



GEF Sustainable Groundwater Management In SADC Member States Project Phase 2

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10797

Countries

Regional (Comoros, Eswatini, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Angola, Botswana, Congo DR, Mauritius)

Project Name

GEF Sustainable Groundwater Management In SADC Member States Project
Phase 2

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

6/16/2022

Review completed by PM

10/25/2022

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
(6/23/2022)

Yes, the project is aligned with the focal area strategy.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

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
(6/23/2022)

1. Please update the PDO and all components (incl. outputs) to make sure these are actually reflecting this and not the Putumayo-Ica project and to allow review. (we understand this to be a simple template update/drafting mistake)
2. Component 1.3 Operating costs of SADC GMI: Please distinguish *technical content* from support to *operating and admin costs* with the latter to be charged to PMC and not to a component. We suggest to consider rewording the sub-component title to aid clarification.
3. Please note that M&E functions are part of project implementation and thus can be charged to a (sub-)component and do not need to form part of PMC. From table B it is not clear where project M&E is budgeted . Based on the project description this appears to be within component 1c (equivalent to component 1.3 table B), yet when cross-checking with the budget template no M&E costs appear in the budget template for component 1c/1.3. M&E costs included in this sub-component should align with the costs for M&E in the project budget template (Annex E).
4. IW-Learn: please note that this [IW:Learn](#) is addressing more than advocacy and outreach but is an important and essential mechanism for knowledge exchange across the GEF global portfolio as well as training on innovative, portfolio relevant approaches. E.g. participation in IW conferences and relevant regional and thematic knowledge exchanges across the GEF IW portfolio are also budgeted with the 1 % [IW:Learn](#) cooperation.

(9/26/2022)

1. Addressed.
2. Still requires revision. It may aid to have a short teams meeting to make this clearer to the task team. Component 1.3/Para 27 of the PAD mixes items that are clearly labeled as project management costs (and hence have to budgeted under PMC !); M&E costs which can and should best be budgeted in a clear subcomponent for M&E; capacity building; and PMU staff. PMU staff that is pure administrative (such as assistants and procurement staff) again are part of the project management costs (PMC).
3. Not addressed. M&E costs budgeted in a sub-component should align with the costs for M&E in the project budget template (Annex E). There no M&E costs indicated in the budget template (Annex E). Again, it may aid to discuss in person.
4. Change in the text para 26 is noted. Please confirm that there is a 1 % budget allocation of the GEF grant for participation [IW:Learn](#) activities including e.g. such as participation in the biannual GEF IW Conferences, and [IW:Learn](#) regional/thematic meetings.

-
- The CIWA grant cash = blended co-finance to pay staff costs are noted and explained in Annex E. CIWA funds do pay for the majority of the project management related staff costs (see PMC details which are now detailed in Annex E).

-
- Cleared.
-
-

Agency Response

Thank you.

Please see responses below.

1. Drafting mistakes addressed.
2. The content is correct. However, the heading was probably misleading. In Para 26 and elsewhere, the sub-component has been changed to ?Sub-Component 1.3 will cover the operating cost of the SADC-GMI's project management costs to implement the project and build capacity for project implementation (US\$0.350 million)?.
3. The M&E costs are indeed under Component 1.3 as part of the M&E Consultant as indicated in the Component description. The budget provided under 1.3 is stated as ?Contribution to Project Implementation Unit costs? which include M&E. This is the same treatment that M&E is covered under the CIWA project
4. Clarified in the PAD under para 25, sub-component 1.2

Response to comments from 9/26/2022

Thank you.

2. Component 1.3 in the PAD has been updated to reflect technical, capacity, and M&E activities.
3. M&E costs updated in the project budget under component 1
4. [IW:Learn](#) activities highlighted in para 39 of the PAD and in results framework, and [IW:Learn](#) costs are reflected in the project budget under component 2.

Response to comments from 11/01/2022

1. Budget updated to reflect detailed description of technical and non-technical staff funded through the project and the PMC respectively. The budget additional now reflects the IW Learn at 1% across the entire project.
2. Budget updated to reflect all operating costs, admin, travel, and office supplies are included under PMC.
3. The Budget table has been updated. M&E costs in table B are under part of component 1. M&E was is not a separate component, but rather part of the capacity and institutional strengthening activities in component 1; The M&E costs are allocated for M&E and KL specialists and for activities carried out under subcomponent 1.3: "SADC-GMI enabled successful implementation of regional and TB activities by MSs and RBOs, including project monitoring & evaluation". Table B has been updated to indicate that 83,000 is allocated to M&E.

