



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

GEF ID:	5526		
Country/Region:	Regional (Angola, Botswana, Namibia)		
Project Title:	Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4755 (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:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$6,100,000
Co-financing:	\$336,638,032	Total Project Cost:	\$343,138,032
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 07, 2013
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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes, the participating countries are GEF eligible.	Yes, the participating countries are GEF eligible.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, all three OFPs have endorsed the project.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, the grant amount requested is within the GEF IW FA allocation.	Yes, the grant amount requested has been approved within the GEF-5 IW FA allocation.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		

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

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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></p>	<p>Yes, the project activities and outputs are aligned with FA objectives 1 and 3. The relative split between these objectives (table A) may need revisiting during project design.</p>	<p>Yes, the project activities and outputs are aligned with FA objectives 1 and 3.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes, the project is consistent with existing strategies and aims at SAP implementation. The SAP was adopted by all countries and the OKACOM.</p>	<p>The project is consistent with the approved Strategic Action Program developed under the previous GEF supported project. The project also provides support to important sites under the Ramsar convention and UNESCO world heritage site of the Okavango delta.</p> <p>As the project is aiming to implement investments in each of the countries (in line with SAP) it needs to show how these are aligned with specific related national strategies and plans e.g. in the water resources and irrigation, in the tourism, wildlife protection, and fisheries sectors. The annexes underlying component 2 for the pilot projects are the one place where these relations are considered.</p> <p>10/21/2016: Please add information on</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>alignment with national strategies. in addition, one table associated with the Annex describing the subprojects and linking these to ongoing baseline/related projects on national level would be useful and instrumental to aid sub-projects coordinate and/or build on experiences from ongoing or recent related efforts on national level as well as avoid duplication.</p> <p>3/27/2017:</p> <p>The alignment of the pilots with national strategies has been added. During the demonstration project development (i.e. within the overall project implementation phase) it needs to be assured that the activities at the selected sites build on and incorporate lessons from ongoing and past related national activities.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes, the baseline is sufficiently described in the PIF as well as the accompanied documentation (e.g. the SAP and NAPs).	<p>While the overall physical and institutional baseline situation has been assessed during the Transboundary Diagnostic and SAP development, an analysis of the specific institutional structures and investment related to the proposed project activities on national level is needed and it is not clear how the project is building on both. Please strengthen for resubmission.</p> <p>(10/21/2016). Comment does not appear to have been addressed (see comment under 5 above; can be addressed</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>together).</p> <p>3/27/2017: The agency response is addressing the comment . Once the geographical location has been determined during project implementation it will be essential for the sustainability of the project to strengthen local implementation structures and either enhance or reform local governance and institutional structures. This needs to be made part of the TORs of the consultant tender.</p> <p>Cleared for endorsement, but please take note during implementation.</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>The activities described are aligned with the SAP and broadly aligned with the recommendations of the TER.</p> <p>Please address the following: - Please aim at a more realistic PDO, e.g. changing "achieve" to "support" in the PDO seems to be more along the scope of the project. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed.</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>- Strengthening OKASEC: it is key to provide institutional strengthening to emerging regional institutions. Please assure and document in project design that OKACOM has the necessary FM and procurement capacity for direct execution of the project and - unless sufficiently addressed by other development partners - please include capacity building in that</p>	<p>The project is an important contribution to strengthening the OKACOM and OKASEK through strengthened basin planning strategies and tools, enhanced capacities and on the ground investments.</p> <p>In summary: The project - especially components one and three seem ambitious in scope given the level of finance. Component 2 requires additional clarification on the scope and sustainability of some of the interventions. Detailed comments are provided below:</p> <p>Part A and overall comments: - Table B at PIF stage listed six outcomes within three components. Two outcomes have been dropped from the current project. GEF policies require consistency of outcomes between the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>regard. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed in PIF and response matrix and will be further considered in project design/prior to CEO endorsement.