



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation			
Country(ies):	Angola, Botswana and Namibia	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5526
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4755
Other Executing Partner(s):	The Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM)	Submission Date:	16 Nov 2015
		Resubmission Date:	7 March 2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	54
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	579,500
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>			

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-1: Catalyze multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in trans-boundary surface/groundwater basins while considering climatic variability and change	<p>Outcome 1.1: Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) incorporates transboundary IWRM principles (including environment and groundwater) and policy/legal/institutional reforms into national/local plans</p> <p>Outcome 1.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency, sustainable fisheries with rights-based management, IWRM, water supply protection in SIDS, and aquifer and catchment protection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National and local policy and legal reforms adopted</li> <li>• Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments</li> </ul>	GEFTF	4,900,000	330,000,000
IW-3: Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for ecosystem-based, joint management of	Outcome 3.1: Political commitment, shared vision, and institutional capacity demonstrated for joint, ecosystem-based management of waterbodies and local ICM principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National inter-ministry committees established/strengthened;</li> <li>• Active experience/sharing/learning practiced in the IW portfolio</li> </ul>	GEFTF	1,200,000	6,638,032

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

transboundary water systems	Outcome 3.3: IW portfolio capacity and performance enhanced from active learning/KM/experience sharing				
<b>Total project costs</b>				6,100,000	<b>336,638,032</b>

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective: Strengthening the joint management and cooperative decision making capacity of the Cubango-Okavango River basin states on the optimal utilization of natural resources in the basin, with the aim to support the socio-economic development of the basin communities while sustaining the health of the basin ecosystems.**

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1: Construction of Basin Development and Management framework	TA	<b>Outcome 1:</b> A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space	1.1. Agreed long-term basin vision, mission and values, underpinned by environmental quality objectives promoted widely among stakeholders at all levels and guiding all the interventions in CORB.  1.2 Initial boundaries set for development space.  1.3 Customized Decision Support Systems relevant to OKACOM developed and used.  1.4 Design and agreement of an Information Management Systems to accommodate both live and static data.  1.5 Transboundary PES principles fully incorporated in the sustainable financing schemes for CORB, including the OKCOM Endowment Fund.	GEF TF	760,000	4,000,000
		<b>Outcome 2:</b> Strengthened management framework including enhanced OKACOM mandates	2.1 SAP and NAP operationalised & M&E framework to monitor SAP/NAP implementation progress designed and applied.  2.2 Revision of the OKACOM agreement to align its mandates and legal status to effectively monitor and coordinate SAP implementation.	GEF TF	840,000	4,100,000

			<p>2.3 Strengthened OKASEC with technical capability to manage and operate the DSS and IMS.</p> <p>2.4 Transboundary EIA Guidelines and procedures developed and adopted by OKACOM</p> <p>2.5 Communication and Information Strategy as well as Stakeholder Integration Strategy effectively implemented</p> <p>2.6 Strengthened OKASEC with adequate Financial and Administrative capacity to manage donor-funded projects.</p>			
Component 2: Environmentally Conscious Livelihoods and Socio-Economic Development - Demonstration Projects	INV	<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> Environmentally sound socioeconomic development piloted in the basin to allow the basin population to improve their socioeconomic status with minimum adverse impacts to and enhanced protection of the basin ecosystem.</p>	<p>3.1 M&amp;E frameworks designed to monitor the demonstration progress and effectiveness</p> <p>3.2 Community-based Tourism activities demonstrated and documented</p> <p>3.3 Sustainable community-based fisheries demonstrated and documented</p> <p>3.4 Community-based climate change adaptation measures demonstrated to improve food security and resilience through application of alternative/conservation agricultural practices</p> <p>3.5 Replication Strategies <b>developed</b> to promote further environmentally sound socioeconomic development activities in the basin, <b>based on lessons learned and knowledge acquired from pilot projects.</b></p>	GEF TF	2,460,000	259,600,000
Component 3: Integrated Water Resources Management	TA	<p><b>Outcome 4.</b> The basin's states capacity to manage transboundary water resources based on IWRM principles enhanced, supporting</p>	<p>4.1 Common demand forecasting and yield assessment methodologies established</p> <p><b>4.2 Assessment of groundwater resources;</b></p>	GEF TF	<b>1,740,000</b>	<b>52,000,000</b>

