



**MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT PROPOSAL
REQUEST FOR FUNDING UNDER THE GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3341
IA/ExA PROJECT ID: PIMS No. 3930
COUNTRY: Continental – Africa
PROJECT TITLE: Regional Dialogue and Twinning to Improve Transboundary Water Resources Governance in Africa

GEF IA/ExA: UNDP
OTHER PROJECT EXECUTING AGENCY(IES): InWEnt – UNU INWEH – UNESCO – UNOPS
DURATION: 3 years
GEF FOCAL AREA: International Waters
GEF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES: SO1/SO2
GEF STRATEGIC PROGRAM: IW-3
IA/ExA FEE: 100,000
CONTRIBUTION TO KEY INDICATORS IDENTIFIED IN THE FOCAL AREA STRATEGIES: National water resource and IWRM reforms/policies adopted; Adoption and effectiveness of regional basin agreements and institutions.

FINANCING PLAN (\$)		
	PPG	Project*
GEF Total		1,000,000
Co-financing		
GEF IA/ExA		100,000
BMZ – InWEnt, GTZ		340,000
GLFC		230,000
NBI		100,000
SIWI/CSIR/PR		130,000
UNESCO		350,000
InWEnt - TRANSNET, RBD		300,000
UNU-INWEH		50,000
GWP (Med, EA, SA, Global)		135,000
SADC-PF/PALDIF		50,000
Co-financing Total		1,785,000
Total		2,785,000
Financing for Associated Activities If Any:		

MILESTONES	DATES
PIF APPROVAL	(actual)
PPG APPROVAL	(if applicable)
MSP EFFECTIVENESS	September 07
MSP START	September 07
MSP CLOSING	May 10
TE/PC REPORT*	May 10

*Terminal Evaluation/Project Completion Report

Approved on behalf of the *UNDP*. This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the [Review Criteria for GEF Medium-sized Projects](#).

John Hough
 UNDP-GEF Deputy Executive Coordinator, a.i.
 Date: 29 August 2007

Mirey Atallah
 Project Contact Person

Tel. and email:
 +9613108985 mirey.atallah@undp.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 – Summary	
Rationale	4
Objectives	6
Expected outcomes	6
Key indicators, assumptions and risks	7
2 – Country ownership	
Country Eligibility	8
Country Drivennes	8
3 – Program and policy conformity	
A – Program designation and conformity	10
B – Project Design	10
Sector issues and root causes	10
Barriers to transboundary cooperation at continental level	11
Project strategy	11
C – Sustainability	12
D – Replicability	12
E – Stakeholder involvement	13
Stakeholders in project development	13
Stakeholders in project implementation	13
F – Monitoring and evaluation	14
4 – Financing	
Financing plan	16
5 – Institutional coordination and support	
A) Core commitment and linkages	18
B) Consultation coordination and collaboration between and among IA, EA and GEFSEC	19
C) Project implementation arrangement	20

ACRONYMS

AMCOW	African Ministerial Council On Water
AMCEN	African Ministerial Council for the Environment
ANBO	African Network of Basin Organizations
COMPSUD	Circle Of Mediterranean Parliamentarians for Sustainable Development
EA	Eastern Africa
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GLFC	Great Lakes Fishery Commission
GWP	Global Water Partnership
IJC	International Joint Commission
InWEnt-RBD	InWEnt Capacity Building International, River Basin Dialogue Programme
InWEnt-Petersberg	InWEnt Capacity Building International, Petersberg Dialogue
ISARM	International Shared Aquifer Resource Management
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MSP	Medium Size Project
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative
OSS	Sahel and Sahara Observatory
PALDIF	Pan-African Leadership Development Institute and Foundation
SADC-PF	Southern African Development Community Parliamentary Forum
SIWI	Stockholm International Water Institute
TWRM	Transboundary Water Resources Management
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNESCO-IHP	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation International Hydrological Programme
UNU-INWEH	United Nations University International Network on Water, Environment and Health

PART I - PROJECT CONCEPT

1 - SUMMARY

- 1) The GEF is currently supporting a dozen African freshwater basin projects through foundational-type projects worth 90 million US\$. This proposal for a Medium Size Project (MSP) Grant from the GEF is to assist African basins toward effecting policy reforms for governance and transitioning to needed investments. This will be done by supporting (i) the adoption and national ownership of a number of transboundary water partnerships, (ii) the shift to systems thinking approaches by including groundwater, lakes and climate change considerations in shared basin planning and management. (iii) the strengthening of investment planning processes, and (iv) exchanges of GEF project experiences that can inform global policy dialogues such as the World Water Forum (WWF) in 2009.. At the broader development level, the MSP is expected to contribute to the achievement of MDGs and of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation in relation to Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) and reform in the water sector. In particular, this MSP will help ensure that successful experiences in benefit sharing are replicated, that legal reforms support investments and that intersectoral coordination supports poverty reduction efforts in sectors underpinned by the use of water resources. This MSP has been designed to complement the upcoming Petersberg Process Africa Transboundary Basin Roundtable thus reflecting the priorities and concerns of African governments and stakeholders.