</p> <p>- please clarify what role is envisioned/realistic for OKASEC in NAP "implementation" versus just monitoring. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed.</p> <p>- The activity to develop a transboundary PES scheme is very innovative and effort appreciated. GEFSEC will be interested to receive regular updates and provide inputs during project design. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment noted in response matrix.</p> <p>- Please - in project design - assure close cooperation and complementarity with SIDA and USAID financed activities. e.g. the development of the Multi-sectoral Investment Opportunity Analysis (funded by which agency?) and the SEA (funded by which agency? please note that the GEF IW strategy does not include funding of safeguards documents perse; there would need to be a specific regional context in the cooperative management of the basin that would make something like this GEF eligible) should be informed by the DSS and vice-versa. There is also complementarity on data and information collection and overlap needs to be avoided.</p> <p>(8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed in</p>	<p>approved PIF and endorsement. It also noted that several of the expected ! outputs at PIF stage are now dropped from table B, yet most are still part of the project. Suggest that the ones that are maintained (e.g. assessment of groundwater resources, and basin-wide IWRM plan) are maintained in the endorsement version of table B for consistency.</p> <p>(10/21/2016). Explanation added in the agency response to reconcile difference. addressed.</p> <p>- Please explain why the review of climate change impacts on water resources has been dropped from component 3. Assessment of climate change impacts is an important point under GEF 5 (and GEF 6).</p> <p>(10/21/2016). comment addressed and noted that this is now financed by USAID. Yet, we have not found the climate change review mentioned in the agency response. Please provide.</p> <p>- It is appreciated and noted that a gender analysis has been part of the PPG and included gender relevant indicators (as per UNDP CEO package). Please share the gender analysis and include appropriate indicators in the RFs. Right now the gender aspects described in the prodoc seem very general (including in the annexes describing the pilots).</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>PIF and response matrix and will be further considered in project design/prior to CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Efforts on an network and joint ventures of tourism operators in this rather pristine basin appear sensible, yet design should require adequate co-finance from these private sector players as well as needs to build in safeguards to not distort the market and assure transparency in the process of what is funded and why. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed in PIF and response matrix and will be further considered in project design/prior to CEO endorsement. - The strategy to address wildlife conflicts through tourism is important. Please explain he value added compared to previous/ongoing efforts by USAID. The component description is vague on what is likley to be implemented on the ground. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed . - Transboundary fisheries component is appreciated and clearly incremental. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment noted/addressed . - Communiy based pilots - is this envisioned as an SGP effort? What is the envisioned approximate size and number of grants. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed in response matrix and will be further 	<p>(10/21/2016). Comment addressed overall by adding gender differentiation to indicators in the logframe and committing to the development of a Gender Action Plan. yet to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency comment lists that the GIZ supported OKACOM gender strategy would be submitted in the ER. It has not reached us - please include in resubmission. - please indicate a target date for finalizing the gender action plan (end of year 1 ?). Please add to logframe. - Further, as mentioned at PIF stage, please clearly allocate 1 % of GEF grant to participate in IWCs, regional IWLEARN meetings, website posting of project efforts, and production of experience notes and results notes. <p>(10/21/2016). Comment addressed.</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The funding for outcome 1 (620 K) seems low if its to finance the listed activities and outputs including a functional DSS system and integrated database (plus other under outcome 1). Please comment/consider revising. - 1.1: Please be more clear in describing the character and scope of the BDMF (1.1) and relation to both the DSS (somewhat described, but please be more explicit) and the IWRM plan (component 3). Also, please relate to the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>considered in project design/prior to CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Component 3: - All activities are clearly aligned with the SAP. During project design - if not at PIF revision stage - it is recommended to consider shifting additional funds into component 3 and/or raise additional direct co-finance. At present, the envisioned GEF grant for this component seem rather small given the level of effort. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed and will be further considered in project design/prior to CEO endorsement.</p> <p>- Within the activity to review national permitting and licensing procedures for water abstraction, please assure/aim to include coupling land-use permits/leases with permitting for associated water-use. Irrigation is one of the most water intensive sectors and hence a lack of coupling land and water uses is a great threat and has often lead to overexplotation, decreasing groundwater levels, and dire impacts on human needs and ecosystems. