



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

GEF ID:	4966		
Country/Region:	Regional (Angola, Botswana, Congo, Malawi, Namibia, Seychelles, Swaziland, Tanzania, South Africa, Zambia, Congo DR, Zimbabwe)		
Project Title:	Sustainable Groundwater Management in SADC Member States		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	127086 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; IW-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,119,179
Co-financing:	\$42,478,000	Total Project Cost:	\$50,597,179
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Paola Agostini

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	(4/18/2012 ah): Yes, the participating countries are eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>At this point only three countries have endorsed the project (Malawi, Tanzania, and Seychelles). While only these three are listed as participants of a 'first phase' of the project, these are too few countries to recommend the project for workprogram inclusion at this point. In addition, the countries that are specifically addressed in component 3 as the riparians of the Stampriet Kalahari/Karoo Aquifer system have not submitted their endorsement letter at this point.</p> <p>We realize that the project team is expecting some of the additional letters</p>	

		<p>(8/26/2013 - AH). ADDRESSED. Endorsement letters for twelve of the fifteen SADC member countries have been received. While Madagascar is suspended with SADC, the two remaining countries (Mauritius and Mozambique) are expected to join the effort during PPG phase and submit endorsement letters shortly. With that in mind all at this stage participating SADC countries have submitted endorsements.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): Yes, the WB's comparative advantage is sufficiently described and is based on the WB's strong presence in the water and other relevant sectors in the SADC region as well as implementing the previous SADC Groundwater and Drought Management Project.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	<p>There is no GEF non-grant instrument in the project.</p>	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): The project fits well within the agency's program and is lead by professional staff based in the region. Part of the task team is based in the region and others at HQ.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 - AH). The new TTL is based in HQ; in addition country office based senior staff (incl. a former TTL) is actively engaged.</p>	
Resource	6. 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? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): Yes, the total amount of USD 8.83 million (incl agency fee) is within the available IW focal area resources.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 - AH). Confirmed at present point (total is now USD 8.89 million).</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Project Consistency	<p>7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?</p>	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): Table A has been filled in correctly. Please still strengthen text section A1.1 and link the major components/activities funded by the project to the relevant IW strategy outcomes and outputs (as listed in table A). Please clarify which output in the project framework addresses the updating of the previous SAP to reflect adaptive management (IW 1 - outcome 4).</p> <p>Please also keep in mind that one key aspect of SAP implementation are the adoption of national level policy and legal reforms - i.e. translating regional SAP commitments into national action and implementation (e.g. by inclusion of groundwater and mmgt of conjunctive uses in relevant sector policies and strategies). Please address here and in the project framework (under # 14).</p> <p>(8/26/2013 - AH). ADDRESSED. The</p>	

		objective 1 (RSAP implementation) and 3 (specific groundwater basins). The type of indicators are in line with GEF 5 IW indicators.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): Yes, IW objective 1 has been identified appropriately for SAP implementation.</p> <p>Please note though that the project is overall classified as global, but should be 'regional'.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 - AH). ADDRESSED. The project is aligned both with IW objective 1 (RSAP implementation) and 3 (specific groundwater basins). The type of indicators are in line with GEF 5 IW indicators. Also, the project is now correctly classified as a regional project.</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): The project is consistent with the RSAP and SADC groundwater management plan as well as the Revised SADC protocol on Shared Watercourses.</p> <p>Beyond regional aspects, showing the alignment of the project/groundwater management with PRSPs and CASs at national level somewhere in the PIF would also be supportive.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 - AH). ADDRESSED. The alignment with national plans (PRSPs, WB CASs, and relevant sector strategies) has been strengthened but should be further elaborated by endorsement.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability	(4/18/2012 ah): The projects aims to strengthen institutional capacity for groundwater management at various	

	<p>transboundary). It needs to be better articulated what is the actually aimed at at each level and how this is translated into implementation/action (i.e. how capacities are applied and maintained). Please include specific output indicator in the project framework (please make them quantifiable as possible).</p> <p>For example, many of the sub-activities in 1.1 are not captured in any output.</p> <p>It would aid to simplify the description of activities in 1.2 and clarify what "regional institutional, legal, and policy framework and minimum harmonized structures at regional and transboundary institutions, such as RBOs" will be supported. This and some concrete output on the GMI operationalization should be listed as outputs of component 1. Capacity strengthening efforts needs to be clearly articulated in itself and then linked to operational need in order to maintained in the longer term.</p> <p>Please also clarify what is envisioned in component 3 (i) by 'supporting the inclusion of groundwater governance into regional climate change adaptability frameworks'. Furthermore, how is climate change and resilience addressed in the RSAP and the GMP and would these need to be updated?</p> <p>(8/26/2013 - AH). ADDRESSED. The project framework and component descriptions have been substantially updated and revised. We ask under question 14 to please be more specific</p>	
--	--	--

