

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

Review PIF 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

3/23/2020

Review completed by PM

10/27/2020

Program Manager

Christian Severin

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, however, please ensure that countries to be invested in, are listed after the heading "regional" on top page of submission.

26th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP, 22 October 2020

The word “Regional” has been inserted in the table immediately under PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION. It now reads: “Regional (Angola, Namibia).”

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Please reformulate the output indicators so they become quantifiable.

26th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP, 22 October 2020

The outputs have been reformulated so that they don’t read as activities as some of them did. At the same time, they have been expressed in such a way that their achievement is more easily measured (completion dates and/or quantifiable targets).

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, particular because a substantial part of the funding will be directly supporting ensuring adequate capacity exists in both countries.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Please re-assess if the project will only be able to restore/protect 2x1000 hectare and engage with a 1000 people. These impacts seem to be low, considering the scale of the investment and the amount of people living in these shared water basins.

26th of October 2020 (cseverin): Not addressed. Footnote, suggests that this has been addressed, but changes has not been inserted into core indicator table. Please do so

27th of October 2020 (cseverin) addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP, 22 October 2020

This has been re-evaluated assuming 4 pilot projects in each catchment focused on projects that result in land restoration and 4 on improved practices and that there will be scaling up equivalent to between 5 and 10 new areas per pilot. This would result in 19,800 ha for each rather than 1000 ha and around 11,000 people. Scaling up should be exponential so that the number of ha and people can be orders of magnitude higher by the end of implementation of the IWRM Plan. If beneficiaries living downstream are included the figure would be more like 200,000.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, please add Wetland (under biome tag heading), to capture the Cuvelai wetland

26th of October 2020 (cseverin):Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP, 22 October 2020

Wetlands and rivers (under biodiversity/biomes) have been added in Table G and the taxonomy annex.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): The core indicator numbers included seems low. Please re-assess if the project will only be able to restore/protect 2x1000 hectare and engage with a 1000 people.

26th of October 2020 (cseverin):Not addressed, please do so

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP, 22 October 2020

This has been re-evaluated assuming 4 pilot projects in each catchment focused on projects that result in land restoration and 4 on improved practices and that there will be scaling up equivalent to between 5 and 10 new areas per pilot. This would result in 19,800 ha for each rather than 1000 ha and around 11,000 people. Scaling up should be exponential so that the number of ha and people can be orders of magnitude higher by the end of implementation of the IWRM Plan. If beneficiaries living downstream are included the figure would be more like 200,000.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): There is reference to Annex A, please upload in portal submission, under appropriate heading, instead of referring.

26th of October 2020 (cseverin):Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP, 22 October 2020

Done.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, please elaborate on the private sector engagement strategy.

26th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed, but can and should still be strengthened during PPG phase.

Agency Response

UNDP, 22 October 2020

The key role of the private sector has been explained under 4. Private sector engagement. While the private sector is currently underdeveloped in both basins, it represents the vast majority of the population who are engaged in subsistence or semi-commercialized agriculture (crop and livestock) and fishing.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly,

1) Please include an analysis of the short, medium and long term impacts of COVID 19 on the project.

2) Please include a Climate Risk Screening. Please see STAP guidance on risk screening

<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>

26th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed, but in the most minimalistic way. Please expand the Climate Risk Screening and short, medium and long term opportunities and constraints that COVID 19 presents during Project preparation phase.

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): Climate Risk Screening annex uploaded

Agency Response

UNDP, 22 October 2020

These two aspects have been taken into account. For the risks (and their mitigation) associated with Covid-19, text has been added under each of the components, where relevant, and in the risk assessment table. A section on climate risk screening has been added under the section on risk (5. Risk).

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): The institutional arrangements for this investment are very brief e.g. M&E seem to be missing. Therefore, please elaborate on the institutional arrangements.

26th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

29th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, please address the following:

None of the LOEs, mention UNOPS as an executing entity, hence please remove UNOPS from the Project Information section and from the narrative in Section 6 and instead include the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Energy as stated in the LoE from Angola.

It is understood that the actual executing arrangement can and will be developed during PPG and that other entities will be included. It may be other ministries and agencies like UNOPS. Please include a description that will ensure that it does not appear as if the entire binational investment will be executed by the two ministries from Angola.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed adequately at this time.

Agency Response

UNDP, 22 October 2020

The presentation of the proposed institutional arrangements has been expanded, in particular to cover the PMU and how it will work with the project steering committee and CUVECOM and PJTC

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(3/30/2020) The associated submission unfortunately does not include valid LOEs signed by the current OFPs, and therefore we cannot proceed with the project review until this is rectified.

(4/9/2020) The PIF version is still incomplete. As per request of UNDP, I am returning the current version of PIF to allow the latest version to be uploaded by UNDP.

9th of October 2020 (cseverin):No, please address the comments above

26th of October 2020 (cseverin): No please address above comments and resubmit

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

29th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address above comments and resubmit soonest

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is recommended for Technical Clearance

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Review

Agency Response

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

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The Kunene and Cuvelai river basins are two adjacent river basins shared by Angola and Namibia, that are situated in south-west and south-central Angola and north-west and north-central Namibia. While the characteristics of the two river systems are very different, both flow from Angola to Namibia. Taking its source on the Angolan water tower that also supports the Cubango-Okavango River, the Kunene River is one of the few perennial rivers in the region, while the Cuvelai is ephemeral throughout almost of its length. There is a number of sites along the Kunene River where the Kunene and Cuvelai channels are connected or lie side by side without a pronounced topographic barrier. Corroborative results for this linkage emerged from fish migrating upstream of the Kunene tributaries draining from the indistinct watershed zone. In reaching the watershed, characterized by flat terrain and depressions, fish escape into the Cuvelai drainage system and migrate downstream.

The Kunene River basin encompasses portions of southern Angola and northern Namibia. It is about 1,050km long and forms a border between Angola and Namibia at its lower part before it reaches the Atlantic Ocean, with a catchment size of 106,560 km². The basin is characterized by diverse climate patterns with abundant precipitation in the upper catchment (in Angola) and water scarcity in the lower basin, as well as a significant hydroelectric potential, and a transboundary management setting. The Cuvelai Basin, a transboundary wetland area of approximately 173,000km², shared almost equally by Angola and Namibia, consists of hundreds of drainage channels. The Cuvelai is an endorheic basin with all its water converging into the Omadhiya Lakes and Etosha Pan or evaporating along the way.

The project will promote effective IWRM at the transboundary, national and local levels. It will ensure the inclusion of the improved knowledge of the Cuvelai/Ohangwena Aquifer and climate information, produced by the co-financing activities, into the TDAs, which will support the promotion of the conjunctive management of surface and groundwater resources as well as climate-resilient basin planning in the basin.

GEF support will enhance the institutional, operational and technical capacity of the CUVECOM (and eventually KUNENE Commission) Secretariat and ensure its/their sustainability. This will contribute to the long-lasting transboundary benefits. GEF support will also result in the formulation of a set of long-term strategic IWRM plans. These plans will guide any future investments by the national governments, by international cooperating partners, and/or by the private sector in the basins so that they will be aligned with strategic priorities agreed for the basins.