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed in response matrix and will be further considered in project design.</p> <p>Please allocate 1 % of GEF grant to participate in IWCs, regional IWLEARN meetings, website following the IWLEARN guidance, production of experience notes and results notes.</p>	<p>WB/UK funded multi-sector investment constraints and opportunity analysis.</p> <p>- 1.2: Please be more clear on the aim for the DSS. The two bullets top of page 19 are clear. Text below though indicates an unclear mix of scope and ambitions for the DSS (incl. the link to the integrated flow assessment, ecosystems evaluation, etc).</p> <p>- Is the DSS aimed as planning tool, management tool, or forecast/operational tool ? etc. In addition there is mention of a sediment model. Please clarify its scope and how it builds on existing model/s. Else the funds allocated appear rather low.</p> <p>- the component text also talks about performing a case -by-case assessment of proposed water development involving technical and economic appraisal to prioritize and screen out projects. Please clarify to what degree this is part of the DSS tool or its establishment. (Note: the reason for asking is based on getting an idea of adequate finance for the component).</p> <p>1.3 Please clarify the demand, goal, and type of information aimed to be included in the Information Management System. Will countries agree to provide real-time/dynamic data to the suggested center and the University? Is QA/QC built into the system? Will the system be costed and added in future to the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed. Caution voiced in the agency response on the website design/re-design is noted and realistic.</p>	<p>operating costs for OKASEC (and reflected in country contributions)?</p> <p>1.4: The PIF provided assurance that the GEF project would be instrumental in the establishment of a PES scheme. As described in the text and RF it is now exceedingly vague if and what the GEF contribution will be as USAID and also WB appear to be the main players. Annex 2 is not adding to that clarification (USAID flyer).</p> <p>1.5/1.6/1.7 - the effort to strengthen various aspects of OKACOM and OKASEC are appreciated.</p> <p>(10/21/2016). Most comments on component 1 have been addressed. Please address remaining 3 comments listed below:</p> <p>Comment 1. Please remove the ambiguity stating the project will put in place a PES scheme. The rather ambitious notion of a transboundary PES has now evolved and OKACOM is working with UNDP, Sida, World Bank and a range of other development partners on the establishment of a sizable endowment fund.</p> <p>The text - but not table B and the logframe - makes it clear that the UNDP project is financing a prefeasibility study and will be instrumental - in cooperation with other development partners - to support the establishment (!) of this</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>endowment fund to address the unique ecosystems of the Okavango-Cubango basin. This by itself is a commendable project deliverable.</p> <p>As written the Logframe and table B it is misleading what is to be achieved and will lead to negative evaluations in future for not achieving expected results of the project is such is misrepresented from the start. Please reword to indicate the support to the feasibility & establishment of the endowment fund.</p> <p>Comment 2. The agency response and prodoc is now clear that the project will not directly contribute to a flood early warning system (given budget limitations) but the IMS and other efforts on data and information capacity will support a future effort (funded from other sources). In line with the aims of the UNDP support to the IMS and strengthening cooperation for SAP implementation it should be considered to support the countries to establish an MoU/protocol for data exchange that includes the exchange for real time data during flood months. This could lay the ground for cooperation on floods and early warning systems in future.</p> <p>Comment 3. Please clarify output 1.1 on the basin vision and the environmental quality objectives. How does this differ from the existing Shared Vision and SAP objectives. Thank you.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Component 2:</p> <p>- It is good that SAP implementation aims at action on the ground and visible impacts. Yet, it is not clear why all pilots are aimed at small scale, local interventions and low (environment) impact in focus - would a higher ambition be possible. e.g. the project description is clear that a major threat to the basin in terms of water quantity and quality are planned/expanding large scale agriculture production. Could the project engage with a/some of the larger scale producers to result in greater efficiency/greater sustainability of these investments instead of entirely focusing all six efforts on small scale, community efforts ?!</p> <p>- Community based pilots to be sustainable and ready for upscaling/larger adoption would need to work with and possibly/if appropriate innovate or strengthen the local government systems as well. There is little indication how the pilots is working within existing national and local government systems, make use and/or strengthen rural extension agents, or similar. As written, efforts seem to bypass existing systems and be reliant mostly on consultant inputs (tendered out). Please comment and explain the alignment with country based institutional structures and support to farmers and fishers and how existing institutional structures have been and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>will be involved in the design and implementation (incl. e.g. existing extension agents, entities such as national departments of tourism and local units, or e.g. the Okavango wetlands management committee etc.). Please also comment on how the pilots build on experiences from previous GEF financed activities on national levels and how e.g. such experiences can be shared across countries (e.g. from GEF investments in Botswana and its tourism, wildlife and fisheries sector).