RATIONALE

- 2) The distribution of water resources in the African continent is characterized by (i) a great variability from the dry North to the South and from the Sahel in the West to the arid Horn of Africa; (ii) a tremendous interconnection through the 60 transboundary river basins covering over 63% of the continent's land area. These features, in addition to the presence of some 700 lakes (15 of which are transboundary), are reflected in the extent of the GEF's response through its extensive IW African portfolio.
- 3) The African nexus is clear:
 - a. Growing pressure on water resources from population and economic growth and climate change is driving the need to engage stakeholders at multiple levels and across sectors in integrated, eco-system-based approaches as a foundation of sustainable development. This means:
 - b. Confronting an increasingly urgent need to improve cooperation both within and between transboundary basin systems at a sub-regional and indeed continental scale to balance competing uses of water resources and share experiences.
- 4) As noted during the AMCOW¹'s October 2006 Conference of African River and Lake Basin Organizations, while capacity remains weak in African water governance institutions at all levels, networking among African practitioners and policy-makers within and among transboundary basins is a proven means to share successful experience and learn from mistakes. Proposals for inter-basin transfers with limited consultation and information of concerned basins are raising worries of devastating impacts – such as in the case of Congo. This illustrates both the need for considerable information exchange and communication as well as the necessity of forging new ways to tackle shared water resources management and ecosystem-based governance to guide investment, infrastructure and development planning at multiple scales to manage Africa's shared freshwater resources as a network of increasingly interconnected and transboundary hydrological systems.
- 5) It is estimated that transboundary water systems cover 61% of Africa's landmass, that 77% of the African population lives in their basins and that they represent 93% of the available surface

¹ AMCOW: African Ministerial Council On Water

water in Africa. These figures make it clear that for the African continent to achieve development and reach the millennium development goals, investing in transboundary cooperation for the development of water resources is a necessity. The GEF alone is supporting collaboration on more than 10 basins, with an envelope of 90+ million US\$. While the first stages of such collaboration required facilitation, the creation and support for legal and institutional structures and piloting innovative approaches, the time is now ripe to move into the realization of tangible benefits. In order to do so, enhancing governance of water systems and facilitating national adoption of reforms through a continent-wide cohesive approach is of utmost necessity.

- 6) GEF and other donor projects on transboundary water resource management have so far adopted a basin-level and water-body based approach. The increased understanding of climate change impacts on hydrological cycles coupled with the underpinning role water plays in achieving sustainable development to lift Africa out of poverty, highlight the need to adopt a systems-thinking approach, integrating the management of lake, surface and groundwater. Furthermore, this approach should extend to integrate climate resilient and sustainable land, forest and biodiversity management.
- 7) In characterizing the issue of water scarcity, the 2006 Human Development Report concluded that it was a consequence of poor management and governance rather than one of absolute scarcity of the resource. The delivery of tangible benefits for African populations and the conservation of key ecosystems functions and services are threatened by (i) poor governance structures and the lack of translation of transboundary agreements into national legislation; (ii) theoretical understanding of benefit sharing which is not easily valued in terms of development impacts and (iii) the prospective of future climate change impacts which tend to reverse the tendency from cooperation to the protection of individual, national interests.
- 8) In order to support systematic reforms in transboundary water management and governance in Africa, the German government in cooperation with GEF, UNDP, and the World Bank are leading a process of experience sharing and dialogue (known as the Petersberg Process) for African Transboundary basins near Bonn in late September, 2007. The high level Roundtable will result in priorities determined by a wide range of African stakeholders including public institutions, regional transboundary basin organizations, civil society representatives and donors. This proposed MSP and the experiences of the GEF international waters portfolio in Africa are integral parts of this process and will ensure the recommendations and priorities identified by the Petersberg Roundtable are taken a step further to the WWF in 2009. The MSP will also ensure that the concerns of African countries are informed by science, that policy reform is enacted through the engagement of parliamentarians in the process and that the effectiveness of Lake and River Basin Organizations is enhanced.
- 9) The proposed project will therefore produce three key results in support of transboundary water cooperation:
 - a. Transboundary water concerns and experiences are better understood by national legislators and decision-makers and that GEF experience will inform deliberations of the WWF in 2009
 - b. Water system approaches (Lakes and groundwater) and climate change dimensions better reflected in water resource planning and management
 - c. Effectiveness of Basin Organizations is enhanced through strengthened financing and investment planning.

- 10) This will be achieved through a partnership comprised of AMCOW, AMCEN, NEPAD², Parliamentary organizations of the regional African communities, civil society organizations media and scientists with the backing of the international community. Given the widespread nature of these shared concerns, tackling them at a continental level will ensure the exchange of lessons learnt, knowledge sharing and cost effectiveness of activities.
- 11) The project proposes a flexible implementation mechanism with a lead institution identified for each component depending on its value added and technical knowledge. The principles of engagement in the MSP for all partners and organizations are:
 - a. Ensuring that all activities benefit African countries, basins and organizations
 - b. Building on existing projects and initiatives, when they bring an added value to the GEF and to the process
 - c. Broadening the stakeholder base beyond the usual technicians, scientists and water experts.