		aiming to engage with to increase inclusion of conjunctive management in legal and institutional frameworks and management plans on regional and national levels.	
Project Design	11. 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?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): The PIF describes the previous action in the region to address transboundary management of water resources and the development of the Regional Strategic Action Plan, as well as the achievements of the previous regional SADC groundwater and drought management project and other GW management activities supported by development partners in the past and present.</p> <p>The write-up of the baseline actions at this stage is somewhat confusing as it describes past action (background), baseline actions, and issues that the proposed projects is going to address (increment). Please maintain a clearer separation of baseline and increment in the incremental cost reasoning.</p> <p>This will also aid in describing agency and other co-finance of the incremental actions. Please see # 25 below.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 - AH). The comment has been ADDRESSED. Baseline and co-financing to the baseline and to the increment has been described and an annex been added/updated in the current PIF.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to		

	similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): The activities are embedded into the implementation of the RSAP and regional GMP. Climate change threat feature prominently for the region and within the project. As mentioned under #11 above the presentation of baseline versus increment could be better articulated.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 - AH). As mentioned under 11, this has been ADDRESSED.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): The project framework (table B) does not specify clearly enough the activities and outputs based on the component and subcomponent descriptions.</p> <p>Component 1: The single output in table B reads 'institutional FW defined and agreed at different levels of groundwater management', yet the text provides details on two subcomponents on establishing management frameworks and strengthening capacity on national and regional levels, including the operationalization of GMI in terms of facilities and functions. Please reflect key items as project outputs in the project framework.</p> <p>For example in the text in component 1.1. (page 8) it says "Under this activity a management framework will be defined and supported in at least at one aquifer in each country" etc. This is a good example for a concrete,</p>	

	<p>B/project framework. There are others in the text/component description.</p> <p>While more clearly including the GMI operationalization in the project framework, please do not intermingle items that relate to project management into GMI functions (see text pg. 8 under 1.2 (ii)).</p> <p>Please when resubmitting clarify and in some instances simplify & concretise the description of what is to be done in each sub-component. Provide specific and quantifiable output indicators in the project framework.</p> <p>Component 2: The project framework has two outcomes and outputs : 2.1 addressing the specific TDA and SAP formulation and adoption for the "Stampriet Kalahari / Karoo Aquifer System" (btw - will the project aim at both: the formulation & adoption AND implementation of the SAP as written in the outcome?) and 2.2 addressing the integration of conjunctive surface and groundwater use into the management framework of at least three river basin organisations.</p> <p>To outcome/output 2.1: it would greatly increase clarity of the subcomponent description if the whole wirte-up would be specific to the "Stampriet Kalahari / Karoo Aquifer System" (after a sentence why it was selected). The generic first half of the para on pg 9 is rather confusing.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>the text(pg. 9) is rather implicit (ie. hard to pin-point) and needs more clarity. A clear delineation of sub-components similar to the format in component 1 would be helpful.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The first output in the project fw/table B "Institutional arrangements for inclusion of groundwater in climate risk management defined" seem to belong and possibly overlap with component 1, which addresses institutional strengthening. Please clarify. - In addition the two outputs "Climate resilience-enhancing measures in targeted production systems implemented" and "Specific adaptive measures to reduce vulnerability to food insecurity implemented" are both rather vague in scope. It is noted that some examples of possible measures are given and a focus on highly food insecure basins is stated, yet the scope of activities is still very undefined. Please be more concrete on what is envisioned and where and provide some quantifiable indicator on measures that fit withing the IW focal area scope, e.g. some indication of what/how much/ and where. Some reference to priority actions identified either in the RSAP or GMP may help. <p>Component 4: Please remove the support to development of educational materials for schools - this is better addressed through some of the baseline actions and is beyond the scope of this project.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please include a budget line and commitment to use 1 % of the grant amount for IW learn activities, such as newsletters, knowledge and lessons learned notes, website (building on IW learn guidance), and participation at bi-annual IW meetings. - Please assure that budget for M&E will be included in project design (as this is not shown as a separate budgeted activity, it is assumed that this will be part of the project management costs.) <p>(8/26/2013 - AH). The current PIF has been substantially revised in terms of the project framework and the component description.</p> <p>We have two remaining comments at PIF stage:</p> <p>(i) Component A: please indicated the number (could be minimum number) of RBOs that the project intends to engage with for greater integration of surface and groundwater management/i.e, effective operationalization of conjunctive management in legal and institutional frameworks and management plans on regional and national levels (See also same comment under question 10).</p> <p>(ii) Component C: please indicate the size of microgrants envisioned (order of magnitude). Are you considering an SGP type effort (grants ~ between 20 to</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>upwards of around 50 or 100 K ? This information would give a better idea of the number of the grants/actions anticipated as well as their nature and impacts - as well as the institutional structure required for implementation.</p> <p>(8/27/2013 AH) . Comment ADDRESSED in the revised PIF submission of Aug 27, 2013.</p> <p>BY CEO endorsement, please consider following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordination: please provide assurance of buy-in by partner agencies (such GIZ/BGR, UNESCO, and others) for GMI to act as coordination mechanism for diverse actions/projects related to groundwater in southern Africa. - Component A/policy reforms on regional and national levels: please - where most relevant - address in project design and implementation and in policy reforms on national and regional levels two emerging threats to groundwater in the region in form of (i) increasing pollution of groundwater sources (e.g. from mining operations, other extractive industries, and urban development) and (ii) need for coupling - or at least making transparent - the relation between land and water management; concretely making transparent the implications on ground-/surface water uses implied in commercial land leases (see also page 8 in the PIF) - IW-learn participation - in the PAD/PAD budget please assure that 1 % of the GEF grant is allocated to participation in IW learn activities. 	
--	--	--