		the Basin Development Management Framework (BDMF)	<p>4.3 Assessment of hydrometeorological monitoring programmes and recommendations for strengthening. Improvements funded in Angola in specific sites.</p> <p>4.4 Sedimentation Monitoring Programme special reference to bed load; capacity building in sediment transport measurements</p> <p>4.5 Water quality baseline survey undertaken and monitoring programme and improvement and investment strategy determined</p> <p>4.6 Basin wide biological monitoring and socio-economic monitoring programmes</p> <p>4.7 Harmonized assessment of water quantity and quality developed to support agreed common objectives and standards</p> <p>4.8 Basin-wide IWRM plan</p>			
			Subtotal		5,800,000	319,700,000
			Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>	TF	300,000	16,938,032
			<b>Total project costs</b>		<b>6,100,000</b>	<b>336,638,032</b>

### 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 (\$)
National Government	Government of Angola	In-kind/cash	184,000,000
National Government	Government of Botswana	In-kind/cash	103,000,000
National Government	Government of Namibia	In-kind/cash	6,376,354
National Governments	OKACOM	Cash	5,260,000
GEF Agency	UNDP Angola	Cash	320,000
GEF Agency	CapNet UNDP	Cash	300,000

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

GEF Agency	World Bank	Cash	800,000
Bilateral Aid Agency	UK AID (CRIDF)	Cash	2,416,918
National Governments	KAZA (Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area)	In-kind/cash	6,802,721
Bilateral Aid Agency	USAID/SAREP	Cash	23,000,000
Bilateral Aid Agency	SIDA	Cash	2,110,828
Private Sector	Wilderness Safari (Private Sector)	Cash	2,251,211
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>336,638,032</b>

#### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	IW	Regional (Angola, Botswana, Namibia)	6,100,000	579,500	6,679,500
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>6,100,000</b>	<b>579,500</b>	<b>6,679,500</b>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

#### F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	850,000	4,200,000	5,050,000
National/Local Consultants	1,040,000	7,000,000	8,040,000

#### 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 PIF<sup>4</sup>

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

<sup>4</sup> 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.

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

N/A

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:

N/A

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

No changes since PIF. Only to note that the UNDP-GEF Botswana project, titled 'Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland District Landscape for Improved Livelihoods', has started its implementation in March 2014. Also, the World Bank-GEF project, titled 'Sustainable Groundwater Management in SADC Member States' (GEF ID 4966), will be active on the ground soon. This project will closely coordinate activities with both projects and share information useful to each other to maximize synergies.

## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

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

The primary stakeholders are the Parties to the Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM), the three basin countries, Angola, Botswana and Namibia, and OKACOM itself. At present OKACOM serves as a technical advisory body to the Parties on matters relating to the conservation, development and utilisation of water resources of common interest. Although there is some representation on OKACOM from other Ministries than the ones directly responsible for water, the representation beyond water sector is currently limited. To expand OKACOM's mandates, the engagement of other ministries, such as Finance, Agriculture, Energy, Environment, Planning, Tourism, and Foreign Affairs, might be required in the near future. Engagement of representatives from those ministries in CORB related matters will be first sought through their participation in the National Inter-sectoral Committee in each basin state.

Local governments and communities will be key stakeholders in the demonstration projects. Their roles and responsibilities will become more and more important as more responsibilities are delegated from national governments to them through the implementation of national IWRM strategies, based on IWRM principles. An extensive NGO network covering the three countries exists and was accessed by the UNDP-GEF EPSMO project and a few other initiatives. Contacts with private sector stakeholders, particularly in the tourism industry, were established in the Botswana part of the basin through the implementation of the UNDP-GEF Biokavango project and the UNDP-GEF Botswana IWRM Project. They were followed-up during the PPG to encourage their active engagement in the demonstration projects, in particular for the transboundary tourism strategy development and implementation a pilot scale.

