



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\*  
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	5772		
Country/Region:	Regional		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Institutional Capacity of African Network of Basin Organization (ANBO), Contributing to the Improved Transboundary Water Governance in Africa		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5338 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$8,431,971	Total Project Cost:	\$10,631,971
PIF Approval:	June 12, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Akiko Yamamoto

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	This is a regional project covering all of Africa; it is not country specific. Support to Africa by the GEF is highly relevant. The mandate of ANBO is given to it by AMCOW, the African Council of Ministers for Water in response to the AU's call for the creation of a Federation of African River and Lake Basin Organisations.	See comment at PIF stage.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	N/A - see above. It would be appreciated to receive a letter of support by AMCOW.  (6/11/2014) - A letter from the AMCOW Executive Secretary with detailed	See above. LOEs are not needed for global projects.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		reasoning for supporting the MSP has been attached to teh resubmission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. The MSP is within the FA budget.	Yes. PIF was approved and GEF funds set aside under GEF-5.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	Yes, the project is aligned with the FA objective. Its majority should be allocated to IW-3. Please revise.  (6/11/2014). Comment addressed.	Yes, the project document is aligned with the GEF 5 FA strategy.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	The project is aligned with the regional mandate of ANBO as the technical arm of AMCOW. It is aiming at strengthening the capacities of transboundary river and lake basin and groundwater commission across the African continent and strengthen cooperation with RECs. All of these are country owned and country driven entities and receiving member	Yes. Please see comment at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		country contributions.	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>The baseline situation of pan-african coordination and limitations thereof through AMCOW is described. Both baseline and increment description need to address and mention groundwater governance and management and conjunctive management more consistently. For example the draft articles on tb aquifer management are nowhere mentioned, yet the UN Watercourse Convention and the UNECE Convention are.</p> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed and groundwater governance as well as advancing conjunctive management of surface and groundwater is now addressed in the PIF. Also see comment 25.</p>	Yes. The baseline situation on regional level is described overall. It would truly be useful to include a box with short information on relevant African RECs, including current cooperation with ANBO.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>- PDO - please include groundwater commission/cooperative frameworks in addition to RBOs/LBOs.</p> <p>- Same should be done across the project framework (Table B) - groundwater governance and strengthening is missing (only RBOs/LBOs mentioned).</p> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed. See also comment 25 for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>- please make clearer why there is such a heavy emphasis of ANBO on data and information and what the scope of this ambition is. Clearly, river,lake, and gw commissions have much more detailed information and DDS tools etc, then</p>	<p>The document addresses the main comments at PIF stage overall with one small exception: ANBO's work on KPIs for African River Basin organisations has been noteworthy. Would the current project not build on this and use this work in guidance documents? Please comment why or why not.</p> <p>We welcome to see that ANBO's role is extending and would see it as useful to annex ANBO's current strategy and work program and showing the alignment with the current project.</p> <p>To extend ANBO's reach there should be some ambition voiced for some more</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ANBO can have; it is not clear what the ambitions of ANBO are. Is it envisioned to store data or provide a meta-database? And what type of data and information (in general terms) is intended - water/hydrology or other?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The description of the African Water Information system (AWIS) is not clear. As written it appears to be solely comprised of data, yet we understand that AWIS intends to be a metadata portal that directs the use to information, but is not a data repository. AWIS appears (see website) to also aim to conduct electronic conferences and forums of exchanges - none of this is addressed in the PIF.</li> <li>- There is no mention of any data but water and climate related data and information. How do social, environmental and economic information factor in that are necessary for basin planning?</li> </ul> <p>(6/11/2014). Comments addressed in revised PIF plus explanation in the agency response matrix.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please consider to put more emphasis on bringing African transboundary institutions together in physical meetings or online fora to exchange experiences instead of ANBO creating case studies/lessons learned that will be webposted or otherwise 'disseminated'.</li> <li>- The regional capacity building workshops described appear to mainly focus on financial resource mobilization. Reason for that is not evident.</li> </ul>	<p>formal cooperation with IW-Learn which would enhance the impact and reach of both IW-Learn and ANBO and hence would provide complimentary resources to the African basin organization.</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Output 1.1. seems somewhat unclear and already existing.</li> <li>- IW Learn (Page 53/para 52); please add key activities such as participation at IW conferences, delivery of at least two experience notes, and a project website. Please also see recommendation made above.</li> <li>- Please revise the results framework (RF): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The 'baseline' and 'end of project target' fields are partly switched throughout the LF.</li> <li>(ii) Please be more quantitative in number of the RF indicators.: e.g.. instead of "case studies developed ..." , please add "at least x # of case studies developed ..."; same for "policy briefs"; "training courses"; "dialogue platforms"; "coordination groups"; and similar items.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Institutional and project management arrangement:</p> <p>We note the different 'nomenclature' between UNDP and GEF terminology of IA and EA and appreciate the efforts to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- Given the strong aim for information exchange, it would make sense to also disseminate for example at least experiences on data exchanges across basin countries - purposes, frequency, format, and protocols/agreements and mechanisms for such data and information exchanges with existing basin institutions. what worked, what was a challenge, etc. Please comment.</p> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed in revised PIF plus explanation in the agency response matrix.</p> <p>- To strengthen the regional basin organisations, it appears to make sense to provide funds for long-term twinning and mentoring and exchanges between these institutions across Africa or to even aim to bring in relevant global expertise from other basin organisations for specific issues.</p> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed in revised PIF plus explanation in the agency response matrix and to be further addressed during project design.