OBJECTIVES

- 12) The project goal is to increase African leaders' and stakeholder's knowledge and political will for balancing sustainable uses of water resources at the transboundary and regional basin systems scales by institutionalizing systems-thinking and adaptive management feedback mechanisms.
- 13) The project will contribute to achieving this goal through 3 mutually instructive objectives in support of the continent wide GEF and other donor funded transboundary water cooperation initiatives:
 - a. To facilitate implementation of partnerships, exchanges of experience, and learning on policy, legal and institutional reform for transboundary waters management through increased knowledge and capacity of decision-makers, legislators and public opinion-makers
 - b. To enhance regional and national knowledge and capacity for the management and planning of shared water resource systems through the integration of groundwater dimensions, climate impacts and development of science and policy linkages for river basin and lake system management;
 - c. To strengthen investment planning processes in shared water resources management and infrastructure by sharing lessons on transition from donor support to self-sustaining regional water institutions and providing a basis for assessing optimal investments in support of benefit sharing discourse

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- Enhanced understanding and capacity of regional and national decision-makers, legislators and the media to influence governance and reform shared water resource planning and management;
- GEF Africa basin experiences inform deliberations at WWF 2009;
- Regional learning mechanisms institutionalized among African RBOs;
- Capacity of key actors and institutions to mainstream groundwater considerations and climate change impacts in water resource management strategies and policies enhanced;
- African perspectives and priorities on (i) groundwater and climate change, (ii) Lakes management and governance and (iii) adding value to collaboration articulated and are also brought to discussions at WWF;

² AMCEN: African Ministerial Council for the Environment; NEPAD: New Partnership for Africa's Development

- A framework for collaboration on great lakes systems through enhanced science and policy linkages agreed;
- Methodology for assessing benefit sharing options for investment tested;
- Investment commitments at water system levels catalyzed;
- Lessons on transition from donor support to self-sustaining regional water institutions transferred.

Key Indicators, Assumptions and Risks

14) This MSP is designed to support the overall performance of GEF-funded foundational capacity building projects for transboundary surface and groundwater basins in Africa by capturing GEF and non-GEF experiences and encouraging successful replication in other basins. It therefore contributes to the larger results and indicators of the GEF 4 IW focal area strategy. Being focused on Africa, this proposed MSP will specifically contribute primarily to Strategic Program 3 “Balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in transboundary surface and groundwater basins by promoting learning, information exchange and capacity building at the regional level, to ensure adequate dissemination of lessons, methodologies and practices. This would be measured by the following process indicators:

- Governance and policy reform in the context of transboundary water systems enhanced.
- Framework of collaboration on Great Lakes Systems through enhanced science/policy linkages agreed.
- Assessment of benefit sharing and business planning at shared basin levels developed and tested in at least one basin from each African sub-region.

15) Key assumptions include:

- The strengthening of media networks and individual capacities through the delivery of trainings and materials and synchronization with newsworthy events, will result in enhanced public participation in environment and water-related decision making processes.
- Creating the space for parliamentarians to engage with regional water institutions and work with fellow parliamentarians to improve water governance set-ups will accelerate the necessary legal reform processes.
- The proposed methodology for assessing benefit-sharing will identify concrete options and catalyze African and foreign investment in these options.

16) The key risks to the success of the MSP would be:

- There is a lack of long-term commitment on the part of African Governments to undertake and maintain sustainable reforms involving inter-sectoral coordination; this risk might be amplified by the pairing of newly founded commissions with strong international commissions which might result in neglect by parent governments;
- The timeframe for impacts of the MSP in terms of reform, investment and management effectiveness is beyond the duration of the project;
- The project is ambitious in terms of the operations and coordination – resulting from the geographic coverage and extent of activities proposed;
- There is potential fiscal risk associated with fluctuations in the foreign exchange rate of the dollar; this was highlighted as a growing problem by GEF IW project participants in IW: LEARN’s 1st Pan-Africa workshop at UNEP in October, 2006; and
- There are tremendous risks inherent in the potential for infrastructure investments linking surface and groundwater systems, and creating linkages between basin systems to open the door to Africa’s development through equitable and economically and environmentally sustainable allocation and use of water resources – or to wreak havoc with the water cycle, leading to unprecedented exacerbation of Africa’s water resource problems. These risks are compounded by the increasing awareness of African governments on the potential impacts of climate change on water resources; such impacts, amplified by ill-informed media and public pressure may lead to hasty decisions destabilizing already fragile transboundary agreements.

2 - COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

A) COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY

- 17)** This project is a learning-type MSP targeting transboundary water resource management at the continental and sub-regional levels in Africa; all benefiting countries are eligible for UNDP technical assistance and GEF funds under paragraph 9(b) of the GEF instrument.

B) COUNTRY DRIVENNESS

- 18)** The project is anchored in and driven by African stakeholders at three levels: (i) continental in responding to priorities identified by AMCOW as key challenges which need to be addressed for the sustainable development of Africa's water resources; (ii) sub-regional through the proposals made to the project preparation team by shared basin institutions and economic communities and (iii) national through the articulation of country needs at sub-regional level.

At a continental level

- 19)** The project builds on the GEF partnership with the government of Germany (BMU and BMZ) and the World Bank in the "Petersberg Process" of transboundary water governance dialogues. Critical issues identified in consultation with AMCOW include: bringing value to benefit-sharing, regional water infrastructure and governance, adaptation to climate change, water use efficiency, products and services, donor harmonization, resource mobilization and sustainable financing.
- 20)** Project preparation workshops held in conjunction with the October 2006 AMCOW meeting of African River and Lake Basin organizations recommended twelve reasons to propose this project:
1. Appropriate legal and institutional frameworks are crucial for sustainable management of transboundary waters in Africa, especially in light of stakeholder demands for competing uses, and emerging plans for infrastructure investments at inter-basin scales.
 2. Major infrastructure investments are required to meet Africa's pressing socio-economic development needs; e.g. less than 5% of Africa's hydropower potential has been developed.
 3. Environmental flows must be maintained to protect the long-term ability of too-often already stressed hydrological systems and the livelihoods that depend upon them.
 4. Emerging water governance institutions in Africa are weak and under-financed; transboundary institutions need support in order to be able to better learn from, adapt and implement measures and investments agreed upon at the level of waterbody systems.
 5. Decision-makers lack knowledge and capacity at all of the necessary levels (inter-ministerial, parliamentarians, NGOs and CBOs, etc.) for governments to articulate and implement appropriate legal and regulatory frameworks linked to implementation of transboundary conventions.
 6. Multiple initiatives at different intervention levels have generated a body of lessons, but GEF-IW:LEARN and others have only begun to build South-to-South (sub-regional) and South/North (thematic) communities of practice to counter an historical lack of trickle down & transferring.
 7. Projects often end before pilots can realize self-sustaining means to share practical experiences and more importantly to facilitate steps necessary for replication and scaling up