</p> <p>- Tourism investments (annex): Please be much more clear WHAT the project funds, Given the two budgets for the pilots, the main funds (e. in the Botswana pilot/output 5) go into investments, but it is unclear what these are. Please explain what is funded. Lodges, restaurants, air strips etc. that make profit should seek private investment and not GEF International Waters grants. Please explain and clarify/revise in the respective annex. There is also mention, but no clarity, on moving of wildlife fences and mention of resettlement of people in future. What is the role of the project in this? Please explain and share the environmental and social assessment done.</p> <p>Please explain in what ways the project involves private operators (the letter of support of one company is noted)? Will these be the investors in tourism</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>facilities (lodges etc) or thought as operators only? Further, are there any sustainable tourism certifications on national level that the regional strategy should build on? One national certificate in Namibia is mentioned. Are there other?</p> <p>Please provide clarity on regulations in the respective countries on community managed tourism (incl. land rights etc). How is the project expanding on existing community based tourism efforts in each country (including but not limited to those with previous GEF finance)?</p> <p>One of the annexes also mentions a microloan scheme among the project outcomes, but there is mention in the pilot otherwise. Please comment.</p> <p>- Fisheries investments: Please provide some overview of the fisheries sector (volume and type of fisheries and institutional frameworks) and how the project interventions fit into that landscape. What type of commercial and community management structures exist and what is the project strengthening?</p> <p>(10/21/2016). Most comments on component 2 have been addressed. Please address remaining 4 comments listed below:</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Comment 1. The explanation of the country request in the agency response for such distinct measures is noted. In addition to this, please let us know if there have been any interaction with any larger scale users/private sector players on increasing efficient water use (surface and groundwater).</p> <p>Comment 2: Comment addressed in the prodoc to assure close interaction with local government and devising up-scaling plans within the project. Also noted is the reference to the GEF funded project in the delta. Comment addressed here (yet , please note the request for national baseline related to the community based activities - see question 5). Also, we still am surprised to see the notion of pilots in a SAP implementation project. The type of project interventions are beyond a 'proof of concept'. While they may be new for the local, SAP implementation would benefits from shift from pilot to at least a demonstration scale. In conversations with UNDP this appears to be the case, but the language in the prodoc does not reflect this. Please add an indication of scale in the logframe (in forms of estimated areas covered (ha); people reached, etc. depending on the type of pilot).</p> <p>Comment 3: Comments on tourism above have been addressed in the agency response. Please transfer the information in the agency response into</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>the prodoc e.g.. on the existing ecotourism regulation and certification, community managed tourism and how the project is building on these experiences.</p> <p>Comment 4: Please include some information on the fisheries sector even if extracted from the TDA.</p> <p>- Component 3:</p> <p>- 3.1 Establishing and overview of 'abstractions and review of national permitting and licensing procedures' is described as well as working with the USAID SAREP efforts (see pg. 25). Will this review result in activities to the strengthen national permitting efforts? Also, given the important work of SAREP on getting an overview of land-use and land-use planning it would be important to review how water and land-use permits/leases are related. and leading to 3.2: How is groundwater use/permitting addressed and is groundwater use implicitly awarded with land use or are there separate regulations? How is conjunctive management addressed? Please show how the project is an entry point to enhance governance aspects?</p> <p>How will the project link and possibly be strengthened through the SADC groundwater project ?</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>3.3. Sediment monitoring - it is understood that the scope of this effort is not clear yet, but some more detail would be needed to allow adequate budgeting for this (e.g. the proposed assessment of current erosion and erodibility can be a large effort).</p> <p>3.6 Biological and socio-economic monitoring: has there been any overview and how is this effort building on national data ? If indeed there would be no existing data on any of the parameters listed on pg, 27 exist, then such a monitoring program would be much beyond the scope and budget of this sub-component. The project should carefully assess , gather and build on national level information on hydrology, vegetation, wildlife etc.</p> <p>3.7 - see comments under component 1 need to link with the BDMF and constraints and opportunity analysis.</p> <p>Please expand on how the scope of the feasibility study (pg 29) and how a flood early warning system will be supported by the project (in collaboration with others). How is it envisioned that the GEF project will contribute to this.