</p> <p>- Working with and - if appropriate - through the RECs is sensible. Yet the RECS appear to be the main (only?) vehicle that ANBO intends to operate through, yet not all basin organisations actually have close ties to the respective RECs yet. ANBO may need to explore and/or strengthen these links where they are workable.</p>	<p>note this throughout the document.</p> <p>That said, please clarify and revise the diagram on "Project Organisation Structure" under heading of Management Arrangement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Listing ANBO, UNDP, and UNESCO/GWP on one level is confusing and does not align with the project management structure and differing functions of these institutions within the project implementation/execution.</li> <li>- Do not show UNDP and UNDP Mauritius as separate entities.</li> <li>- Show the PMU as part of the structure</li> </ul> <p>Project Board: as shown/explained this seems to mix implementing and executing functions. Please clarify. Please clarify and provide clear TORs to assure separation of implementing and executing functions. If this is to be equivalent to a PSC that needs to be more clear. In that case we recommend having GEF be invited as observer (on annual base). ANBO may want to consider inviting IW-Learn in observers status as well to build cooperation and complementarity with regards to IW-learn regional activities.</p> <p>Please also include a funds flow diagram which will further clarify respective roles of UNDP, GWP &amp; UNESCO, and the PMU within the ANBO Secretariat.</p> <p>Project Manager TORs (annex 3): What</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- IWRM is mentioned and so is regional integraton - yet there is no explicit mention to bring in other sectors into basin dialogue and planning - including energy, agriculture, transport, environment etc ...</p> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed in revised PIF plus explanation in the agency response matrix and to be further addressed during project design. Both RECs as well as water basin organizations (RBOs/LBOs/GWCs) need to address multi-sectoral issues such as water-food-energy-nexus which provide oportunities and challenges for transboundary cooperation.</p> <p>- ANBO institutional strengthening: unless addressed by SITWA or other already, it seems that ANBO in long run will require to mature into an institution that is mandated and capacitated to receive, manage, and disburse funds directly in future. How will this capacity be built?</p>	<p>contract will the PM hold? Assuming that this necessarily would be a contract with one of the executing agencies, the PM should not have triple reporting lines , but only dual: i.e. report to the ANBO secretariat and the executing agency. There should not be a mandatory reporting line to UNDP (as GEF IA) and certainly not on day-to-day management. Again, a clearer diagram showing the institutional structure and reporting lines would clarify this and hopefully add to simplification.</p> <p>(10/6/2016) The above comments have been sufficiently addressed and clarifications added on relations to IW learn, project management and enhancing quantification of the deliverables.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The strengthening of cooperation for sustainable management of water resources and to address pressing environmental challenges is described.</p>	<p>Yes, GEBs with regard to water security and cooperation and their links to sustainable development are addressed by the project.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement</p>		<p>No - as already commented under question 7 the scope of sectors and goals for ANBO's activities and the project's goals and what it aims to achieve in this broader context needs strengthening. Gender is not mentioned.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	of incremental/ additional benefits?		<p>(6/11/2014). This will be addressed during project design.</p> <p>At endorsement stage: Addressed. The project is aimed at strengthening the capacity of ANBO and of regional basin organizations (lake, river, and groundwater). The link to development and resilience is outlined and addressed, but the numerical benefits are impossible to address in this kind of project. It is well perceived that participation of a gender expert and CSOs is required 'in both the inception workshop as well as throughout project implementation'.</p>
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>No - please address. Some of the African RBOs - often with GEF support - have significantly strengthened the capacity of civil society platforms across basins and strengthened participatory and communications and outreach activities to reach the broader public. Will ANBO include elements to disseminate lessons on this and/or create other public participation opportunities and/or disseminate lessons.</p> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed in revised PIF plus explanation in the agency response matrix.</p>	yes, see comment under question 9.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate	The project does explicitly address and intends to strengthen the capacity of basin organisations to assess increasing climate variability and change and build resilience, yet it is not quite clear what it intends to do. One very concrete item	Yes, key risks and mitigation measures are addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	resilience)	<p>though is the development of guidelines for sustainable infrastructure.</p> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed in revised PIF plus explanation in the agency response matrix and to be further addressed during project design.</p> <p>The PIF needs to be more explicit about the sustainability risk. Outside support to ANBO is essential in its initial stages, yet the make or break will be for ANBO to relatively quickly deliver visible results to its clients - the basin organizations and its member countries - to be able to in the long term be assured sustainable finance.</p> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed in revised PIF plus explanation in the agency response matrix. If successful ANBO may receive a designated budget from country contributions for both AMCOW and via funds to RBOs/LBOs/GCs.</p>	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Please enhance this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is very little in terms of 'scanning the field' evident and/or relation to other sectors considered (such as regional power pools etc.)</li> <li>- What are other relevant global and regional transboundary learning and capacity building initiatives that ANBO will collaborate with and build on (incl. IW Learn, INBO, GIZ?, CIWA, and other).</li> </ul> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed in revised PIF under coordination and</p>	<p>The project is well coordinated with GWP and UNESCO work and embedded in AMCOW mandates.</p> <p>Please outline the link with CIWA support to ANBO and any continued cooperation with INBO (while ANBO is now entirely independent of INBO).</p> <p>(10/6/2016) Comment addressed. Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		details need to be addressed during project design including allocation of funds to participaton in and benefitting from IW-learn.	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>ANBO is one of the first regional, continent (AU and AMCOW) owned network of basin organisations. Nothing comparable exists in other regions that the GEF works in. If ANBO can deliver visible services and benefits to its member countries, it has great potential to being an essential part of Africa's regional governance mechanisms and aid in strenthening regional cooperation and integration.</p> <p>ANBO is aiming to develop a financial sustainability strategy, yet this needs to be further addressed and explicit options be evident in PPG phase.</p>	<p>ANBO is a formal entity within the AMCOW and AU structures and aims at consolidating itself capacity in Africa and transboundary cooperation on water and related resources with the aim to further development goals, support regional integration, resilience and stability in face of increasing pressures of increasing climate variability and change.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		Yes.