8. Opportunities for synergies between complementary objectives in land and water management are lost due to lack of means for coordination and cooperation between GEF projects operating in countries sharing watersheds.
 9. Experience and expertise in peer learning and process tools (consultative dialogue, consensus building, and conflict resolution) should be targeted at the scale of water systems within sub-regional economic communities to reap and sustain benefits of GEF investments and to optimize implementation.
 10. A comprehensive set of indicators is lacking for monitoring and evaluation of healthy ecosystems, especially in contiguous African lakes systems where harmonization would add value to monitoring & evaluation efforts
 11. Despite best efforts, low levels of participation and dissemination of information remain obstacles to participatory water governance: public participation is predominantly constrained by lack of access to information - most notably in the media; gender mainstreaming remains a key area of missed opportunity and unrealized potential.
 12. Climate variability and change introduce new risk factors in water governance, investment and management decision-making which are little understood, and consensus on priority threats and actions is weak.
- 21)** This first level of African political anchorage demonstrates the continental driven-ness of the project.

Shared basins and economic commissions

- 22)** Shared waters institutions such as the Lake Victoria Basin Commission, the Nile Basin Secretariat, and the nascent Lake Tanganika Management Authority have participated in the identification of activities and the design of specific components of relevance and interest to their work.
- 23)** The same applies to other regional organizations involved in the project (SADC, PALDIF, COMPSUD, GWP³, etc.); following the initial project brainstorming workshop and agreement on the principles, approaches and aim of the project, proponents in each sub-region have undertaken their own consultations and proposed specific activities that would contribute to the overall goal of the project.

National levels

- 24)** Most organizations involved in the project undertake strategic planning with their membership and boards, composed of constituencies ranging from Ministries of Water, members of parliament, to networks of professionals. These organizations generally rely on a pyramidal process starting with broad-based, diverse activities stemming from the constituency which are then filtered down to common priorities offering opportunities for economies of scale when delivered regionally. The project responds to these needs and priorities identified at the national levels and articulated in the form of strategic activities.
- 25)** The bulk of beneficiary countries are riparians of one or more shared water system engaged in GEF IW projects with their GEF OFPs having endorsed the need for GEF support to strengthen the management of the transboundary water bodies they share.

³ SADC: South African Development Community; PALDIF: Pan-African Leadership Development Institute and Foundation; COMPSUD: Circle Of Mediterranean Parliamentarians for Sustainable Development; GWP: Global Water Partnership.

3 – PROGRAM AND POLICY CONFORMITY

A) PROGRAM DESIGNATION AND CONFORMITY

- 26)** The GEF 4 IW focal area strategy states that *“An increased emphasis on targeted experience sharing and learning among the new and existing GEF IW projects in the portfolio is planned to improve capacity of projects to achieve objectives and to identify and replicate good practices before project completion. South-to-South experience sharing among IW projects contributes to quality enhancement for the GEF IW portfolio, development of knowledge management tools to capture good practices, and accelerated replication of good practices. With the help of its IW:LEARN program, its web-based resource center (www.iwlearn.net), and the GEF International Waters Task Force, this portfolio learning is an important feature of GEF programming and will be enhanced with a focus on many Africa IW operations now underway.”* The project specifically responds to this statement and will contribute to the transfer of lessons, knowledge and best practices to GEF IW operations within and beyond the African continent.
- 27)** The project will contribute SO1/SO2 at a continental level: by leveraging existing GEF portfolio projects and transboundary organizations on water bodies worldwide through South-South and North-South partnerships, it will contribute to replicating existing best practices and approaches in terms of institutional management of shared water bodies; the project also tackles financial aspects of TBW management. In doing so, the project clearly abides by the principles set out in the GEF4 IW strategy and squares with its overall targeted learning outcomes.
- 28)** Strategic Program 3 “Balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in transboundary surface and groundwater basins” ascertains the findings of the 2006 Human Development report by acknowledging that the global water crisis results from a crisis of governance. Through its interventions, the project contributes to the resolution of this crisis by engaging legislators to accelerate legal reforms and by creating the frameworks for public participation in decision-making processes.
- 29)** More specifically, the proposed MSP will contribute to indicators of IW#1/2 through the promotion of integrated water policies and joint activities to key decision-makers and key policy reform instruments such as basin-wide business plans and the inclusion of groundwater and climate change consideration in economic development planning tools.
- 30)** Finally this MSP will enhance the performance of basins receiving GEF support as well as the commitment of individual countries as part of their participation in basin-wide development activities.

