prominent roles in the project. Private sector entities representing major uses in the basin will though be consulted in the TDA and SAP process. PPPs will also be explored in the demonstration/pilot projects. The elaboration of the role of the private sector will be further explored during project implementation. It is adequate at this stage.

(7/6/2022) No further comment

Cleared

## 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

(5/2/2022) Overall the risk assessment is detailed. Please include/address the following:

1. Within the row "lack of inter-sectoral coordination": is it worth to especially call out logging and/or mining interests in the Angola headwaters as main competing interests to sustainably managing the water tower functions in Angola?
2. Please explain what is meant with "Risk of drawing attention to the IWRM plans" - what is the risk here ? NOT drawing attention to them ?
3. Row on project delays etc. due to COVID - please update the risk mitigation response which appears to be originating from the PIF stage.
4. Please comment on risks to stability and local conflict potential.

(7/6/2022)

1. 2. and 4. Agency responses noted and comments addressed.
3. Please expand on (i) COVID related risks to the project implementation and adequate mitigation measures built into the project design to be prepared and react to COVID resurgence waves as well as (ii) opportunities for the project to contribute to resilience against future pandemics and/or recovery efforts.

(7/13/2022) Through increasing water security in each country to project hopefully will also aid in economic recovery as well as strengthen resilience in both countries. Cleared

## Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

1. Text reflecting this has been added to the risk assessment tables in the CEO ER under the Project Risk Management Matrix and in the Prodoc (Para 62 and Para 66, para 89 (under risks). This includes the following among others:

- While economic activity in the central highlands is dominated by agriculture, forestry (including logging) and mining are important economic activities and must be taken into account. Involvement of stakeholders from these sectors is critical
- Analysis of the current use of natural resources, for agriculture, livestock, forestry (including logging) and mining and the impacts of these activities

2. This is an error. The risk should read ?Risk of other priorities drawing attention away from the IWRM Plans?. The text has been re-drafted accordingly.

3. The row on COVID-19 risk related to project development has been deleted and the COVID-19 risk related to project implementation has been updated in the CEO ER Project Risk Management Matrix and has also been redrafted in the UNDP Risk Register (Annex 5 of the Prodoc).

4. There is no obvious reason why the project should have a negative impact on stability and the potential conflict. Components 1 and 2 are aimed at building plans that are based on both enhance knowledge and a high level of stakeholder engagement. The implementation of such plans is much less susceptible to conflict than an adhoc or non-integrated development approach. This holds true for the potential for conflict at all levels from the most localized through to transboundary. This has been added to the Project Risk Management Matrix in the CEO ER and Prodoc and to the UNDP Risk Register (Annex 5 of the Prodoc).

#### UNDP Response, 8 July 2022

3. This additional text has been added into the last row of the Project Risk Management Matrix in the Prodoc and CEO ER: *“Although business has largely returned to normal in both countries, it is clear that there remain a significant risk of COVID resurgence waves. In the event that either country re-introduces measures that restrict the extent of stakeholder consultation (either through restrictions in the numbers of stakeholders congregating or travel restrictions), the team will revert to virtual workshopping. Stakeholders have experience in virtual meetings and workshops, so the risk of significant impact is considered low. The role that the project potentially plays in promoting and supporting stakeholder engagement during COVID restrictions can be significant in supporting stakeholders during future pandemics and/or the recovery efforts following pandemics and other disasters (flood and drought etc)“.*

#### 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

(5/2/2022) Yes, the organizational structure for the project is well described for the overall project. Details of implementation of the demonstration pilots will be developed during the project inception and implementation phase.

(7/6/2022) Additions noted and appreciated.

Cleared

Agency Response

**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

(5/2/2022) Yes, this is described in the detail (see also the annex on stakeholder engagement).

(7/6/2022) Additions noted and appreciated incl. to address the comment by the German Council member.

Cleared.

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

(5/2/2022) This is elaborated in component 6 including learning exchanges with other SADC RBOs and participation in [IW:Learn](#).

1. Please elaborate/expand the targets in the results framework for component 6 to more fully represent the project description of component 6. Furthermore, please provide an indication of the type and extend of the knowledge products to be produced and shared (5 at midterm and 10 by end of project as per the results framework, page 41 of prodoc).