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		The projects costs and design are well elaborated.
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>Yes, the funding and co-finance is adequate. Additional co-finance could be pursued to expand the scope of activities.</p>	<p>Please explain how the GWP co-finance will compliment the GEF funding given that SITWA funds appear to wrap up in 2016.</p> <p>Please given an indication of the type of OMVS co-finance amounting to a truly</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>commendable in-kind amount of USD 2 million.</p> <p>GWP amount is given as Euro 20K/year in the LOE. Please indicate how the amount in table C was calculated to avoid questions at financial clearance stage.</p>
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>Yes, the amount and composition of co-finance is adequate.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>The project management costs are close to 10 % and hence quite high. Please reduce.</p> <p>(6/11/2014). Comment addressed in revised PIF plus explanation in the agency response matrix. Reduction and explanation is adequate as such a regional effort does bare additional management costs.</p>	<p>Yes, it is between 5 and 10 % of the GEF grant and in line with effort for a regional project.</p>
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>The PPG amount requested is within the norm.</p>	<p>Yes, PPG funds have been reported on.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Please submit the IW TT.  (10//2016) TT was submitted today. Cleared.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, a budgeted M&E plan is provided.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		N/A for MSP
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	(4/10/2014). No, kindly address comments provided above.  (6/11/2014). The previous comments have been addressed in the revised PIF and additional detail provided in the agency response matrix.  The PIF is technically cleared.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Coordination with other initiatives and direct or indirect support to ANBO: - Please explore the linkages and support by INBO in more detail and provide detail on synergies with the GEF support to ANBO. - All IW projects should set aside 1 % of the GEF grant for participation in IW-Learn activities (participation meetings;	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>etc.). ANBO will especially benefit from cooperating with IW-Learn and gathering experiences from IW-learn efforts on knowledge management. Mechanisms of harnessing this experience and learning for ANBO staff from IW Learn may be part of ANBO institutional strengthening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- other synergies with support by relevant partners to transboundary waters cooperation in Africa and KM should also be explored in more detail , such as GIZ, WB - CIWA, and others.</li> </ul> <p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We noted the agency explanation/agency response to comments and questions on ANBO's ambitions on being a data hub. We note that ANBO 's aim is to create a meta-data base for hydrological, but also relevant socio-economic data that have been gathered on basin scale. Well noted and we assume this will be expanded in the project document. The PIF has some confusing wording on a need for compatibility with ANBO's database/AWIS which is rather unlikely to be fueled by demand from countries or RBOs/LBOs/GCs; what is needed is designing the meta data to link to basin dat . Harmonization of such data formats on basin-scale appears hard enough and aiming for a continent wide standard does not seem timely.</li> <li>- the previous engagement of ANBO in Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) is noted. Would it be worth to consolidate this effort through the current project?</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>IW Learn could be of assistance here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The implementation mechanism as well as future finance are to explored. In terms of implementation the relative roles of ANBO and the AMCOW secretariat (see para 57 of PIF) need to clarified during PPG.</li> <li>- During PPG , please expand on how ANBO with RBOs/LBOs and/or through the RECS will work on enhanced cross-sector engagement and addressing synergies and trade-offs of transboundary issues related to not only water quantity and quality , but also in relation to energy and food security - such as through facilitating enhanced interaction between RBOs and regional power pools.</li> </ul>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>Not yet. Please respond to comments given above.</p> <p>(10/7/2016). The comments provided at PIF and pertaining earlier submission are addressed. The tracking tool was submitted today.</p> <p>The project is technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.</p>
	First review*		June 25, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 10, 2014	October 06, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		

**\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**