B) PROJECT DESIGN

SECTOR ISSUES AND ROOT CAUSES

- 31)** Transboundary water resource management in Africa is subject to poor management and lack of support at the national level; the extent of interlinkages at the ecosystem level among the basins warrants linkages among decision-makers and managers as well. There are multiple root causes to be addressed, they include the following:
- Inadequate governance systems, including inadequate integration of legal and administrative frameworks at the national levels
 - The absence of solid bases for looking comprehensively at water resource management by including groundwater, climate change and lake systems
 - Inadequate linkages for effective sub-regional management based on an ecosystem approach in key institutions.
 - Poor understanding of benefit-sharing concepts and transboundary water cooperation at the level of national decision-makers which are not directly involved in TWRM .
 - Weak bases to determine options for financing permanent institutions and for joint investments generating benefits to be shared.

BARRIERS TO TRANS-BOUNDARY COOPERATION AT CONTINENTAL LEVEL

32) At the ecosystem and sub-regional level, there is a need for countries to cooperate in addressing these root causes in order to manage water resources, including trans-boundary resources, effectively. The barriers to successful cooperation at the basin and sub-regional levels include:

- Insufficient human and financial resources for international cooperation.
- Inadequate institutional arrangements for coordination and exchange of information
- Insufficient harmonization of legislation and procedures within countries, between countries, between regional and national levels and inter-regionally.
- Insufficient data and analysis of status and trends in transboundary resources especially in terms of climate change impacts
- Insufficient linkages between science and policy leading to ill-informed policies, legislation and strategies.

PROJECT STRATEGY

33) This proposed MSP for will aim to achieve the objectives referenced above in Section 2. The proposed MSP has been structured around four components as described below:

Component 1: Exchanges of experience on legal, policy and management reforms in transboundary water resources management (Total cost: US\$1,351,000; GEF: US\$506,000; Others: US\$845,000)

This component would include (i) conducting the Petersberg Roundtable entitled “From agreements to investments – How to put measurable value on transboundary water cooperation in Africa”; (ii) conducting a series of parliamentary dialogues to inform and engage parliamentarians; (iii) establishing mechanisms and process tools for networking among RBO and Pan-African partners; (iv) conducting trainings for African media on water and environment; and (v) using GEF-funded Africa basin experiences to inform discussions at the World Water Forum in Istanbul.

Component 2: Systems thinking approach to shared and transboundary water resources (Total cost: US\$972,500; GEF: US\$300,000; Others: US\$672,500). This component (which represents a more comprehensive, ecosystem-based approach) will focus on (a) bringing the groundwater and climate change dimensions into shared water resource thinking and management and (b) strengthening Lake Management systems through twinning with successful global experiences. It will help articulate African perspectives and priorities in these two areas for presentation and discussion at the WWF 5. Sub-component (a) would include: (i) articulating a consensual view of African stakeholders on GW integration in transboundary systems; (ii) providing thematic trainings for legislators on groundwater issues; (iii) publishing and disseminating a series of papers on GW integration; (iv) publishing and disseminating a series of papers on climate change and adaptation in transboundary water resources; (v) facilitating an inter-parliamentary position on GW integration, climate change and adaptive policy in Africa. Sub-component (b) on Lakes Management includes (i) generating a synoptic overview of ecosystem-health related science; (ii) publishing four workshop proceedings; (iii) developing a suite of indicators to monitor and evaluate ecosystem health; (iv) publishing a science synthesis report and (v) developing a framework for collaboration on great lakes systems through enhanced science and policy linkages.

Component 3: Mechanisms for investment planning and financial sustainability (Total cost: US\$344,000; GEF: US\$114,000, Others: US\$230,000). This component would focus on the financial aspects both in terms of the sustainability of RBO and in terms of investment planning. It would include (i) the development of a methodology for assessing benefit sharing options which could be pursued through joint action among riparian countries; (ii) transferring lessons learnt from shared basin institutions that have already achieved their financial sustainability and shifted from donor support; and (iii) testing the effectiveness of inter-ministerial committees in communicating with ministries of finance for the allocation of budgetary resources to transboundary water cooperation.

Component 4: Management, monitoring and evaluation (Total cost: US\$117,500; GEF: US\$80,000; Others: US\$37,500). This component will focus on the management and oversight of MSP implementation. Given the number of project partners, it would include (i) establishment of the project structure, communication lines and incorporation of findings of the (ii) meetings of the PSC to track implementation, ensure complementarity between the different components and support feedback loops among them; (iii) ad-hoc technical and thematic groups for technical backstopping and coordination and (iv) independent evaluation of project performance and activities.

C) SUSTAINABILITY (INCLUDING FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY)

- 34)** The project brings together the sustainability of natural resources, the sustainability of processes and the sustainability of institutions. Together these three result in the sustainability of the GEF and other investments made to meet the project objectives.
- 35)** By (i) introducing a systems thinking approach to water and natural resource management, (ii) including the integration of groundwater dimensions and mainstreaming of climate change impacts in planning and decision-making processes, (iii) enhancing capacity to assess and share public goods and benefits generated through transboundary cooperation; and (iv) supporting cost-benefit analysis of sectoral development decisions, the project will contribute to the sustainability of the African natural resource base.
- 36)** As a demand-driven project responding to calls of governments and regional organizations, the project will ramp up networking, inter-basin cooperation, exchange of knowledge and lesson learning. Given the African leadership of these activities, the project will constitute a seed investment in forming networks, regulatory approaches and investments required to insuring self-sustaining processes and functions.
- 37)** The project entails systematic capacity building of individuals, organizations and institutions. The third component of the project exemplifies the contribution this project brings towards the sustainability of existing institutions. Drawing on successful models of conflict resolution and joint action (e.g. IJC and GLFC) the project will not only contribute to the strengthening of existing water-body organizations, but will more importantly be an important transfer to accomplish transboundary management of water resources as opposed to national interventions.
- 38)** Finally, during its life-time the project will work with the permanent organizations such as InWEnt, AMCOW, GWP, SADC PF and UNESCO's ISARM networks to integrate the practices and approaches piloted by the project into their core programming. By specifically targeting financial aspects of transboundary water resources management, the MSP will support resource mobilization efforts beyond the lifetime of the project.

