



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9054		
Country/Region:	Regional (Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa)		
Project Title:	Support to the Orange-Senqu River Strategic Action Programme Implementation		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5506 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2 Program 3; IW-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$250,000	Project Grant:	\$10,815,137
Co-financing:	\$738,953,600	Total Project Cost:	\$750,018,737
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Akiko Yamamoto

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>IW: Yes, the project is aligned with IW GEF 6 strategy. The proposed project is implementing the SAP for the Orange-Senqu basin (IW objective 2).</p> <p>(PIF stage comments): i) please split resources between programs 3 and 4 as appropriate (conjunctive management of surface and groundwater and Nexus program).</p>	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(3/27/2015): Addressed.                      ii) please email/add the signature page of SAP when re-submitting showing signature/approval on ministerial level by all countries.                      (3/27/2015): UNDP communicated that the SAP was approved at a COM meeting. The COM minutes approving the SAP to be shared with GEFSEC before WP inclusion of the project</p> <p>LD: Yes, aligned for focal area strategy.</p> <p>Comment: Please fill out row 2 in table F for LD (ha)</p> <p>(3/27/2015): Addressed.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>Yes, the project is consistent with national plans and with conventions.</p> <p>By endorsement, please be more specific on this alignment for each country, incl. alignment with NAPs (for LD)</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	The project builds on the Transboundary Analysis and Strategic Action Plan for the Orange Senqu basin. This process identified the state of environmental issues including their rootcauses (context specific	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		drivers) and priority actions to address these on transboundary and national level - including institutional and policy reforms and investments.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Yes, the incremental reasoning is laid out and based on the agreed actions signed by ministers in the SAP. Actions are focused to enable both environmental monitoring at basin level and stress reduction through national investments under a regional agreed umbrella of the SAP.</p> <p>Note: within the description it is surprising that salinity appears to be the main concern associated with acid mine drainage. Heavy metals and radionucleotides appear to be at high concentrations at certain locations, but the link to mining is not clearly made. This should be reviewed during project design and in addressing mining issues. Groundwater use and contamination (besides surface water quality) is usually another serious concern to take into account in the design of mitigation measures.</p> <p>(3/27/2015): Comment noted by agency in response matrix. Please do also address not only impacts on groundwater quality but also possible threats due to withdrawal (quantity ).</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound	IW:	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>- (PIF stage) Please fix typo in PDO: ... "SAP priority actions in (not "at") the Orange-Senqu basin"</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>- (during project design and implementation) The aim for a transboundary PES scheme would be a breakthrough and at heart of the vision of transboundary benefits sharing and addressing the food-water nexus. The benefit sharing concept and how possibly this could also provide some income to ORASECOM could be explored in that context . Please also clarify to the financial sustainability of ORASECOM by the endorsement. Core costs by end of project should be covered by country contributions or other income to ORASECOM.</p> <p>- (PIF stage) 1.2.1. Please explain the meaning of WIS being "promoted to the ORASECOM Secretariat" - this seems unclear given that WIS should be an integral part to ORASECOM.</p> <p>- 1.2.2. By endorsement, please add to the clarification between 1.2.2. and 2.1.1.</p> <p>- 1.3. By endorsement, please add in</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>prodoc that SAP and NAP updates will continue to refine addressing climate variability and change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (PIF stage) 1.5. Important KM functions and budget may need increase. In the moment IWC participation and project website do not appear budgeted - not mentioned in the text.</li> </ul> <p>Component 2 (address during project design)::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To underpin investment in the basinwide water resources monitoring system a data sharing agreement/MoU between countries specifying type, format, and frequency of data exchange as well as QA/QC protocol should be considered.</li> <li>- 2.3. Important effort. Please also note that another aspect of the Stampriet is the effort on a new approach to gender and water indicators.</li> </ul> <p>Component 3 (address during project design):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the project should consider how regular communication between ORASECOM and the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) can be 'institutionalized' such as through inviting BBC to annual COM meetings as observer and vice versa..