OKACOM started organizing an annual River Basin Dialogue in 2010 as a platform to strengthen these contacts and information exchange between OKACOM and their stakeholders in the basin. The project will build on their database to ensure the wide coverage of stakeholder engagement during the project preparation. OKACOM Secretariat, as part of the TDA process, undertook a stakeholder analysis and will use it as the basis for

development of a public involvement and communications strategy.

Women will be a key stakeholder group for the project. Gender inequalities, when present in the basin at any level, reduces women's access to resources and the decision making process. All demonstration projects are designed to contribute to gender and youth empowerment in the communities where they are implemented. To ensure this, the project will gather as much information as possible during the inception phase on women's unique roles in the stewardship of natural resources and support to households and communities and incorporate them into the final design of the demonstration projects. The knowledge and active involvement of women can make the project more resilient and adaptive to changes, especially in highly vulnerable areas. A preliminary gender analysis was undertaken as part of the PPG to develop a set of appropriate gender disaggregated indicators to measure progress in gender mainstream in IWRM through the project and has informed the design of the project.

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 (LDCF/SCCF):

A central theme of the project is the promotion of low impact, environmentally sustainable development activities in basin as an alternative to conventional development activities with higher impacts on the basin ecosystem, such as for example large-scale, commercial agriculture that may be both water and fertilizer intensive. The improved livelihood of the basin communities is an overall project objective and the balance of exploitation of resources and utilization of ecological services and goods a central question. The project will provide the participating countries with the means and methods to make this fine judgement collectively and encourage appreciation of the existence 'value' of the Cubango-Okavango system both locally, regionally and globally. The benefits need to be achieved principally at the community level and they should be shared between the three countries. This need for benefit sharing as well as the need for development is recognized by the countries who will analyse, based on scientific knowledge, and negotiate to agree on the optimal 'development space' for the basin. This concept of the mutually agreed 'development space' will be a central principle in the basin's future management.

As described in the PIF, the project will test low impact development alternative pathways through a series of 'pilot' projects, testing new management arrangements and technical methods and evaluating economic performance. The pilot projects will be carefully monitored to gauge the socio-economic benefits and the environmental impacts to make comparisons with conventional water resource developments. It is this assessment which has been missing in many previous pilot projects implemented in the basin as high-lighted during the TDA and when carrying out the Integrated Flow Assessment (IFA) study. Care will be given to effective M&E framework design, ensuring that the communities are closely involved in the monitoring. The M&E frameworks will enhance ownership by placing accountability in the hands of the community, and empowering them to use their own data to make their own decisions.

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

The project is cost-effective in two ways:

- The project is to be executed by OKACOM, through the OKACOM secretariat in Botswana, thus removing a management tier and ensuring close and efficient communication with the beneficiaries. It is appreciated that there are risks with such an arrangement and it will require additional over-sight by UNDP in the first stages, but this will be more than compensated later on in the project through the expected cost savings and increased operational efficiency compared to agency execution. The project will be supported in this task by SIDA, whose project will also be directly implemented by OKACOM, and will provide further oversight and guidance to the OKASEC.
- The project is supported by and designed around strong SAP and NAPs, providing good country

ownership. The donors are all committed to assisting the countries to implement the SAP and have good communication and working relations with each other. Thus the GEF-financed project has been designed to maximize synergy and avoid overlap with the partner projects - examples of which are the support to the Payment for Ecological Services sub-component, conceptualized initially by the USAID SAREP project and the adoption of logistic infrastructure inherited from past pilot projects. The GEF-financed project through its support of the OKASEC will be the lead project in coordination of the SAP and thus be able to tailor its activities to the SAP in the most cost-effective manner.

### **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 after the project manager is recruited 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 (after 2 PIRs have been completed.). The Mid-Term Evaluation 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 evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

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

**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 fora, such as GEF IW: LEARN, AMCOW/African Network of Basin Organization, SADC Water Sector, Stockholm World Water Week, World Water Forum, etc.