(7/6/2022) Comment addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### **UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

1. These details have been added to the Results Framework and in the text under outcome 6.1 in both CEO ER and Prodoc:

Other knowledge products on key scientific outputs such as E-Flows in Kunene, Flood early Warning system in Cuvelai, the groundwater assessment of the transboundary Cuvelai basin and on the Kune River Basin Scenario Analysis and development proposals.

#### **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

(5/2/2022) The environmental and social safeguards documentation is included and provided in detail. It and all project documentation will be made public at local levels once finalized.

1. Please update the project information on project costs and co-finance on page 1. Also, this seems to be a draft ? Why or when is this final and can you please submit a final version with the resubmission.

2. Is there sufficient budget set aside in component 5/demonstration pilots to fund the grievance mechanisms ? Will these be/are these easily locally accessible and built on locally accepted entities and procedures ?

(7/6/2022) Comments addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### **UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

1. Project information on project costs and co-finance on page 1 under 'Project Information' section of the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) and the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been updated. Also, the titles of both SES and ESMF have been updated to show these documents as final not drafts.

2. There is USD 210,000 allocated to fund ESMF implementation including FPIC and IPPF (See page 51 of ESMF). Effective and acceptable grievance mechanisms in line with local practices in both countries will be detailed during final pilot project design.

#### **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

(5/2/2022) M&E is outlined in detail in the endorsement request and prodoc.

1. Please include a column on the 'responsible entity' in the table detailing the M&E budget.

(7/6/2022)

Re. 1: (i) Please separate roles of the PMU from those of UNDP to make it clear that there is no GEF agency self-execution. (ii) If there is intent for UNDP to administer the funds for MTRs and TERS these needs to be justified and requested (via separate email) and approved by the GEF GPU manager and filed in the portal.

(7/13/2022) Comment addressed.

(7/25/2022)

1. Travel for MTR and Terminal Evaluation should be charged to the M&E Budget and not to the PMC. Please change.

(8/10/2022)

Addressed and noted in the budget note 64d. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

1. This column has been added in both CEO ER and Prodoc.

**UNDP Response, 8 July 2022**

1. The text under column on the 'responsible entity' in the table detailing the M&E budget has been revised in both CEO ER and Prodoc to separate roles of the PMU from those of UNDP to make it clear that there is no GEF Agency self-execution.

**UNDP Response, 28 July 2022**

This was an error. The budget is now specified under M&E and related notes have been updated accordingly under Annex G. Project Budget in the GEF portal and under IX. Total Budget and Work Plan and Budget Notes in the ProDoc.

#### 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

(5/2/2022) Yes, this is detailed in the ER and prodoc.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(5/2/2022) Yes, required annexes are provided.

(/7/25/2022)

Budget:

Please rename and provide more detailed budget notes to explain what is entailed in/meant by the items below:

	Other Operating Costs	+/- \$5,000/year across all outputs
Equipment	Materials and goods mainly for fieldwork and investigations	
Equipment	\$500 per pilot project x 10 + \$1000 per EWS x 4	
Equipment	+/- \$1,500/year across all outputs	

(8/10/2022) Addressed indicative in budget notes 51 to 58. Details/specifics will have to be provided during implementation when the pilots have been identified. As the have yet to be defined as per the prodoc it is understood that specifics cannot be provided at this point. Cleared.

Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 28 July 2022**

The errors in naming have been corrected and the notes have been detailed to clarify under Annex G. Project Budget in the GEF portal and under IX. Total Budget and Work Plan and Budget Notes in the ProDoc.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request



(5/2/2022) The results framework (RF) is attached to the prodoc and as Annex A of the ER.

1. As commented on earlier, there is a mismatch between some of the results indicators in the RF and the core indicators. Please address.

2. Indicators for indicators for component outputs under component 5.1 and the component description text for the demos/pilots do not align. The component text para 67 of prodoc appears to refer to different types of pilots than the RF.

Note: Also, please refer to earlier comments on KM and on gender with regard to the RF. No need to repeat these here again.

(7/6/2022) The comments have been addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

1. This has been addressed.

2. This has been clarified in the Results Framework.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(5/2/2022) Please address the comments and resubmit.

(7/25/2022) See GEFSEC recommendation below.