		resistance - please assure coordination with other GEF (e.g. LDCF) and other activities on the ground and value added of specific small grants under this project.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	(4/18/2012 ah): See comment under 11 and 13. (8/26/2013 AH): Yes, this is well described in the PIF and based on regional and national ownership.	
	16. 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?	(4/18/2012 ah): Gender aspects have not been considered. The ppg/project preparation phase may want to analyse e.g. to what degree rights to water and especially pumping from gw and other aspects in relation to the demonstration measures in component 3 differ by gender and how the project interventions should address this within the specific context at regional and national level. (8/26/2013 AH): The comment above remains valid and this needs to be addressed in the PAD (component descriptions and RF prior) to CEO endorsement.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	(4/18/2012 ah): Please articulate the role of civil society more prominently - e.g in the TDA - SAP process, the water efficiency/adaptation measures, etc. (8/26/2013 AH): The operationalization of the GMI /component D explicitly aims at establishing a platform for stakeholder engagement. Nevertheless, the PAD should elaborate on stakeholder processes in project	

		of civil society in components A, B, and C as well.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	(4/18/2012 ah): Yes. Threats to climate change are prominently addressed in the PIF. (8/26/2013 AH): YEs, confirmed in the reformulated PIF.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	(4/18/2012 ah): Please expand on this in some detail in section B.6.. (8/26/2013 AH): Comment addressed in sufficient detail for PIF stage. Please expand in PAD (by CEO endorsement - see also comment under question 14).	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	(4/18/2012 ah): Project management will be by SADC and engaging the Groundwater Management Institute within SADC, which was created with support of the SADC Groundwater and Drought Management project. The relation between SADC and GMI could be more clearly explained in the PIF. Also, while GMI is a promising institution built on commitment of SADC member countries for enhanced groundwater management, it is only now being operationalized, i.e. starting to be functional. The lack of initial capacity of the GMI should be addressed in project design. (8/26/2013 AH): Comment ADDRESSED in the current PIF and detail explanation and diagram provided.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): Please slightly decrease project management costs to stay below 5 %.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 AH): Please see comment above (note: project management costs are calculated as % of sub-total in table B).</p> <p>(8/27/2013 AH): Comment ADDRESSED.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): GEF funding is appropriate. For additional co-finance please see comment #25.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 AH): Comment ADDRESSED. There is regional direct co-finance from the WB CIWA Trust Fund (TBC) as well a detailed annex on specific IDA and other co-finance to the increment.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): The indicative co-finance at present is close to 1:4 and therefore falls short of the GEF CEO guidance of a 1:5 ratio.</p> <p>Please show additional co-finance at the time of resubmission.</p> <p>(e.g. from other development partners supporting groundwater issues as indicated in Table C or the GEF agency). Please also provide detail/description of the grant contribution by national governments (will there be additional in-kind</p>	

		(8/26/2013 AH): Comment ADDRESSED. There is regional direct co-finance from the WB CIWA Trust Fund (TBC) as well a detailed annex on specific IDA and other co-finance to the GEF increment.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): The indicative co-finance is based on a substantial portfolio in the SADC region and draws from resources of a subset of the ongoing and pipeline projects that are aligned with the project objective. Co-finance of USD 15 million is indicated which is in line with the agency's role.</p> <p>Please - in moving forward - keep in mind that only those funds that are directly contributing/are essential to delivering the project objective can be counted as co-finance. Other funds may be parallel finance which is still important , but cannot be counted as co-finance.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 AH): Yes, There is regional direct co-finance from the WB CIWA Trust Fund (TBC) as well a detailed annex on specific IDA co-finance on country level</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAD?	(4/18/2012 ah)/(8/26/2013 AH): No	

		inclusion.	
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): No. We are looking forward to resubmission of the PIF and a submission of request for PPG (as indicated in the LOEs). Please address the comments above in relation to #s 2, 7, 10, 14, 16, 19, 20 and 23.</p> <p>Specifically, please address comments with regard to level of co-finance and please include missing endorsement letters with the resubmission.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 AH): Please address two comments under 14 and 23 and resubmit the PIF ASAP -as discussed.</p> <p>(8/27/2013 AH): The PIF is technically cleared and recommended for inclusion in a future workprogram.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>(4/18/2012 ah): We will provide key points here after PIF resubmission as it is expected that many point may be addressed in PIF resubmission.</p> <p>(8/26/2013 AH): By CEO endorsement, please address points under 8, 9, additional points under 14, and under 16, 17, and 19.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		

	Additional review (as necessary)	August 26, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

*** 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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes. No detailed description required.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes. 100 K is well within budget norm for this size of project.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes, in principle i.e. as soon as PIF is technically cleared. (8/27/2013 AH): Yes, PPG approval is recommended (PIF has been technically cleared).
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 26, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* 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.