D) REPLICABILITY

- 39)** The project will generate knowledge material, design methodologies and propose concrete recommendations for policy reform to promote the replication of successful management measures. Given that the project steering committee will include representatives of AMCOW, of regional GWP members and of organizations active throughout the continent and beyond, it is well positioned to promote successes and lessons through its members. Further replication and promotion of best practices will be undertaken through GEF IW:LEARN tools, mechanisms, events and networks. The project also allocates specific space to facilitate African contributions to the next World Water Forum.

E) STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

STAKEHOLDERS IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

- 40) Regional stakeholders, intergovernmental and non-government organizations have been involved in the planning of basin level activities for GEF and non-GEF support. They have further contributed to the last meeting of AMCOW and informed its debates.
- 41) For GEF supported projects, the focal points have already provided endorsement ascertaining the national relevance of IW projects with some committing financial resources as well. In order to ensure the relevance of this MSP to countries, basins and on-going processes a consultation meetings were held during project preparation and the official Brazzaville Ministerial Declaration of AMCOW's sixth's ordinary session were integrated into the project. The project will specifically support three results of AMCOW's 2007 meeting: (i) Pan African declaration on water financing and engaging finance ministries with annual review of progress – through its component 3 the MSP will contribute the transboundary dimension and develop targeted communication materials for finance ministries; (ii) promote the institutionalization of groundwater management by river basin organizations to ensure regional ownership – through its component 2 the MSP will provide the basis for informed and systematic integration of groundwater dimensions; (iii) strengthening relations of AMCOW with NEPAD, AMCEN, LBOs/RBO⁴s and civil society organizations – through the broad stakeholder base targeted by the first component of the project, the MSP responds to this policy statement by AMCOW and will support the strengthening or relations in between Pan-African organizations.

STAKEHOLDERS IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

- 42) Stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the MSP have been identified during the planning process and their role as partners and beneficiaries agreed based on value added and relevance to the expected results from the MSP.
- 43) Following on from the Petersberg Roundtable the project's inception meeting and regular steering committee will involve AMCOW, AMCEN, NEPAD as providers of strategic guidance to the project.
- 44) Parliamentarians have been identified as a group often marginalized in IW projects while their role in enacting legislation for the adoption of transboundary legal frameworks is key. Through partnerships with the SADC parliamentary forum and PALDIF, with the Sahel Forum and with the NBI, the project will develop and deliver targeted material to engage parliamentarians in IW processes.
- 45) The media shapes public opinion and support – or lack of – to IW processes, including infrastructure development. In certain basins, second-hand reporting has been identified as a set-back to joint developments. The project will work directly with the media to increase their understanding of transboundary water resource management.
- 46) International organizations will be involved in their respective areas of intervention and comparative advantage to leverage internal knowledge and networks in support of the project. For instance, GWP will play a key role in engaging the media, UNESCO in engaging scientists on groundwater and climate change, UNU-INWEH will capitalize on its partnership with GLFC⁵ (and perhaps the International Joint Commission—Canada and U.S.) and mastery of lake basin systems management, InWEnt will pursue with GEF a partnership with RBOs to enhance their performance.

⁴ LBO: Lake Basin Organization; RBO: River Basin Organization

⁵ Great Lakes Fishery Commission

F) MONITORING AND EVALUATION

- 47)** Project-based monitoring will be organized by InWEnt with the cooperation of UNESCO and UNU-INWEH, under the guidance of the Steering Committee and in accordance with GEF/UNDP monitoring and evaluation policy. Specific considerations in relation to the monitoring of results and adaptive management approaches will form the basis of Monitoring and Evaluation processes.
- 48)** The project will adopt a three-pronged approach to monitoring and evaluation: (i) oversight of project implementation and delivery of expected outputs and results by the PSC⁶; (ii) generating feedback from project beneficiaries on the usefulness and results of project activities; (iii) independent evaluation of the overall project performance.
- (i) Project steering committee:
- 49)** An inception meeting of the project partners, concurrent with the Petersberg roundtable for cost-efficiency purposes will be held at the on-set of the project. During this meeting the membership, modus operandi, and focus of the PSC will be agreed and endorsed. The PSC will meet on a regular basis (at least once annually) and all efforts will be exerted to ensure minimum financial implications of such meetings (e.g. organized concurrently with IWC, project meetings...). As already experienced during the project preparation phase, virtual meetings through teleconferencing and other communication technologies will be used optimally. A final face to face meeting of the PSC will be held following the terminal project evaluation at the end of the project to take stock of and generate lessons for similar projects in the future and envisage follow-up mechanisms and activities.
- (ii) Beneficiary feedback:
- 50)** More informal systems-thinking influenced approaches recommend that ‘feedback generation’ be given greater prominence than ‘measurement’. There is persuasive evidence of the value and effectiveness in terms of organizational capacity building of M&E approaches which:
- are based upon participation through self-assessment of key players;
 - encourage reflection and learning on the basis of experience;
 - promote internal and external dialogue.
- 51)** The MSP will monitor and evaluate the generation of feedback mechanisms by tracking the development of learning capacity on three levels: individual, organizational, and institutional or enabling environment. Objectives, interventions and expected results indicators are summarized in the table below and a logical framework with additional detailed indicators to be used in monitoring & evaluation of project activity results and outcomes are included in Annex a.