Budget table adjusted. Component 1 in the Budget table is the subtotal + M&E costs (1,055,400 + 83,000); component 2 subtotal is now 2,100,300 to match table B. Please note that project subtotal 4,348,772 in inclusive of M&E (4,265,772 + 83,000).

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

(6/23/2022)

1. Please only list the Name of the co-financier in the "Name of co-financier" column. Everything else belongs in the text under the table.
2. Please spell out acronym for CIWA
3. The World Bank is the "GEF agency"
4. Text under table: Please delete duplicate text.

(9/26/2022)

1. Addressed
2. Addressed
3. Addressed
4. Addressed

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you. Co-financing section updated.
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
(6/23/2022)

Table D is adequate. The project builds on the previous support by CIWA and GEF to SADC-GMI and its work which has been shown to provide substantial value added to the region, RBOs and communities. Comments on the project design are provide below in Part II.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.
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 (6/23/2022) NA

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(6/23/2022)

1. For core indicator 7, please fill out values for "Expected at CEO endorsement"
2. Indicator 11 - Please assure that the target of 133.000 is (i) consistent across the documentation (e.g. pg 43 of PAD); (ii) is captured in the Results Framework (pg 33 of PAD) and (iii) the Results Framework provides gender disaggregated for this and all *relevant* other project indicators (participation, training, grant recipients, etc.)

(9/26/2022)

1. Addressed
2. (i) addressed (ii) change in the direct beneficiaries listing females as 53% noted. What about tracking other gender relevant indicators and providing sex disaggregated data such as "Percentage of stakeholders reporting using capacity and knowledge products developed by the project for their work"?

(10/25/2022)

1. Previously addressed.
2. Addressed. The % female beneficiaries are noted as well as the more granular detail on sex disaggregated tracking of indicators in table 1.1. on page 34 of the prodoc.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. Core indicators and PAD updated

Response to comments from 9/26/2022

Thank you. Gender disaggregated data is described in Annex 1 of the PAD; table 1.1

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

(6/23/2022) Yes, this is overall well outlined across the project documentation/documents submitted and builds on the previous project and lessons learned.

Please address below:

1. Please strengthen both the Theory of Change Text and Diagram which for now are basically just repeating the project PDO, components and outputs with no mention of assumptions underpinning the project design (or ideally also alternative pathways or adaptive management options).

(9/26/2022)

1. Addressed. The updated text is noted. The project design is based on the experience and identification of root causes identified in the previous SADC which rated well in its terminal evaluation. If read together with the following sections outlining the complementarity of the current GEF finance with the CIWA grant (section E) and the detailed outline of lessons learned and reflected in the project design (section F) there is a clear and strong logic described that lead to the project design.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

Theory of Change diagram and narrative updated in the PAD.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(6/23/2022)

There is no clear section outlining baseline projects on regional and national level. Please clarify where this is addressed and/or please add more clearly.

(9/26/2022)

Addressed well enough though it would have been useful to take stock of relevant other ongoing activities and projects.

(10/25/2022) Thank you. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Para 10 in the PAD gives a chronology of baseline projects implemented in the SADC regional since 2005 to date to date. These were implemented at regional and local level. Paras 13-16 of the PAD elaborate how the project fits to the SADC regional and national development objectives, as well as for the World Bank and GEF. Paras 38-47 outline the lessons learnt from the previous projects and how this has informed the design of this current project. Annex 1-Implementation Arrangements and Annexure 3 - Diagnostic of groundwater challenges in the SADC region provide more details on the baseline projects used to design this project.

