



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

GEF ID:	9593		
Country/Region:	Regional (Mozambique, Zimbabwe)		
Project Title:	Management of Competing Water Uses and Associated Ecosystems in Pungwe, Busi and Save Basins		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1 Program 1; IW-2 Program 3; IW-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$6,000,000
Co-financing:	\$17,400,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,400,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Cathrine Mutambirwa

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	(7/26/2016) yes, the project is overall aligned with the GEF 6 IW strategic objectives and result framework.. (Please see comments under project design on distribution per program.)	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	(7/26/2016) Yes, the project is consistent with the regional commitments and builds on the agreement signed in 2016 by both	

¹ 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>countries.</p> <p>At endorsement stage/during project design: please expand on alignment with relevant national strategies in key sectors in more detail.</p>	
Project Design	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>(7/26/2016) Yes, the project is designed as a foundational project and conscious of drivers of degradation and need to address competing inter-sectoral and cooperative uses.</p> <p>The project is structured around a water-food-energy-ecosystem nexus approach, which is key to balanced ecosystem based poverty-reducing economic growth in the Pungwe-Save-Buzi basins. The increasing competition over water highlights the difficult policy choices that are posed by the water-food-energy-nexus and the trade-offs involved in managing each sector, either separately or together.</p> <p>In terms of innovation: The project will explore the use of hydrodynamic tools to assess the severity and impacts of salt water intrusion in the estuaries. This will be key, given the data-poor environments that are typical of the three basins. Further,</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the use of remote sensing—satellite or airborne sensors to provide a baseline for monitoring groundwater abstraction and use is an innovation, which will help to overcome the limited data on ground water monitoring in the three basins in order to mitigate droughts in the basins. The technique can provide objective measurements at potentially large scales, with quasi-continuous cover at low cost per km², and its success will provide opportunities for replication in other basins in Africa.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>(7/26/2016)</p> <p>Please enhance the description of the project alternative scenario. Specifically address how the project will enhance governance aspects and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. The indicated amounts for program 3 are far larger than program 4 and not well articulated to support this amount. See also comment under 5.</p> <p>(8/22/2016)</p> <p>The comments addressed both through better articulation of the project alternative with regard to groundwater and conjunctive management and re-balancing the GEF IW resources between</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		objectives/programs. Cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>The project design is well articulated and well written in most aspects.</p> <p>Please address one point:</p> <p>2.9 million are requested from IW program 3 on enhancing the conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. Yet, the activities addressing groundwater management - let alone conjunctive management - while well articulated and using novel tool are mainly focused on 2.1.3 (total of USD 424 k). There is little else obvious in table B (and the project description) that specifically addresses improved governance or management of groundwater or indicating more clearly how the project will advance the conjunctive management of surface and groundwater resources. Often groundwater becomes the 'hidden resource' and taken for granted leading to overabstraction and pollution, e.g. by the mining sector and agriculture (which are both relevant in the Beira corridor and mentioned in the PIF).</p> <p>Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - change the split/allocation between GEF 6 IW programs 1-1, 2-3 and 2-4; 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>OR</p> <p>- more clearly articulate the outputs addressing IW program 2-3.</p> <p>(8/22/2016)</p> <p>The comments addressed both through better articulation of the project alternative with regard to groundwater and conjunctive management and re-balancing the GEF IW resources between objectives/programs (see comment under 4 above). Cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>(7/26/2016)</p> <p>Yes, socio-economic aspects are well addressed and adequate for PIF stage.</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>(7/26/2016)</p> <p>Yes, as per the anticipated GEF 6 IW envelope.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>(7/26/2016)</p> <p>Not recommended yet. Please address</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the related comment in questions 4 and 5.</p> <p>Please also correct the addition (the "math") of sum of GEF funds in tables A and B.</p> <p>(8/22/2016)</p> <p>The project is recommended for technical clearance. The PPG requested amount is inline with norms and justified.</p> <p>By endorsement (i.e. during the project design process):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Baseline: please expand the consideration of 'baseline' to not only address regional but also relevant national activities. - During project design and implementation: please add private sector under 'stakeholder groups' addressed. Currently they are not in the table on stakeholders though the PIF is clear that engagement will be 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>key in maintaining environmental flows (quantity) and water quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Urbanization and possible threats and opportunities for maintaining sufficient water quality and quantity of both surface and groundwater should also be better described in the final project document and then addressed in the TDA and SAP (during project implementation; as relevant). - Expand on and provide detail on the 'flood early warning system for community risks and collaboration with disaster risk management agencies (in 2.2) and/or consider to possibly move to/combine with 2.5. Right now the community warning aspect seems to be only marginally addressed among all the other activities in 2.2.. - 3.2.3 - activity is very much appreciated. During project design please try to estimate the degree to which coastal mangroves provide coastal protection and fish spawning and shrimp habitat benefits. The project itself (during implementation) may want to assess this in more detailed economic terms to provide incentives to avoid further 	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		degradation. - During project implementation , please consider partnering with ANBO on learning mechanisms and knowledge exchange.	
Review Date	Review	July 26, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 23, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

³ 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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		