



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening the institutional capacity of African Network of Basin Organization (ANBO), contributing to the improved transboundary water governance in Africa			
Country(ies):	Africa continental	GEF Project ID: ¹	5772
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5338
Other Executing Partner(s):	GWP, UNESCO	Submission Date:	3 June 2016
		Resubmission Date:	16 Sept 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	40
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	190,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-1	Outcome 1.2: Transboundary institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management demonstrate sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation frameworks agreed with sustainable financing identified 	GEFTF	500,000	5,431,970.68
IW-3	Outcome 3.3: IW portfolio capacity and performance enhanced from active learning/KM/experience sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active experience/sharing/ learning practiced in the IW portfolio 	GEFTF	1,500,000	3,000,000
Total project costs				2,000,000	8,431,970.68

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To strengthen the coordination and collaboration capacity of African Lake and River Basin Organizations (L/RBOs), Commissions and/or cooperative framework for transboundary groundwater management and their member states towards improved transboundary water governance in Africa through improved support by the African Network of Basin Organizations (ANBO)

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1: Strengthening ANBO's institutional and technical capacity as a technical arm	TA	Outcome 1.1: Institutional capacity of ANBO strengthened to deliver on its statutory	Output 1.1.1: ANBO vision, mission and detailed 5-year strategy developed and adopted by ANBO General Assembly (fully funded by EU-SITWA) Output 1.1.2: Institutional design	GEF TF	1,000,000	6,000,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

of AMCOW		mandates	<p>for ANBO Secretariat agreed and Secretariat made fully operational (fully funded by EU-SITWA)</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: Relevant policies and procedural manuals (HR policy, FM policy, gender policy etc.) for effective and efficient operations of ANBO Secretariat developed and applied</p> <p>Output 1.1.4: Financing options for ANBO analyzed for its sustainability to function as a technical arm of AMCOW</p>			
		<p>Outcome 1.2. ANBO's technical, knowledge and information management capacity strengthened to serve as a technical arm of AMCOW focusing on transboundary water resources management, including groundwater.</p>	<p>Output 1.2.1: ANBO's information management capacity strengthened through the enhancement of the African Water Information System (AWIS) on data related to transboundary water management, including groundwater.</p> <p>Output 1.2.2: Support to information exchange and synthesis (knowledge management and open/online access, thematic databases, development of regional indicators etc.) at regional and pan-African level provided, with specific emphasis on AMCOW water sector reporting requirements</p> <p>Output 1.2.3: ANBO's website strengthened to make it as a premier information exchange platform for Africa's transboundary basins and aquifers.</p> <p>Output 1.2.4: ANBO's technical capacity strengthened to represent transboundary perspectives and interests on behalf of L/RBOs and groundwater commissions at AMCOW's technical task forces, such as M&E task force for water resources and transboundary waters, to mainstream transboundary concerns into AMCOW discussions.</p> <p>Output 1.2.5: Financial options to</p>			

			sustain technical and financial capacity of ANBO for maintaining AWIS and ANBO web platform, participation in tasks forces and other related political and development processes analyzed and recommendations made to ANBO General Assembly			
		Outcome 1.3: ANBO's capacity as a clearing house for AMCOW on information related to climate change, vulnerability analysis and adaptation strategies of African transboundary basins strengthened	<p>Output 1.3.1: Meta-database for studies related to climate change predictions, vulnerability assessment, and adaptation strategies of African transboundary basins developed</p> <p>Output 1.3.2: Case studies/ best practices/ lessons learnt from L/RBOs on financing and implementing (transboundary) climate change adaptation initiatives developed and disseminated through AMCOW</p> <p>Output 1.3.3: ANBO guidelines on climate resilient infrastructure development for L/RBOs developed and disseminated through AMCOW</p> <p>Output 1.3.4: At least four transboundary water commissions (L/RBOs and/or Groundwater Commissions) sensitized and trained on the use of ANBO's meta-database through related capacity building workshops and training sessions (in cooperation with WACDEP programme)</p>			
		Outcome 1.4: ANBO communication, monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management capacity strengthened	<p>Output 1.4.1: ANBO communication strategy developed</p> <p>Output 1.4.2: Policy briefs on transboundary groundwater management produced and disseminated</p> <p>Output 1.4.3: Regular project progress monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management</p>			
Component 2: Supporting the capacity	TA	Outcome 2.1: Information and data management	Output 2.1.1: Knowledge management capacity needs assessment carried out for African	GEF TF	850,000	2,000,000