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

(6/23/2022)

The overall project is well placed and builds on the previous successful support to SADC and SADC-GMI on groundwater. While this is the case, there are some comments to please address:

1. Sub-component 1b: Please explain what is meant and how the GEF funded project will complement the endowment fund "by implementing initiatives arising from the SADC GMI Financial Sustainability Plan and those coming from the input of the Fundraising Specialists". The scope and type of initiatives is unclear. Please explain and provide examples.
2. Sub-component 1b: Please annex TORs for project funded staff. Please separate technical and administrative tasks in the TORs and indicate % of staff time for each of these blocks of tasks (technical vs. management/administrative).
3. Sub-component 1b: Please charge all management and administrative staff time to PMC. Also, the Admin and Finance officer is entirely to be charged to PMC (GEF and by Co-finance of PMC).
4. Independent audit costs again are PMC costs.
5. Sub-component 1C: from the description of the component this does not seem to "operating costs" but mostly technical tasks. Please clarify what covers technical expertise and support and capacity building versus "operating"/PMC costs. This may mostly be a drafting/language issue, Please clarify and address.
6. Please clarify how the project component description can be correlated to the Results Framework (pg 33 in draft PAD). Without a clearer correlation between the component description and the results framework it seems not clear how progress will be monitored and what deliverables and targets for each sub-components are.
7. The project sub-headings are useful in also providing amounts for each sub-component. How is the correlated to the budget template ?

(9/26/2022)

1. Addressed. Thanks for the explanation.
2. Please indicate where these drafts TORs are annexed. This is important as only the portion of salaries pertaining to technical tasks can be covered under the components. Administrative posts and tasks are part of the Project Management costs (PMC). See previous comment. The team's response indicates that the budget was updated but it is not clear what was done and how this relates to the comment.

3. Please clarify and state in the budget what staff is charged to PMC (122 K). Also, there is no part of component 1 that is noted as PMC.

4. Your comment is noted yet in GEF terms per the GEF project guidelines, audit costs are to be charged to PMC. the link to the guidelines is included (59th Council, Info document 3)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_C.59_Inf.03_Guidelines%20on%20the%20Project%20and%20Program%20Cycle%20Policy.pdf

5. your response is noted. Just to note that the sub-component title causes confusion with the GEF labeling of Project Management Costs, but of course up to the team how to label component names. As noted above though procurement and FM staff are part of project management not technical task teams and to be charged to PMC (in GEF definition).

6. Not addressed, This was not a question related to the budget.

7. Addressed.

(10/25/2022) Comments addressed. Thank you for appending the TORs and indicating that the admin and finance staff are covered by the CIWA grant during the first four years of the GEF project (until the CIWA support is closing in the last year).

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Please see responses below

1. All potential income streams for SADC-GMI are fully captured in the Financial Sustainability Plan. Some of these include the setting up and raising income from a Regional Groundwater Association, generation of revenue from Project Management fees and selling of knowledge products. These are initiatives that the Fundraising Specialist will contribute to, in addition to exploring for broader opportunities for SADC-GMI

2. Budget updated

3. Budget updated

4. Independent Audit Costs are operational costs it is a statutory external audit for SADC-GMI (the company) and not only for the project

5. It is indeed purely Project Management Costs. The staff under this component are hired exclusively to deliver the project. These are technical staff e.g. M&E, Infrastructure, Project Assistant, etc. Their costs for fulfilling this role are under this sub component. In addition, the costs for the Project Steering Committee are also charged under this component. The capacity building here is targeted at this team of experts to enable them to deliver on the project objectives

6. Budget updated.

7. Budget for Sub-Component 2.1 (Para 28 corrected).

Response to comments from 9/26/2022

1. Thank you.

2. Draft TORs are now available in Annex and updated in the roadmap.

3. Budget updated.

4. Audit is now excluded from project component. It will be covered by PMC

5. sub-component title updated

6. Results matrix updated in submission to include references to project components.

7. Thank you.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(6/23/2022)

While the project is clearly aligned with the GEF IW focal area there is no clear heading addressing this and referencing the GEF-& IW strategy.

(9/26/2022)

Noted. Addressed.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Alignment with GEF IW Focal area is in para 16 & 17 of the PAD in section C.

Relevance to Higher Level Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(6/23/2022) As there is no clear baseline description is hard to see an explanation of the GEF increment. Please provide a short para of explanation.

(9/26/2022)

Addressed in principle.

(10/25/2022) Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

The SADC region counts 15 international rivers and about 30 TBAs. The first SADC Groundwater project supported the establishment of cooperative management of groundwater in 5 shared ecosystems (3 river basins and 2 TBAs) which is taken as baseline for this Project. The target for this project is to strengthen cooperative management in 3 additional shared ecosystems in the SADC region

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

(6/23/2022) While there is no clear heading on this there is a clear outline of the project's contribution to cooperation on shared groundwater resources, resilience, and water security throughout the text. Please provide a concise para on project GEBs at is a key prerequisite to justify GEF resources.