</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . Comments under component 3 are mostly addressed . Please expand on two points below: 1. Expand on the work on groundwater which is currently a desk study only and seems to be rather unclear how it will</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>have much - if any - impact. The SDAC groundwater project has had its inception meeting and is aiming at partnering with a number of transboundary basins. It would be timely to build on this. Further, please clarify if the assessment is also reviewing the legal and policy framework underpinning groundwater governance and conjunctive management in the three countries AND providing recommendations to strengthen groundwater governance and conjunctive management at basin, national, and local levels.</p> <p>2. Sedimentation - please provide the report on the preliminary sediment monitoring requirements. Please try to provide some more details on this to allow for adequate budgeting as per the previous request.</p> <p>(10/21/2016). Please note/be reminded that GEF IW funds are not being used for installation of national hydromet stations, while GEF regional IW funds are of course often used for the regional network design and related on regional level.</p> <p>(3/27/2017)</p> <p>Comments have been addressed overall in the agency response and the resubmitted project document and additional documentation.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Before internal UNDP endorsement/approval: Please align the numbering of outputs to the numbering of activities throughout (including in table B of GEF datasheet). This will greatly improve the transparency and oversight of the project. While commented on earlier this has not been done.</p> <p>During project implementation:</p> <p>- Please assure flexibility in the output under component 1 and aiding the establishment of the Okavango Endowment fund - which has evolved from the initial aim to establish a transboundary PES scheme. The current formulation of "assuring the inclusion of PES principles in sustainable financing schemes of the CORB, including the Okacom Endowment Fund" needs to be transformed into a clear and tangible output and aiding in accelerating the establishment of the endowment fund. Please assure review of this at MTR.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the description and incremental reasoning is clear. The Cubano-Okavango-basin is a comparatively pristine basin and GEF support is unique in aiming at proactive action to support both ecosystems health and sound development decisions in the basin.</p>	<p>yes, the project builds on the previous effort which laid the foundation for the countries to agree on regional and national action program to address threats to the shared river and wetland system.</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . Re. gender: please refer to the earlier comment in this review.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>(10/21/2016) . On civil society participation (beyond the 'pilots'): please clarify any provisions anticipated for consultation/comment periods or mechanisms on basin development and IWRM plans on basin level.</p> <p>(3/27/2017). Comment addressed in the revision. It is understood that details for each pilot will be developed during project implementation and full community participation will be assured.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>The project is outlining the development and socio-economic benefits of the ecosystems functions this unique ecosystem. Gender dimensions and indicators for measuring impacts need to be better articulated especially under component 2 (see comment under question 7 above).</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . Addressed.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Overall there appears to be sensitivity to public participation, yet project design needs to assure that this is realized across all relevant activities and not only in the pilot measures. In addition, project activities are implemented and complement SIDA funding which is supporting a basin-wide awareness campaign.</p>	<p>The means of involving civil society and e.g. consultations and/or comment periods or mechanisms on basin development and IWRM plans is not described.</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . See comment under 8.</p> <p>Yet, the main physical interventions are within the pilots which in majority community based efforts. Details of participation and consultation mechanisms - incl. gender differentiated</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>actions- will need to be and will be further addressed during the detailed design of the pilots within project implementation.</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . Addressed.</p>
	<p>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 resilience)</p>	<p>Climate change is clearly identified as a threat in the SAP and consequently the PIF. For example, component 3 will support a review of climate change scenarios and impacts. Yet, the risk section also outlines the need for strengthening the hydromet stations in the upper catchment without providing a realistic mitigation effort (e.g. could LDCF/SCCF support be an avenue?).</p> <p>- The risk section also lists the challenge of inter-sectoral coordination as a moderate risk. The OKASEC/the project further should also assure engagement of central ministries such as ministries of finance, planning, and foreign affairs i.e. go beyond sectoral line ministries to assure increased traction and financial support for transboundary cooperation.</p> <p>(8/29/2013 AH) - Comments addressed.