building of Lake/River Basin Organizations, Groundwater Commissions and RECs to foster transboundary cooperation	capacity of L/RBOs and Groundwater Commissions strengthened	<p>L/RBOs and target L/RBOs selected for capacity strengthening (fully funded by EU/GWP SITWA project). Lessons learned and best practices extracted and disseminated.</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: Transboundary data management and information sharing systems (data exchange/management protocols, common referential and priority topics, data exchange scenarios and tools, data exchange platforms etc.) implemented for two selected L/RBOs and one Groundwater Commission, then linked to AWIS.</p>			
	Outcome 2.2: RECs capacity to foster international cooperation among its member states to manage transboundary waters strengthened	<p>Output 2.2.1: REC's (transboundary) water resources management focal points and selected L/RBO and/or Groundwater Commission representatives trained in transboundary water law and legal relationship between international water law and domestic law and policy; sensitized and trained on the benefits and other international, regional and domestic implications of the international legal framework for transboundary water cooperation</p> <p>Output 2.2.2: Lessons learned and best practices of effective REC support to its member states and/or L/RBOs to foster international cooperation for transboundary water management identified, discussed and disseminated among RECs and L/RBO/GC.</p> <p>Output 2.2.3: Dialogue platform/s among RECs and other regional stakeholders established to stimulate international as well as multi-sectoral cooperation and reflect development issues under water and climate security framework (in cooperation with WACDEP programme).</p>			
	Outcome 2.3. Financing/Resour	Output 2.3.1: ANBO in-house capacity to gather and disseminate			

	ces mobilization capacity of L/RBOs and Groundwater Commissions strengthened	financial opportunities related to transboundary water resources management (including peace building through resource management cooperation, resilience building through cooperation, etc.) strengthened to benefit its Member Organizations. Output 2.3.2: Capacity building workshops (at least 2) for L/RBOs and Groundwater Commissions on financial resources mobilization carried out (including sharing lessons regarding effective donor conferencing, effective ICP coordination, etc.) Output 2.3.3: Donors and partners coordination group/s established to monitor available resources and funding possibilities for long-term development and strategic support (in cooperation with GWP and WACDEP Programme).			
Subtotal				1,850,000	8,000,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³			GEF TF	150,000	431,970.68
Total project costs				2,000,000	8,431,970.68

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP-CapNet	Cash	240,000.00
Other Multilateral Agency	EU/GWP SITWA	Cash	2,433,628.32
Others (Regional Institution)	AMCOW	In-kind	2,700,000.00
CSO	Global Water Partnership	In-kind	108,342.36
Others (River Basin Authority)	OMVS	In-kind	2,050,000.00
Other Multilateral Agency	UNESCO-IHP	In-kind	400,000.00
Other Multilateral Agency	UNESCO-IGRAC	In-kind	500,000.00
Total Co-financing			8,431,970.68

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

UNDP	GEF TF	IW	Continental Africa	2,000,000	190,000	2,190,000
Total Grant Resources				2,000,000	190,000	2,190,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	1,020,000	2,000,000	3,020,000
National/Local Consultants	270,000	1,000,000	1,270,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The fundamental baseline project and the problems it seeks to address have not changed since the PIF stage, however, there has been a minor amendment to the project proposal, namely:

- Outcome 1.4: ANBO communication, monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management capacity strengthened, has been added to the project with the three outputs of ‘1.4.1 ANBO communication strategy developed’ and ‘1.4.2: Policy briefs on transboundary groundwater management produced and disseminated’, and 1.4.3: Regular project progress monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management. The stakeholder consultations held during the project development phase identified the improvement of ANBO’s communication within the framework of a clear communication strategy, as well as its monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management efforts as a major need in terms of ANBO strengthening that was not addressed during PIF design.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

N/A

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

N/A

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The project will coordinate closely with the overall GEF IW freshwater portfolio in Africa, specifically project supporting L/RBOs. Lessons learnt from these projects will be integrated into the project, for example the establishment of the ORASECOM Water Information System through UNDP-GEF support can provide valuable guidance and lessons learnt for the support provided to the full establishment of the AWIS and the development of knowledge management systems at L/RBO level. In turn, lessons learnt from this project supporting ANBO will be shared with the other GEF projects on the continent (and where applicable beyond), through the AWIS and ANBO web platform as well as through direct project to project information exchange.