(9/26/2022)

Thank you. Can you please confirm that this para is part of the Endorsement Request and/or PAD?

(10/25/2022) addressed.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

The Project will directly support SADC Member States with studies and data sharing facilities that increase the available knowledge on groundwater resources, the establishment of National Focus Groups that promote multi-sectoral planning, decision-making and awareness on groundwater and through capacity building efforts, to promote the inclusive and sustainable management of groundwater resources. In addition the Project aims to support the establishment and strengthening of cooperative management mechanisms for transboundary groundwater resources in the SADC region, ensuring equitable and sustainable use of these shared ecosystems. These efforts, in combination with the promotion of innovative groundwater supply infrastructure options that maximize nature-based solutions, the Project contributes to water security and strengthened resilience to climate shocks in the SADC Region.

Response to comments from 9/26/2022

Yes, added in PAD, para 20.

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

(6/23/2022) Yes.

Cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

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
(6/23/2022) Yes, maps are provided.

(10/25/2022) Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.
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
(6/23/2022) Yes, a stakeholder report has been provided and efforts build on the successful previous phase. GEF attended and contributed to the launch workshop of phase II of the CIWA grant in April.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

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

(6/23/2022) Gender considerations are evidenced and addressed throughout the document. The SADC-GMI gender strategy has been submitted.

1. Please throughout the Results Framework include gender sensitive and gender disaggregated indicators and targets.

(9/26/2022)

Table 1.1 in Annex 1 page 46 of PAD is noted. Thanks.

(10/25/2022) Table 1.1, page 34 of the prodoc for circulation provides granularity in terms of indicators and gender considerations are mainstreamed across the project as well as the past support - which showed the attention to opportunities for women incl. in the support to Masters and other training and leadership in pilots.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Table 1.1 of Para 15.e of Annex 1 ? Implementation Arrangements specifically disaggregates the gender sensitive targets as already incorporated in the Results Frameworks for all the indicators where applicable

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
(6/23/2022)

No. This needs clearer elaboration. The current text in the endorsement request provides *no specificity to this project* and its components or results to be achieved.

Current text: "The project intends to explore alternative delivery models and optimal use of the existing strong partnerships with regional implementation partners and the private sector to complement efforts at the national level"

(9/26/2022)

Addressed overall. Para 14 in Annex 1 is noted. One would hope though that engagement with e.g. the agricultural sector as *one of* the major users of water including groundwater would go beyond seeing the sector as providing data but work with the major use sectors to discourage over-abstraction and reduce pollution (e.g. via the wider WB lending portfolio in region).

(10/25/2022) Noted. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

A new Para D ? 14 added in Annex 1 ? Implementation Arrangements. This provides more on the role of the private sector

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
(6/23/2022)

Risks are listed on page 31. While not provided in a typical risk matrix, risk categories, ratings and mitigation measures are provided.

1. Please include a climate risk assessment.
2. Please address risk to project implementation and outcomes from the ongoing/continuing COVID 19 pandemic and how the project is addressing this in the project design. Also, provide a para on how the project on the other hand can support recovery and resilience to future waves of the pandemic.

(9/26/2022)

Comments addressed.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Climate risk assessment uploaded. A climate-risk assessment has been performed using WB screening tools. Although the project locations are exposed to increased climate hazards ranging from drought to floods, the climate-risk to the project objectives is considered low, considering that the project components are designed to tackle the root causes for vulnerability of water users to climate variability. Details are provided in para 67 of the PAD.

On COVID 19, Para 3 in the PAD was updated.

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

conepct ((6/23/2022)

1. The institutional arrangement is described. Please also more clearly show the synergy in this between the CIWA and GEF grants which are essentially "one project". What

staff is funded by the CIWA grant and how is the PMU co-financed by both and/or other co-finance? Table 3.3. is well noted and very useful in showing the complementarity in terms of what is delivered by each.

2. Several key regional projects financed by other bi-laterals, such as Germany, UK, etc. are well outlined (see Annex 4). Please add and more clearly list other *relevant* non-GEF and GEF funded projects and initiatives not only from angle of transboundary cooperation (e.g. GEF IW and otherwise supported RBOs) but also other relevant projects of groundwater dependent sectors that this project will form synergies with e.g. to increase water security for agriculture or municipalities.