#### Agency Response

**Council comments**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(5/2/2022) Council comments have been listed and addressed in the project development. This is summarized in Annex B of the ER.

(7/6/2022) Cleared.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request (5/2/2022) STAP comments have been adequately addressed in the project document.

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

See earlier question and comment

(7/6/2022) Comment has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

The comment has been addressed in the CEO ER.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

See earlier question and comment.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response, 21 June 2022**

Thank you for confirming that Geographic coordinates and maps have been provided.

**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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

(5/2/2022) Please address the comments and resubmit.

(7/6/2022) Please address the few remaining comments and resubmit.

(7/25/2022) Please address the comments on gender, M&E travel and the budget annex (in the prodoc and ER). Please resubmit together with the revised merged prodoc with annexes PDF for circulation. Thank you.

(8/10/2022) These comments have been addressed. The project is technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/29/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/6/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/25/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

**Background.** Improved management of water resources, especially the extremes of flood and drought are key elements of the project, which covers the adjacent but quite different transboundary Kunene and Cuvelai basins shared by Angola and Namibia. Current demands on the surface water resources of the Kunene River are relatively limited. Within Angola there are long-standing plans for the development of both hydropower and irrigation but very little of this has materialized. The situation in the Cuvelai basin is very different. There are no significant surface water abstraction schemes since flows are ephemeral and unpredictable, but the contribution of the river to water and food security are nonetheless significant.

**The project.** For the Kunene River Basin, the focus will be on the groundwork required for the sustainable development of the Kunene River which has significant potential for hydropower and irrigation development. This will be achieved through a basin-wide e-flows assessment, the modelling of water resources development and management, a detailed TDA and a long-term IWRM Plan. The IWRM plan will be informed by preliminary results from pilot demonstration projects. For the ephemeral Cuvelai River basin, which is beset by extreme drought and flood, the focus will be on an assessment of groundwater potential, flood management through food risk mapping and the development of a flood early warning systems, and water harvesting. Both aspects will also feature in the proposed pilot demonstration projects. As with the Kunene River basin, a detailed TDA will be developed and used to update the existing preliminary IWRM Plan. Five-year Investment programs for both basins will be drawn up.

With respect to the cooperative governance and management of the basin, the proposed project will undertake a suite of activities designed to strengthen joint management and planning capacity and practices at the transboundary basin level. These activities include strengthening of CUVECOM and the Kunene Permanent Joint Technical Commission (PJTC), strengthening of the CUVECOM and an eventual joint basin Secretariat to support IWRM implementation at the basin level; addressing critical information gaps that prevent effective IWRM implementation; developing information management tools to consolidate information and present it to policy makers and other audiences to raise awareness of issues critical to the sustainable management of the two basins.

**Sustainability, innovation and scaling-up potential.** Angola is the sub-regional regional water tower providing the main sources of water for several transboundary basins beyond the Kuvelai and Cunene basins which provide unique and essential assets for livelihoods, environmental services and global biodiversity assets. The project is taking a proactive approach to not only strengthen the assessment of such assets within the Cuvelai and Kunene, but also employing the pilot approach in GEF IW to support Angola as a fragile country to fully participate in international negotiations and cooperation involving its water and natural resources through support to evaluation of the natural capital in the Angolan highlands as well as strengthening relevant national

institutions to support of long-term sustainable planning and management of the land and water resources in Angola.

IW GEBs of the project include the cooperation and integration across sectors in the two basins, increased water security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater as well as aiming to strengthen peaceful relations among countries where local tensions have started to surface in times of drought and related water needs on both sides of the border.

**COVID.** Although business has largely returned to normal in both countries for now, it is clear that there remains a significant risk of COVID resurgence waves. In the event that either country re-introduces measures that restrict the extent of stakeholder consultation (either through restrictions in the numbers of stakeholders congregating or travel restrictions), the project team will revert to virtual workshopping. Stakeholders have experience in virtual meetings and workshops, so the risk of significant impact is considered low. The role that the project potentially plays in promoting and supporting stakeholder engagement during COVID restrictions can be significant in supporting stakeholders during future pandemics and/or the recovery efforts following pandemics and other disasters (flood and drought etc)?. Furthermore, water security and access to communities is a basic requirement for health and resistance to any both pandemics and climate variability and change.