The project will also be informed by the outputs of the GEF Transboundary Waters Assessment Programme (TWAP), which will specifically inform the knowledge management and monitoring, evaluation and reporting elements of this project. The project will also learn from discussions facilitated by the GEF regional targeted workshops in Africa organized by IW: LEARN and will utilize information collected by IW: LEARN from all the L/RBOs supported by GEF. Close coordination will be sought with relevant global and regional capacity building organisations such as UNDP Cap-Net, GWP and SADC WaterNet. They each have ongoing training and capacity building programmes on various aspects of Integrated Water Resources Management which the project can both benefit from as well as contribute to.

Outside the GEF portfolio, the project will cooperate closely with the EC/GWP SITWA project. Several of the outputs of this UNDP-GEF project build on initial assessments carried out by that project and assist ANBO in implementing some of the main elements of the ANBO strategy and work plan that is being developed with support from the SITWA project.

In addition, the project will cooperate with initiatives such as the African Working Group (AWG) under the EU Water Initiative, African Water Facility financed initiatives of AMCOW on monitoring and reporting, the Cooperation in International Waters in Africa (CIWA), the International Network of Basin Organisations (INBO), and other initiatives supported by bilateral donor agencies, whenever possible and appropriate.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Lake/River Basin Organisations (L/RBOS), Groundwater Commissions, RECs and AMCOW all derive their mandate from individual Member States and in combination they represent all transboundary water management aspects from continental, to regional, to basin and to national level. Representatives of these key stakeholder groups (e.g. ANBO Chairperson and office, AMCOW Secretariat, REC Secretariats, etc. were engaged in a consultative manner during the development of this project and are key beneficiaries of the project.

The project recognizes the importance of public participation, engagement of civil society organizations, including gender groups, in discussions pertaining to transboundary water management. Not only can they make valuable contribution to discussions that form basin planning, water resources management and policy recommendations to decision makers, but also they have strong capacity and experience in outreach especially to local communities who affect and are affected by basin-wide planning. Their contribution in sensitizing local communities on transboundary issues have been proven significant through other GEF-financed projects in Africa in the past 20 years. The project intends to benefit from their experience and perspectives during the project development phase as well as during the project implementation. To this end, the project will ensure the involvement of at least two civil society organization (one from Francophone and the other from Anglophone countries) and at least one gender expert in both the inception workshop as well as throughout the project implementation. Cost effective ways to engage the civil society in the discussions of transboundary water management at ANBO level (instead of a basin or country level) will be applied based on ANBO's structures and established mechanisms for stakeholder engagement. A set of gender aggregated data/indicators to be tracked by

the project and by the ANBO will be identified during the project inception phase.

The project will contribute to the increased accessibility to information and data for African transboundary basins for all, including civil society organizations, academic institutions, water managers, economists, decision makers, politicians, L/RBOs and Groundwater Commissions, the donor community, within and outside of Africa. Such increased accessibility to information by all will facilitate informed decision making and stimulate meaningful stakeholder engagement on transboundary water management issues in Africa.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF):

The project contributes considerably to strengthening pan-African transboundary water governance and knowledge management frameworks. Through strengthening ANBO as the technical arm of AMCOW on transboundary water management, AMCOW will have a permanent focal point on transboundary water management matters, which in turn represents the broader L/RBOs community on the continent. Through this policy guidance to African Ministers will be provided in a more coherent manner and representative of the practical challenges facing transboundary water management in all regions of the continent. At the same time, the dissemination and implementation of AMCOW policy decisions at REC and basin level, through the respective Member States, will be significantly improved. The full establishment of the AWIS as the continent's premier knowledge platform for transboundary water management information will further strengthen these effects.