3. Please also take note of the recent approved GEF project (June 2022) in support of the AMCOW groundwater program/ApaGROP in which SADC-GMI will have an important role in knowledge exchange across Africa's key regions and in collaboration across SADC, ECOWAS and IGAD regions. This project is implemented by FAO and executed by IWMI which is already closely working with SADC-GMI.

rdbv

1. This comment will likely be addressed already with previous comments on component 1.c.
2. Noted. Addressed.
3. Thank you.

(10/25/2022) Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

Please see responses below:

1. The additional project deliverables targeted under the GEF project will necessitate additional Level of effort from the dedicated project staff such as the M&E, Infrastructure, Procurements experts. These come under Component 1.3. Under Component 1.2, the operational capacity of SADC-GMI under Component 1.2 will continue to be supported, especially considering that the CIWA project is 4 years and the GEF is 5 years and the GEF funding is likely to continue for say 2 years after the end of the CIWA project.

2. Para 5-6 of Annex 1 highlights text on the subject matter

3. Noted

Response to comments from 9/26/2022

1. project components updated.

The 9 MU\$ CIWA grant funded Sustainable Groundwater Management in SADC Member States Project Phase 2 finances SADC-GMI core tasks during the first 4 years of Project implementation and similar knowledge and capacity building activities in the SADC region, strengthens groundwater management in the regional institutions and promotes transboundary water resources management. Full coordination of Project activities allows for scaling up of sustainable groundwater management pilots, ensures increased impact and allows to keep PMC to a minimum.

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

(6/23/2022) Yes.

Agency Response Thank you.

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

(6/23/2022) Deliverables are clearly outlined, but there no timeline or mid-term targets for any activities given in the results framework. Please address.

(9/26/2022) The RF provides targets for stakeholder use of capacity and knowledge products which (i.e. the %) as per the M&E plan will be monitored and reported annually. It does not detail what type and number of capacity and knowledge products are expected to be delivered.

(10/25/2022) Addressed in the RF and text. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Please see PAD Results Framework - section on M&E Plan and results indicators

Response to comments from 9/26/2022

RF updated to reflect components.

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

(6/23/2022) Yes, documentation has been provided.

Cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

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

(6/23/2022) There needs to a clearer M&E plan with a budget and who is responsible for what and with what funds budgeted for this.

(9/26/2022) Please consult the GEF project cycle guidelines page 18 for an outline of a budgeted M&E plan , which you can adapt /use as guidance. Also, for now no M&E costs are provided in the budget template.

(10/25/2022) A budgeted M&E plan has been made explicit and a table added. \$ figures match the budget and activities are all recipient executed. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Component 1.3 includes an M&E Consultant who is charged with all M&E work for the project and his costs are fully covered there

Response to comments from 9/26/2022

Thank you.

M&E Budget table included in the PAD. Project budget also updated to reflect M&E costs

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

(6/23/2022) Yes.

Agency Response Thank you.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(6/23/2022)

1. Please strengthen the Results Framework as per previous comments
2. Please enhance the budget template and clarify with regard to the budget be able to be related to project components/deliverables. Also, please change the last column in the budget template which lists the World Bank as executing agency which appears as a

simple drafting mistake as SADC GMI will execute the project and administer the funds. Please confirm/address.

(9/26/2022)

1. Please note earlier comment on the Results Framework including difficulty to align this with the project component and subcomponents description.
2. The last column should list the executing agency (here SADC GMI) as the responsible entity to execute the funds, not the World Bank.

(10/25/2022) Comments addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Results framework and budget updated.

Response to comments from 9/26/2022

Thank you.

1. RF updated to reflect project components
2. Project Budget updated

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(6/23/2022) See earlier comments on enhancing the RF.

(9/26/2022) See earlier comments remaining on enhancing the RF.

Agency Response

Thank you.

RF updated.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(6/23/2022) Provided above. Please address and please reach out for any questions.

(9/26/2022) Same as above. It would be really helpful to have a meeting and clear up any confusion that may result from differences in language and guidelines between the WB and GEF before resubmission of the project, so the comments can be addressed smoothly. This is a good project and comments do not call this in question and it may be to the advantage for both sides to explain and discuss how to address GEF policies and guidelines.

(10/25/2022) The Meeting explained some of the GEF policies and revisions have been made accordingly. The previous project has been very successful and SADC GMI is in close touch with many of the river basin organizations in the SADC region.

