



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 Strategic Action Programme Implementation		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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:	\$60,700,000	Total Project Cost:	\$67,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 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	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country 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.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/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>	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>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>	Yes, the project is consistent with existing strategies and aims at SAP implementation. The SAP was adopted by all countries and the OKACOM.	
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	Yes, the baseline is sufficiently described in the PIF as well as the accompanied documentation (e.g. the SAP and NAPs).	
	<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	

Component 1:

- 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 regard.

(8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed in PIF and response matrix and will be further considered in project design/prior to CEO endorsement.

- please clarify what role is envisioned/realistic for OKASEC in NAP "implementation" versus just monitoring.
(8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed.

- 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.

- 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

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.

(8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed in PIF and response matrix and will be further considered in project design/prior to CEO endorsement.

Component 2:

- 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 the value added compared to previous/ongoing efforts by USAID. The component description is vague on what is likely 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 .

- Community based pilots - is this

envisioned approximate size and number of grants.
(8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed in response matrix and will be further considered in project design/prior to CEO endorsement.

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.

- 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.

Please allocate 1 % of GEF grant to participate in IWCs, regional IWLEARN meetings, website following the IWLEARN guidance, production of

		(8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed. Caution voiced in the agency response on the website design/re-design is noted and realistic.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	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.	
	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?		Yes, the project is designed to provide measurable socio-economic benefits and 'gender empowerment' is part of the explicit outcomes of component 3. In addition the project is building on previous efforts which contributed to evaluating the costs-benefits of potential development scenarios.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	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.	
	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)	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?). - The risk section also lists the challenge of inter-sectoral coordination as a moderate risk. The OKASEC/the project	

		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. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comments addressed.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	- 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.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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 likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	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 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.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-		

	design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	<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. (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. (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-finance in direct support to SAP implementation and supporting the overall project PDO. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed.</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</p>	

		the activities targeting transboundary tourism.) (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed and to be further considered in project design.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Please decrease project management costs. The usual cap is at 5 % - please provide a detailed justification for amounts exceeding the 5 % norm. (8/29/2013 AH) - Comment addressed.	
	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.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		N/A at this stage.
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		

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.	<p>This section will be finalized after receiving the resubmitted PIF.</p> <p>(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	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 27, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 29, 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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.