</p>	<p>The outputs looking at climate impacts has been dropped between PIF and endorsement, yet clearly changes I flows due to existing variability and impacts of climate change are important. The project is aiming at increasing modeling capacity, an assessment of the hydromet system, and an overview of abstraction. All of this will aid in establishing a better handle on the existing flows and combined with the IFA will be a base to assess impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Further, the pilots are aimed at increasing community resilience and income diversification.</p> <p>The project team is asked to add some text/explanation in the project document that outlines how climate changes is being addressed more clearly.</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . See comment on climate change under question 7. Please provide the CC information as per comment there.</p> <p>3/28/2017. Additional information of climate change vulnerability has been submitted. Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>- The activities - especially under component 1 - are closely related to the USAID and SIDA support. As the SIDA support is not operational/under preparation, please explore how the efforts could be operationally aligned (ideally these would have been 'blended' operations within one project). a coordination matrix is expected to be established and aid ORASEC to coordinate the various related efforts.</p>	<p>The project is aligning with regional efforts, incl. the Sida, GIZ, and USAID efforts. It also mentions the WB funding for a multi-sector constraints and opportunities analysis. This should be well integrated with efforts under components 1 and 3.</p> <p>The project needs to provide a better analysis of the baseline of specific national investment and how these relate to the planned project activities (incl. in terms of using/building on institutional arrangements). Right now this is lacking and a general reference to the TDA and SAP would not be adequate to show how the project interventions -incl. pilots interventions - build on related national efforts of monitoring water quality and quantity, wildlife management, artisanal fisheries, community based tourism etc.</p> <p>Please specifically comment on how component 2 interventions build on previous GEF BD financed interventions in the Okavango delta.</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . Addressed.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the 	<p>The project provides a unique opportunity for taking proactive action in a relative pristine basin which is home of unique global assets such as the wetlands systems of the Okavango Delta. Getting traction for cooperation in this kind of situation is in some way harder as it is not based on immediate threats but aimed to avoid future threats and as such be 'ahead</p>	<p>The project provides important foundations at regional level to assess the sustainability of existing and future interventions, e.g. by having basin-wide overview of water uses and water quality.</p> <p>The pilots are meant to be scalable and hence the project resubmission is</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>of the curve' and build on the natural assets of the basin as a potential for income. As such this effort is a unique opportunity to test concepts of green development and natural resource accounting in a proactive way in a transboundary setting.</p>	<p>advised to be clear on how such investments are designed not as one off investments but using or creating structures that can be replicated.</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . Addressed.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>Please see comment with regard to dropping two outcomes under question 7. Please comment.</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . Addressed.</p>
	<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>		<p>No additional comments. See questions/comments under 7.</p> <p>(10/21/2016) . Addressed.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<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, GEF finance is building on previous GEF finance and is line with the efforts. Shifting funds among components for greater attention to the range of key outputs under component 3 is recommended - see also comment under #7.</p> <p>(8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed.</p> <p>Adequate private sector co-finance needs to yet be assured in project design in the activities targetting transboundary tourism.</p> <p>(8/29/2013 AH) - to be addressed further in project design/by CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Please clarify what of the listed indicative co-finance will be direct co-finance to the project and what will be parallel co-</p>	<p>No additional comments. See questions/comments under 7 (regarding asking if components 1 and 3 may be underfunded given the ambitions).</p> <p>(10/21/2016). Please reconcile/assure that funding figures in table B and in the budget (pg. 45 - 47) correspond. There is a mismatch at present.</p> <p>Furthermore, harmonizing the output numbering in table B, the text, and the annexes would be helpful (e.g. see page 17 - numbering does not match table B in all cases).</p> <p>(3/27/2017) See comment under</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>finance in direct support to SAP implementation and supporting the overall project PDO. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed.</p>	<p>question: "Before internal UNDP endorsement/approval: Please align the numbering of outputs to the numbering of activities throughout (including in table B of GEF datasheet). This will greatly improve the transparency and oversight of the project. While commented on earlier this has not been done. " GEF is confident that UNDP can address such during internal review and approval of the project. Cleared.