Agency Response Thank you.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(6/23/2022) Comments from the German Council member have been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(6/23/2022) Annex B provides responses. Please address comment on the ToC - as per our previous comment - and include assumptions of the design and a clearer intervention logic narrative.

(9/26/2022) Thank you and addressed if read together with the following sections as noted above.

(10/25/2022) Addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

ToC updated in the PAD.

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 NA

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed - See above.

Agency Response Thank you.

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

(6/23/2022) Please address the comments provided and resubmit.

(9/26/2022) Please address the comments provided and resubmit. Please consider the offer to have a common/virtual meeting on the remaining comments.

(11/1/2022) Please respond to comments on the budget under Part I; question 2 and resubmit. Thank you.

(22/3/2022) Comments have been addressed and the project is technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

6/23/2022

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 11/1/2022 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

For the SADC member states (Angola, Botswana, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Eswatini, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe) water is a key resource for the growth of national and local economies, while supplying regional cohesion. As climate variability is affecting the availability of surface water, groundwater becomes an even more indispensable source of water in SADC. Groundwater plays a key role in improving water security, while also being intrinsically linked to improved hygiene practice and provides effective mitigation against the spreading of diseases, including COVID-19. It is estimated that over 70 percent of the 345 million people living in the SADC region rely on groundwater as their primary source of water.

Water, including groundwater, is the most shared resource in the SADC region. More than 70 percent of the surface water resources are shared between two or more member states. The SADC region has 15 internationally shared rivers and an estimated 30 transboundary aquifers, where the interest and need for cooperation on shared groundwater resources is growing. Attention to the conjunctive use and management of surface and groundwater resources, will require improving competences around groundwater, for example, by creating groundwater committees and reaching out to groundwater expertise.

The Project. The project objective is to develop capacity and knowledge for inclusive groundwater management in the SADC region at the national and transboundary levels. Building on the achievement of the previous SADC-Sustainable Groundwater Management Project (SGWMP), this horizontal expansion second phase of the project aims to support the SADC Groundwater Management Institute (SADC-GMI) in consolidating its position as the region's go-to center of excellence on groundwater management. Building on an ongoing long-term technical engagement with the Secretariat of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the project will support SADC-GMI to fulfil its mission to develop, sustain and demonstrate technical and financial capacity to inclusively and innovatively to: (a) build capacity on groundwater management and development on national and basins level, including the

establishment of national intersectoral national focal groups, national and regional institutional strengthening and policy reforms, implementation of national and basin groundwater action plans; (b) collect, manage, and share data accessible to all users and c) develop and manage knowledge for sustainable surface/groundwater use.

GEBs. The project is co-financed with the Cooperation of International Waters in Africa (CIWA) funded project, which is a Trust Fund managed by the WB with many development partners contributing to the CIWA Trust Fund that are also donors to the GEF. THE GEF funds will enhance the transboundary dimensions of the CIWA grant support to SADC GMI by: 1) supporting activities with global environmental benefits within the shared river basins which provide groundwater dependent ecosystem services; 2) enhancing transboundary cooperation on shared aquifers through participatory fact-finding and joint strategic action plans (JSAPs) on cooperative opportunities (including through IW-LEARN) and a vision for a collaborative future.

COVID. The COVID-19 pandemic and its associated public health and economic consequences have highlighted the stark realities regarding inequality in the access to potable water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) facilities and water for livelihoods. Food insecurity is expected to increase dramatically because of currencies weakening, rising staple food prices, and disruptions to agri-food supply chains. The COVID-19 pandemic has exposed systemic vulnerabilities, inequalities, and lack of protection, bringing new threats to and new impacts for women and girls and other vulnerable groups,[1] not only in terms of the disease itself but also in the loss of labor productivity, increasing vulnerability and decreasing resilience to other social and environmental stressors. Within the SADC region, the SADC Secretariat conducted an assessment and developed an Impact Assessment and Mitigation actions for COVID-19 in the region's water sector which interrogated several key areas, namely evaluates the impact of the pandemic on the Southern African water sector and recommends mitigation strategies for adoption. To address these developmental challenges, water security is pivotal and groundwater especially vital. Within the project implementation hybrid meetings and exchanges will be facilitated as needed and in cooperation with CapNet.

[1] 2021 UNFPA news release (<https://esaro.unfpa.org/>).

[1] 2021 UNFPA news release (<https://esaro.unfpa.org/>).