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](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](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\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Manager</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: \$30,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.</li> </ul>	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 <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oversight by Project Manager</li> <li>▪ Project team</li> </ul>	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"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RTA</li> <li>▪ UNDP EEG</li> </ul>	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> </ul>	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: \$50,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team,</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: \$50,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ local consultant</li> </ul>	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> </ul>	Indicative cost per year: \$6,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate)</li> <li>▪ Government representatives</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: \$40,000  For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b>		US\$ 200,000	
Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		(+/- 5% of total budget)	

**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)
Mr. Carlos CADETE	National Director of Statistics, Planning and Studies Office	Ministry of Environment, <b>Angola</b>	<b>7 AUGUST 2013</b>
Ms. Ingrid M. OTUKILE	Chief Natural Resource Officer and Head of Policies and Programmes Division,  Department of Environmental Affairs	Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism  <b>Botswana</b>	<b>7 AUGUST 2013</b>
Mr. Teofilus NGHITILA	Environment Commissioner	Ministry of Environment and Tourism,  <b>Namibia</b>	<b>12 AUGUST 2013</b>

**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	Tel.	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator UNDP- GEF		7 March 2017	Akiko Yamamoto, Regional Technical Advisor	+251 91 250 3316	<a href="mailto:akiko.yamamoto@undp.org">akiko.yamamoto@undp.org</a>

**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 page 32 of the Project Document

## Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility  
(Version 5)

### **STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)**

Date of screening: October 04, 2013

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit

Consultant(s): Thomas Hammond

#### **I. PIF Information** *(Copied from the PIF)*

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**            **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5526

**PROJECT DURATION:** 4

**COUNTRIES:** Regional (Angola, Botswana, Namibia)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** The Permanent Okavango River Basin Water commission (OKACOM)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** International Waters

#### **II. STAP Advisory Response** *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Minor revision required**

#### **III. Further guidance from STAP**

1. STAP welcomes this technically and scientifically sound project proposal in the Cubango-Okavango river basin shared by Angola, Botswana and Namibia in Southern Africa. The project builds on long term efforts by the riparian states to protect and develop the river system for the benefit of poor people living within the basin and to sustain ecosystem goods and services for broader use within the SADC region and beyond. The project is a continuation of innovative investment efforts in governance and management by the GEF (third project) and Sida and USAID that have worked together in a coordinated fashion. The PIF proposes a project design that is prioritizing a few activities within the SAP that complement the work of other donors and builds upon the strengths within UNDP that through its implementation status can provide technical assistance. The ownership rests with the riparian states and the functions carried out by the OKACOM and its secretariat. Nevertheless, STAP recommends minor revision to the project design for the following reasons.

2. As the economies of the three countries and the neighboring SADC countries expand demands for water from energy production, irrigation and water supply will grow. The riparian countries are therefore working to put in place a collective governance mechanism to ensure the sustainable flow of goods and services. The PIF does not, however, provide a governance baseline analysis relating to SADC and its support to transboundary river basin management in general and the work of the SADC water sector. It is recommended that such an analysis is included during project preparation to mitigate potential political risk outside the basin that may impact transboundary water management within the basin. Likewise a national governance baseline analysis should be undertaken covering the political economy of the basin countries and their longer term investment appetite into transboundary water resources management. It is noted in the PIF that financial contributions to OKACOM recently has been put in place by the riparian states and this demonstrates a current willingness to cooperate. As the PIF notes the governance challenges

at basin level are significant, nevertheless STAP believes that these also represent an opportunity to innovate and to show how nested governance and benefit sharing can be demonstrated at national and regional scales.

***A full governance analysis relating to the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the national governments of transboundary water resources can be found in the OKAMCOM Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (2011). In addition an institutional review of OKACOM and its associated bodies was undertaken in 2013 by the SIDA-supported project which was fully consulted during the project design. It was therefore decided that there was no need to undertake a further assessment of governance at the PPG stage, since, in the interim, the situation and potential risks have not changed.***

3. STAP agrees with the GEF Secretariat that the proposed use of PES at transboundary level is innovative and STAP encourages the project executants to refer to the available GEF guidance, to keep full records of the assumptions made and decisions taken to enable the GEF to maximize the learning opportunity. Likewise efforts to continue build sustainable tourism efforts beyond Botswana and Namibia into Angola are encouraged.