</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Component 4 (address during project design):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4.2.2 and 4.2.3. - During project design, please evaluate/design eradication initiatives beyond planting of native species to devise local agreements with stakeholders to address continued maintenance. In addition, marketing options for prosopsis need to be evaluated for not creating perverse incentives to continued propagation.</li> </ul> <p>(address during project design)/by endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please make sure to define more clearly impacts - quantifiable indicators and projected targets/impacts - especially for stress reduction actions (incl. but not limited to 2.2.3; 3.2.3)</li> </ul> <p>(3/27/2015): Addressed in PIF and/or noted in agency response matrix.</p> <p>LD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (PIF stage) Please be more clear/confirm that the proposed outcomes and outputs will focus on the production systems to benefit land users in that side of the basin (i.e. is taking a livelihoods approach to the</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>sustainable management of the sub-watersheds to assure sustainability).                      - (Project design) Please address socio-economic data (incl. household level) as well as physical state of watershed in the baseline (4.1.1.)</p> <p>(3/27/2015): LD activities will be implemented via a linked but separate project in Lesotho implementing SAP priorities on national level.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Gender is considered at sufficient detail for PIF stage. CSO were involved in TDA/SAP and need to be involved in project design. UNDP has long experience with the design of community driven programs.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>LD:</p> <p>Comment: Please submit endorsement letter for Lesotho</p> <p>(3/27/2015): It is noted that the Lesotho LD portion is anticipated to be submitted as an aligned but separate project implementing SAP priorities on a national level (see component 4 description in the PIF).</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes, the project is within focal area allocation.	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Comment: Please submit endorsement letter for Lesotho.</p> <p>(3/27/2015): To be submitted before WP inclusion.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>(3/16/2015) The PIF is not cleared yet - see below:</p> <p>Please address PIF stage comments (and simply note those for endorsement/rproject design).</p> <p>Please submit LOE for Lesotho.</p> <p>Please address inconsistencies in the addition (math error) of co-finance figures across table B and C.</p> <p>Please resubmit.</p> <p>(3/27/2015): The PIF is technically cleared for inclusion into a future work program subject to submission of the endorsement letter for Lesotho and receipt of record of COM endorsing the Orange- Senqu SAP.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 16, 2015	



PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 27, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	The endorsement package in content is consistent with the PIF.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The project endorsement is overall detailed and lays out the project well. There are a few items we request to be addressed before endorsement:</p> <p>- Please add the establishment (or continuation) of NICs in the project framework (on national level and - if possible - some form on regional level). Intersectoral formal processes will be important for a number of activities, incl. e.g. basin-wide ESA guidelines (1.4), optimizing flows and 'infrastructure operation for equitable allocation' (1.2); and agreement on e-</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>flows (3.1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please confirm that the ORASECOM council (i.e. the Commissioners) are at the level of ministers. This is essential for SAP review/SAP 2 approval, ESA approval, and agreement on basin-wide flow regimes (1.4; 1.3; 1.2, and 3.1) - among possibly other.</li> <li>- Communication (and other)/Outcome 1.5: please be more clear on the strategic importance of what is envisioned under the communications efforts of this outcome. What is to done, who is targeted, and what does it contribute to? Is this intentionally limited to communicating lessons and best practices? What about wider benefits of cooperation and targeting specific stakeholders? A short para would do.</li> <li>- Groundwater/outcome 2.3 (and other): i) Please indicate means of collaboration with the regional SADC groundwater project and the Center of Excellence which is now operational. The project will support a number of transboundary aquifer and enhancing conjunctive management in at least three transboundary basins (TTL is Marcus Wijnen, World Bank).</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>ii) How will be information gathered under 2.3 be used ? How will the project support enhanced groundwater governance and conjunctive management on national and transboundary levels.