Through the technical support provided to RECs and L/RBOs on knowledge management, legal and institutional issues and financial resource mobilization, some of the most pressing challenges facing the majority of L/RBOs will be addressed, thus assisting those basins to better manage the environmental challenges they are facing and contributing to long-term sustainable management of transboundary basins. The global environment benefits that will be realized through this project include: improved governance in the management of transboundary water resources management in Africa and the realization of ecosystem based- IWRM planning and implementation in the various L/RBOs. ANBO has been identified as a suitable vehicle to effectively fill some of the identified governance gaps and capacity needs at continental and regional levels with respect to the management of these global environmental problems. With it being the umbrella organization that brings together the L/RBOs on the African continent ANBO facilitates the exchange of experiences and best practices among these institutions so that they can learn together and from each other. Many L/RBOs are already supported by GEF through the International Waters portfolio. Linking them under the single umbrella will therefore help consolidate the overall expected results from GEF interventions in Africa at the portfolio level.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project is closely coordinated with the EU funded SITWA project and builds directly on outputs from that project, including the ANBO Strategy and Action Plan. Synergies, and thus cost savings, are created through designing outputs of this project that respond directly to priorities/ needs identified through the SITWA project. As a consequence the project funds can be spend directly on already identified priority activities with no funding used for scoping, needs assessments etc., thus maximizing the impact of the project funds.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

Project start:

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and

programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop shall address a number of key issues including:

- a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis-à-vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- b) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- c) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget shall be agreed and scheduled.
- d) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- e) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures shall be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting shall be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

- Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits:

UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also

join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term of project cycle:

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Review at the mid-point of project implementation (between the 2nd and 3rd PIRs). The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term Review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems.

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term review cycle.

End of Project:

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response, which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and knowledge sharing:

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and visibility requirements:

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP logo can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines").

The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf.

Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

M & E workplan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ Executing Agency (UNDP IP) ▪ UNDP GEF 	\$25,000	Within first two months of the project manager in place
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP ▪ EA (UNDP IP) ▪ Project Manager 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager supported by the project team ▪ EA (UNDP IP) ▪ UNDP 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ EA (UNDP IP) ▪ UNDP GEF RTA 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager and team ▪ Consultants as needed 	None	Quarterly
Project Board Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager and Team ▪ EA (UNDP IP) ▪ UNDP GEF RTA 	\$60,000 (For cost effectiveness, any co-financing opportunities will be sought.)	At least twice a year.
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ EA (UNDP IP) ▪ UNDP GEF RTA ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: \$40,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ EA (UNDP IP) ▪ UNDP GEF RTA ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: \$40,000	About three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team 	0	At least three months before the end of the project

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ EA (UNDP IP) 	Indicative cost: US\$ 30,000 (Average US\$10,000 per year)	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP ▪ EA (UNDP IP) ▪ ANBO representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST		US\$ 195,000	
Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses			

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
N/A			

The letter of support has been secured from AMCOW and submitted with the PIF.

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator UNDP-GEF		16 September 2016	Akiko Yamamoto	+251922503316	akiko.yamamoto @undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

See Section III: Project Results Framework of the Project Document

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

GEFSEC COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p>Please explore the linkages and support by INBO in more detail and provide detail on synergies with the GEF support to ANBO.</p>	<p>Continued cooperation and information exchange with INBO will be a priority for ANBO, despite the fact that the recent amendment of the ANBO Statutes (approved by the ANBO Coordination Bureau in Dec 2015 and expected to be endorsed by the General Assembly in September 2016) makes ANBO fully independent from INBO institutionally. Section 5 (1) of the revised ANBO Statutes calls for the establishment of strong partnerships and Section 5 (2) provides for regular partnership forums to be held by ANBO. The project will support ANBO on the establishment of the partnerships, signing of MoUs, holding of regular forums and regular communication and information exchange primarily through Outcome 1.1.</p>
<p>All IW projects should set aside 1 % of the GEF grant for participation in IW:LEARN activities (participating meetings; 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>	<p>The project commits to setting aside at least 1 % of the budget allocated by GEF for participation in portfolio learning activities (see Sec 52 and 69 of the pro doc) through IW:LEARN. In addition, several of the project activities contribute to portfolio level learning through enhancing the capacity of ANBO, RBOs, RECs and AMCOW in the area of communication, information and knowledge exchange, knowledge management etc. (see Sec 69 of the pro doc). The Project can help ANBO share the experience globally – through IW:LEARN – how the continental network such as ANBO can play an effective role on these knowledge management and information exchange efforts.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The newly revised ANBO Statutes place a string emphasis on developing partnerships, which will be supported by the project through Outcome 1.1. This includes the establishment of technical partnerships as well as the broadening of financial partnerships/ funding, the latter being specifically supported by the project through Output 1.1.4. The project has been working very closely with the EU-GWP-SITWA project during the project development. Support from GIZ, WB-CIWA, and/or further support from EU are all anticipated to some degree but not yet confirmed. ANBO is trying to organize a donor roundtable as part of their resources mobilization effort later in 2016, and some preparatory discussions are underway. The project will support ANBO on this resources mobilization endeavor as soon as it starts implementation.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>This is well noted and provided for in the project document (Outcome 1.2 – p 15 of the pro doc). It is emphasized there that the focus will be on the strengthening of the AWIS as a meta-database and the improvement of linkages/ interfaces between basin databases and the AWIS as well as other databases (e.g. for AMCOW reporting), but not on the development of a harmonized continental standard. A focus will also be on the increase of groundwater information in the AWIS, for which the expertise of UNESCO-IGRAC will be brought in with support from this project.</p>