***The proposed PES development is in the pre-feasibility stage and is currently supported by USAID with technical support by UNEP. OKACOM is leading the overall coordination of all preparatory activities towards PES establishment. The pre-feasibility study is programmed for two years and if positive a full feasibility will follow with the World Bank support. Through the project OKACOM will be involved closely in defining the goals and mechanism of the PES scheme and its promotion. UNDP will ensure that the lessons learnt and potential wider applications will be recorded and disseminated to the IW community.***

***Through consultative processes during the project development phase, Namibia and Botswana each selected a tourism pilot project as one of the two pilots to be implemented in their territories, but Angola did not. Instead, they have selected fisheries and conservation agricultural themed pilots. It is important to ensure that through the OKACOM national inter-sectoral structures the tourism authorities and industry is kept informed about the pilot project results and made aware of development potential for this low-impact economic activities.***

4. Regarding water abstraction and permits, it was noted by the proponent that OKACOM does not control permits for land/water use, but could seek to influence them. STAP welcomes the availability through other projects of a water audit for the basin. Clearly permits for surface and groundwater abstraction need to be co-managed and budgeted across the basin with due regard to seasonality given the very large wet/dry season differences in available flows. With respect to co-management of surface and groundwater and the need to proceed to an integrated water budgeting mechanism, the proponents could consider coordination of the proposed project with the proposed World Bank/GEF project 'Sustainable Groundwater Management in SADC Member States' (GEF ID 4966), within Component 3. This PIF also has a comprehensive analysis of SADC and its institution in which OKACOM sits.

***This point is noted and reference to the World Bank-GEF project has been inserted in the project document.***

5. STAP notes that transboundary fishery management is also to be supported through one of the proposed pilot projects. The PIF states that the objectives include the protection and improvement of fish stocks; in this regard STAP cautions that conservation of the species diversity (71 species in the Delta alone) and avoidance of non-native species would be a wise outcome.

***This point is noted and the pilot project objectives have been amended accordingly.***

6. Finally, STAP notes that there have been a number of GEF investments in the Okavango area from the biodiversity focal area, and wishes to have greater clarity as to the degree to which this initiative may be able to build on the outcomes of these initiatives particularly with regard to the management of ecosystem services.

**A greater part of the biodiversity studies and investments have been made in the Okavango delta and are encompassed by the Okavango Delta Management Plan. This plan was one of the key inputs into the TDA and provided the constraint boundaries for the Integrated Flow Assessment, thus the potential degradation of ecological services caused by different water demand in the upper catchment. Subsequent to the TDA there has been a Strategic Impact Assessment of the Delta, the findings of which will feed into the updated IFA. The biodiversity knowledge of the upper basin and impacts of increased water demand are less well defined and as part of the project an ecological monitoring programme will be established at strategic points and important upper basin wetlands. There will also be established community led ecological monitoring programmes associated with the pilot projects to evaluate changes in ecological goods.**

**Botswana has recently started the implementation of another UNDP-GEF national project, titled ‘Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland District Landscape for Improved Livelihoods’ financed by GEF Land Degradation Focal Area. During the project development phase, this project has been in close contact with those involved in the development and finalization of the Ngamiland SLM project to ensure the complementarity and maximize synergies.**

**The proposed regional project plays a critical role in sharing the knowledge generated in the downstream part of the basin – through national projects – with upstream countries. Sharing knowledge across the basin states not only inform their joint management decisions better but also contribute to trust building. Also, the project can ensure OKACOM, the regional body, to remain important stakeholders for those national projects in the basin.**

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:            (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:            (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>5</sup>**

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>\$200,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Scoping and Formulation of FSP Activity	200,000	166,828	33,172
<b>Total</b>	200,000	166,828	33,172

<sup>5</sup> 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