⁶ PSC: Project Steering Committee

	<i>Learning Capacity Development at Three Levels</i>			
	Individual	Organizational	Institutional/ Enabling Environment	
Learning Capacity Objectives	Improved knowledge, skills and networking	Improved coordination, shared vision & goals	Improved trust, confidence & political will	<i>(Demand)</i>
Project Activity Interventions	Technical, professional and communications knowledge-sharing, skills, self-assessment	Systems-thinking feedback mechanisms tested for adaptive policy, regulatory & water management decision making	Key stakeholder group consultative dialogue, capacitation, knowledge and experience-sharing & networking	<i>(Supply)</i>
Expected results/outcomes indicators	Self- assessed increase in confidence, knowledge, skills	Improved effectiveness of TBW organizations in managing change	Consensus on challenges & solutions in key sectors	<i>(Does S meet D?)</i>

(iii) Independent evaluation:

52) As per standard GEF and UNDP procedures, an independent evaluation of the project will be commissioned 3 months before the end of the project. It will look into results in terms of capacity building and policy reforms, ownership, co-financing and strategic mainstreaming of key technical issues raised by the project. InWEnt, in cooperation with UNDP and project partners, will initiate and coordinate external review processes

TABLE 1: Indicative Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and corresponding budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team Staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ InWEnt ▪ UNESCO-IHP ▪ UNU-INWEH ▪ UNDP/GEF ▪ IW:LEARN 	None	Back to back with Petersberg roundtable meeting
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ InWEnt with feedback from project partners ▪ UNDP/GEF 	None	Immediately following inception meeting
PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ InWEnt ▪ UNDP-GEF ▪ Others as identified 	None	Annually
Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ InWEnt ▪ UNESCO-IHP ▪ UNU-INWEH ▪ PSC members ▪ IW:LEARN ▪ UNDP/GEF 	To be linked to other project events/meetings therefore costs covered in other budget lines	At least once a year and additional virtual meetings as necessary
Beneficiary feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ InWEnt ▪ IW LEARN ▪ UNU-INWEH ▪ Partner institutions 	None	Throughout project lifetime and specifically in response to key regional and thematic adaptive learning activities
Independent Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP/GEF ▪ External Consultants 	20,000 USD	3 months before the end of the project
Final Project Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ InWEnt ▪ UNDP GEF 	At WWF 5	Following the terminal evaluation
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		20,000	

4 - FINANCING

FINANCING PLAN

- 53) The project's cost-effectiveness lies in the fact that it will be delivering its results and goal at a continental level through partnerships, peer-to-peer learning, exchanges and transfers within and among continents rather than engaging with each sub-region or water basin in isolation.
- 54) The second aspect of cost-effectiveness lies in the fact that methodologies for assessing benefit-sharing, manuals for parliamentarians, training for journalists will be developed to allow their application across the continent. While they will be comprehensive in their content and approaches, all efforts will be exerted to avoid a blue-print approach.
- 55) In the design of the project's activities – especially in relation to meetings, workshops, trainings... project proponents have accorded special attention to the merging of such events to avoid mobilizing too much of stakeholders' time and reduce the costs of such events.
- 56) It is noteworthy here that the prospect of a GEF support has rendered this project a catalyst for a more comprehensive programmatic approach among partners where existing and planned initiatives were aligned to contribute to a higher vision, align behind African state needs and create natural outlets for certain processes. For example, the GEF support to the development of a benefit sharing methodology is on a 1:3 co-finance ratio, but it more importantly provides a natural outlet for this methodology through the basin organization, parliamentary dialogues while also guiding the identification of investment options and options for financing RBOs.

A) PROJECT COSTS

<u>Project Components/Outcomes</u>	<u>Co-financing (\$)</u>	<u>GEF (\$)</u>	<u>Total (\$)</u>
1. Legal, policy and management reforms	845,000	506,000	1,351,000
2. Systems thinking approach	672,500	300,000	972,500
3. Mechanisms for investment planning and financial sustainability	230,000	114,000	344,000
4. Project management monitoring and evaluation	37,500	80,000	117,500
Total project costs	1,785,000	1,000,000	2,785,000

B) PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST⁷

<u>Component</u>	<u>Estimated staffweeks</u>	<u>GEF(\$)</u>	<u>Other sources (\$)</u>	<u>Project total (\$)</u>
<u>Personnel*</u>	20	15,000	16,250	31,250
<u>Local consultants*</u>	10	7250		7250
<u>Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications</u>		2000	16,000	18,000
Executing agency support costs		40,000		
Travel		3,750	5,250	9,000
Miscellaneous (Audits)		12,000		12,000
Total		80,000	37,500	117,500

⁷ For all consultants hired to manage project or provide technical assistance, please attach a description in terms of their staff weeks, roles and functions in the project, and their position titles in the organization, such as project officer, supervisor, assistants or secretaries.