</p> <p>- Sustainable land management - Component 4:</p> <p>i) at some point there was hope to add LD STAR resources for upstream urgently needed work in soil erosion/watershed degradation which lateron countries decided to operationalize in a separate project. Can you please comment on status and on cooperation among these projects.</p> <p>ii.) 4.1 is focused on prosopis eradication. Please indicate on how this can be scaled beyond 'demonstration sites' and aim for impact given this is SAP implementation (USD 1.5 million GEF and USD 128 million co-finance !).</p> <p>iii.) Prosopis is a thirsty species and we assume this is why there is aim to monitor impact of prosopis on sub-catchment groundwater resources. yet, as written the logic seems not clear as the aim of the component is to eradicate prosopis. Would you want to show that prosopis</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>eradication has a major impact on recovery of groundwater levels? has there been some basic previous studies on this in the area. Outcome 2.3 activities should be able to give some indication.</p> <p>- Gender: there is a gender section and two(!) gender indicator in the RF (for component 4 and one overall). Overall there is no indication on gender considerations in the project design of the components and no indicators beyond these two.</p> <p>- Results indicators: please tighten, quantify and aim higher for some of the end of project indicators - e.g. "at least 2 person from each country participate ... actively in transboundary monitoring, planning, and management of the basin's water resources" is very low and seems inadequate. Similarly targets such as "sustainable improvement in ecosystems status is measured in at least 80 % of designated locations. " or "socio-economic benefits realized though project interventions, ....and reported ..." leaves no clarity on WHAT the end of project targets of improved conditions are on either front (i.e. on the ecosystems status nor the socio-</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>economic benefits).</p> <p>Details:</p> <p>Comp. 1.1. (pg) - Please explain acronyms - what is WDM to mean here ?(design and implement WDM and PES schemes; WDMs do not appear in results framework)</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	The GEF finance seems to match the effort and targets as indicated.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>The risk matrix seems to address major risks. Yet, project design should more explicitly address e.g. climate risks in key components such as for optimizing infrastructure and flows, for e-flows and for the rehabilitation of the delta areas. Similarly, increasing climate variability and change needs to be addressed in the revision of the SAP, Action Plans and IWRM plan.</p> <p>Please also in that comment on previous work by ORASECOM on assessing climate change impacts and links to funds by other development partners.</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>Letters of co-finance have been provided.</p> <p>i.) Please comment on why GIZ co-finance seems to have decreased to</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>25% of what was anticipated at work program inclusion and around 40% for DFID/CRIF.</p> <p>ii.) Please aim to provide some detail of what is included in the substantial government co-finance. It is unclear as the letters use a format that do not specify efforts but add numbers in terms of overall categories which are similar across the country letters (e.g. "Initiatives related to water quality" etc. ). It becomes very hard for the OFPs and GEF to track on what co-finance is part of what project and what the nature of the co-finance is, if no addendum is provided by UNDP to explain this. Co-finance includes e.g. some dam feasibility studies of over USD 230 million in one case. If this is intended to be co-finance for the project, then information on the environmental and social impacts of these dams would need to be addressed/shown.</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Yes . IW TT has been completed.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Please provide more detail on cooperation or coordination with other regional or related national projects, especially GEF financed	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		ones.  Further, please ask ORASECON for an overview diagram of funding from development partners which would depict key partner contributions and relation to each - including UNDP and GIZ as well as other key partners listed on the ORASECOM website.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes, the project includes a budgeted M&E plan.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Yes, the project includes specific activities and budget on knowledge management.  Please note a related comment/question on collaboration with SADC .	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	Yes, comments have been addressed.	
	• STAP	Please add responses to the STAP review (minor comments) in the endorsement submission (annex B: Responses to project reviews).	
	• GEF Council	N/A	
	• Convention Secretariat	N/A	
	12. Is CEO endorsement	Please address the comments	

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Recommendation</b>	recommended?	provided in the review sheet for resubmission.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 22, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		