</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>There is indicative co-finance of USD 60 million , including a 1.2 million grant from UNDP. Co-finance is commensurate to the effort and GEF finance. (See above: Please clarify what of the listed indicative co-finance will be direct co-finance to the project and what will be parallel co-finance in direct support to SAP implementation and supporting the overall project PDO. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed.</p> <p>Adequate private sector co-finance yet needs to be assured in project design in the activities targeting transboundary tourism.) (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed and to be further considered in project design.</p>	<p>Please explain the decrease in UNDP co-finance from 1.2 million to 300 K by UNDP Angola. There is no letter from the UNDP Country Rep explaining this cash co-finance. (10/21/2016) . Addressed. (3/27/2017) Letters of co-finance have been provided. The significant increase in co-finance from WP entry to endorsement is supported by these letters. Nevertheless, we caution overly high ambitions of co-finance (e.g. including by the countries) and trust for UNDP to review that the specified co-finance materializes during project implementation and does support the project PDO as per GEF co-finance requirement.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>Please decrease project management costs. The usual cap is at 5 % - please provide a detailed justification for</p>	<p>yes. (3/27/2017) PMC can be rounded to 5%</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		amounts exceeding the 5 % norm. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed.	of total GEF grant (exceeding PMC by 0.17 % is reasonable given the regional character of the project and added transaction costs). Cleared.
	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?	The requested amount is within the norm for this size of project.	PPG has been used/reported in the submission.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A.	N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		The IW TT is attached. Please list all six pilots not only three. (10/21/2016) . We understand the idea for aggregation. Addressed.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, a budgeted M&E plan is attached.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		STAP comments have been responded to. The one question that is restated under question 7 is the specific link to other GEF funded activities (not a general reference). (10/21/2016) . Addressed.
	• Convention Secretariat?		N/A

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council? 		<p>3/27/2017. The US Council comments for need of scale -up of NAP and SAP implementation are being addressed through greater cooperation by donors and additional finance, as well as plans for scale-up and replication of the demonstration projects inter alia through the Okavango Endowment Fund.</p> <p>Comments addressed also the needed for building on local knowledge which is critical for the design and implementation of the demonstration projects. Comment noted and UNDP will need to assure this aspect during project implementation. At endorsement stage this is sufficiently addressed in the outlines provided for each national level activity in Annex 1.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other GEF Agencies? 		N/A
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No. Please address comments above (under 7, 11 and 16) .</p> <p>(8/29/2013 Astrid Hillers) - Yes, comments have been addressed in the PIF and additional clarifications requested also provided in the agency response matrix.</p> <p>The PIF is being recommended for inclusion in a future work program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	This section will be finalized after receiving the resubmitted PIF.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		(8/29/2013 Astrid Hillers) During project design please consider the remaining items that are clearly indicated to be considered in project design in questions 7, 10, 16 and 17.	
<p>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</p>	<p>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</p>		<p>Not yet.</p> <p>We appreciate the submission and are looking forward to resubmission after addressing the comments and clarifying questions outlined in the review sheet. We would be happy to have a call to explain any of the comments.</p> <p>(10/21/2016). Not recommended yet. Please address the remaining comments (10/2016). We stand ready for any clarifications and assist in a swift revision. Please do not hesitate to get in touch in the next days/week.</p> <p>(3/28/2017.) The project is recommended for endorsement.</p> <p>Please note the comments in the review sheet to be addressed before internal approval inside UNDP and during implementation.</p> <p>The latter relates mainly to a clearer and actionable output to accelerate/aid the establishment of the CORB Endowment Fund (to be reviewed at MTR) and comment on the design of the demonstration pilots during project implementation. It will be essential for replicability and scale -up (e.g. though support by the endowment fund) to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>assure that demonstration pilot will be designed to not create parallel implementation structures but build on, strengthen and/or reform (as needed) local governance and institutional structures. As the location of pilots has not been finalized, this needs to be a requirement in the TORs for the tender of demonstration pilots during implementation. The use of country system appears to be strongly supported by OkaSec to enable scaling up of demonstration pilots in future including through the envisioned Okavango endowment fund.</p> <p>The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>
	First review*	August 27, 2013	October 21, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 29, 2013	March 28, 2017
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
Review Date (s)			

* **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.**