



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:	\$121,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$132,065,137
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Akiko Yamamoto

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<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):</p> <p>i) please split resources between programs 3 and 4 as appropriate (conjunctive management of surface and groundwater and Nexus program). (3/27/2015): Addressed.</p> <p>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</p>

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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Design		<p>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>
	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>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 drivers) and priority actions to address these on transboundary and national level - including institutional and policy reforms and investments.</p>
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Yes, the incremental reasoning is layed 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</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>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 and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBS?	<p>IW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (PIF stage) Please fix typo in PDO: ... "SAP priority actions in (not "at") the Orange-Senqu basin" <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (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. - (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. - 1.2.2. By endorsement, please add to the clarification between 1.2.2. and 2.1.1. - 1.3. By endorsement, please add in prodoc that SAP and NAP updates will continue to refine addressing

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>climate variability and change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (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. <p>Component 2 (address during project design)::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - 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. <p>Component 3 (address during project design):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.. <p>Component 4 (address during project design):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. <p>(address during project design)/by endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please make sure to define more clearly impacts - quantifiable indicators and projected targets/impacts - especially for stress reduction actions (incl. but not

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>limited to 2.2.3; 3.2.3)</p> <p>(3/27/2015): Addressed in PIF and/or noted in agency response matrix.</p> <p>LD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (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 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>(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.
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? 	<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"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>Yes, the project is within focal area allocation.</p> <p>Comment: Please submit endorsement letter for Lesotho.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		(3/27/2015): To be submitted before WP inclusion.
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	
	• Focal area set-aside?	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<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/project 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>
Review Date	Review	March 16, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 27, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
-----------------	-----------	--

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
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?	
	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.

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