<p>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 data. Harmonization of such data formats on basin-scale appears hard enough and aiming for a continent wide standard does not seem timely.</p>	
<p>The previous engagement of ANBO in Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) is noted. Would it be worth to consolidate this effort through the current project? IW: LEARN could be of assistance here.</p>	<p>The KPIs developed under the previous ANBO initiative form an important guideline document for RBOs in the organization and streamlining of their operations. The KPI will inform and guide the implementation of project activities wherever possible and appropriate. The KPI are particularly likely to inform the establishment and enhancement of data management procedures and communication and knowledge management support provided to ANBO itself as well as to the RBOs and RECs through Component 2.</p>
<p>The implementation mechanism as well as future finance are to be explored. In terms of implementation the relative roles of ANBO and the AMCOW secretariat (see para 57 of PIF) need to be clarified during PPG.</p>	<p>Recently, ANBO has made a decision to establish an independent Secretariat. This decision is reflected in the recently revised Statutes (approved by the ANBO Coordination Bureau in Dec 2015 and expected to be endorsed by the General Assembly in September 2016). The ANBO Secretariat will remain physically hosted by OMVS in Dakar, but will become legally independent, using its own financial management, HR, procurement etc. procedures. The project supports the establishment and operationalization of the ANBO Secretariat through Outcome 1.1 (specifically outputs 1.1.2 & 1.1.3). The securing of long-term financial security to sustain the Secretariat and the network programme as a whole is a high priority for ANBO and is supported by the project through Output 1.1.4: strengthening ANBO's resource mobilization capacity.</p> <p>The ANBO Secretariat will work closely with the AMCOW Secretariat in Abuja, Nigeria, in the coordination of all activities relating to ANBO's support and cooperation with AMCOW and matters related to transboundary water resources management (including aquifers).</p>
<p>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 ,</p>	<p>Outputs 2.2.2 and particularly 2.2.3 (p 21-23 of pro doc) are specifically designed to facilitate cross-sectoral engagement among a variety of stakeholders related to the water, energy, food security and climate nexus.</p> <p>Ensuring food security of their basin communities is considered as a priority by most of African RBOs, as part of their efforts towards improving the livelihoods of the basin communities, regardless of the actual mandates of those RBOs on</p>

<p>but also in relation to energy and food security - such as through facilitating enhanced interaction between RBOs and regional power pools.</p>	<p>paper.</p> <p>The emphasis on the link between water and energy varies depending largely on the mandates of each RBO. A few RBOs (such as OMVS and Kunene Commission) have very relevant mandates on energy matters while others not.</p> <p>The project can facilitate enhanced interaction between RBOs and regional power pools, where relevant, through its interaction with RECs and its support to strengthen awareness of RECs on RBOs' roles on transboundary water resources management.</p>
--	--

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$100,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Project document development/CEO Endorsement	40,000	30,640	9,360
Capacity needs assessment	15,000	12,000	3,000
Stakeholder consultation	25,000	21,400	3,600
Translation of the documents	10,000	5,600	4,400
Travel (including GEF IWC8 participation)	10,000	7,500	2,500
Total	100,000	77,140	22,860

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A