* Local and international consultants in this table are those who are hired for functions related to the management of project. For those consultants who are hired to do a special task, they would be referred to as consultants providing technical assistance. For these consultants, please provide details of their services in c) below:

C) CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Estimated staff weeks</u>	<u>GEF(\$)</u>	<u>Other sources (\$)</u>	<u>Project total (\$)</u>
<i>Personnel</i>	277	\$55,000	\$392,454	\$447,454
<i>Local consultants</i>	282	\$114,000	\$187,500	\$301,500
<i>International consultants</i>	48	\$83,500	\$44,050	\$127,550
<i>Total</i>	607	\$252,500	\$624,004	\$876,504

D) CO-FINANCING SOURCES⁸ (expand the table line items as necessary)

Co-financing Sources					
Name of co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Amount (\$)	Status	
				Confirmed	Unconfirmed
UNDP	IA	Cash parallel	100,000	X	
BMZ	Bilateral	Cash parallel	340,000	X	
GLFC	International Basin Commission	Cash parallel	230,000	X	
UNU-INWEH	Multilateral	In kind	50,000	X	
UNESCO	Multilateral	In kind	350,000	X	
NBI	Transition mechanism	Cash parallel	100,000	X	
InWent (German Development Cooperation)	Bilateral	Cash parallel	300,000	X	
SIWI/CSIR/PRA	Foundation	Cash parallel	130,000	X	X
		Cash parallel	130,000		
GWP (Med and EA) /MIOECSDE	NGO	Cash parallel In kind	135,000	X	
SADC	IGO – Intergovernmental Organization	In kind	50,000	X	
Sub-total co-financing			1,785,000 130,000	X	X

⁸ [Refer to the paper on Cofinancing, GEF/C.206/Rev. 1](#)

5 - INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A) CORE COMMITMENTS AND LINKAGES

- 57)** This project directly supports expressed aims and objectives of the AMCOW and African transboundary lake and river basin organizations and shared aquifer systems to cultivate trust and confidence, political will, science-based policy linkages, inter-basin knowledge-sharing mechanisms and sub-regional networking to improve institutional and legal set-ups for water governance and ecosystem-based management of water resources in Africa. These priorities have been articulated in the documentation of the AMCOW Conference of River and Lake Basin Organisations, October 2006.
- 58)** A key level of water governance targeted for scaling up in this MSP (tested with GWP in the Nile Basin and in GEF/UNDP Yellow Sea project) is the engagement and capacitation of parliamentarians to improve legislative and regulatory frameworks for water governance and additional benefits that can be realized through transboundary cooperation. This aim is shared by the SADC Parliamentary Forum and PALDIF with the contribution of COMPSUD to transfer experience from Euro-mediterranean processes. In partnership with these African institutions, this project will bring local expertise from GEF International Waters projects and other African-based applied research projects on benefit-sharing (SIWI) to inter-parliamentary consultative workshops organized around transboundary river and lake basin, and shared aquifer systems in the SADC sub-region, and will lay foundations for sustaining this approach in the SADC region and replication in other sub-regions.
- 59)** Another good practice (piloted in the Nile Basin) this project scales up in the Eastern Africa sub-region is the cultivation of media to raise public awareness, ensure transparency, and facilitate stakeholder participation in water resources management and governance; activities to establish an environmental media network are supported by GWP.
- 60)** The German government (Ministry of Development Cooperation- BMZ/GTZ, and InWEnt) is supporting with cofinance and proposing this project as an extension of the GEF, World Bank and BMU “Petersberg Process” on Transboundary Water Resources Management. It aims, in conjunction with Germany’s Presidency of the European Union to apply this process to improve water resources management at the regional scale in Africa. The Petersberg Africa roundtable adapts and replicates lessons and experience gained in “Petersberg Process” activities in South Eastern Europe carried out by German Ministry of Environment-BMU, with World Bank, GEF-IW:LEARN, GWP-Med, UNECE⁹ and UNESCO. The German government (BMZ, InWEnt/GTZ) financed teleconferencing and a project preparation workshop in conjunction with October 2006 AMCOW meeting in Kampala to facilitate consultations and root the project at the highest level of African leadership.
- 61)** As overall convening and executing agencies of the project, InWEnt and GEF-IW:LEARN internalized costs of project preparation meetings in Entebbe, Windhoek, Nairobi, Cape Town, Berlin and Washington, DC as an extension of GEF-IW:LEARN partnership with InWEnt launching regional networking and knowledge-sharing activities among GEF IW projects and partners in Africa. Consultative dialogue on balancing competing uses and infrastructure development with basin organizations and regional water institutions in SADC and EAC¹⁰ will build on foundations of UNEP Dams and Development project.
- 62)** With Canadian funding, the UNU-INWEH is supporting peer networking and technical training for African lake basin organisations and twinning with North American Great Lakes organizations to establish sustaining knowledge-sharing mechanisms within Africa and with lake basin organizations outside of Africa. UNU-INWEH committed funds to prepare proposed

⁹ UNECE: United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

¹⁰ EAC: East African Community

twinning and technical exchange activities with African and North American Lake Basin organizations. The Great Lakes Fishery Commission has committed bi-national (S-Canada) funds to a series of scientific workshops that will run in parallel (and nearly contemporaneously) to the MSP that will engage scientists from around the world to identify ecosystem health indicators for great lakes ecosystems.

- 63)** The adoption of ‘systems thinking’ is a well established approach in water resources management which has been in the forefront of the UNESCO International Hydrological Programmes achievements, world wide and also in Africa. Thus UNESCO and its Africa Partners (i.e. the National IHP Committees) are well equipped to work within this framework. The MSP’s approach in promoting the mainstreaming of water-ecosystems into the national economic development squares with UNESCO’s experience and work. UNESCO-IHP’s contribution will build on an already very strong on going programme that involves all aspects of water resources, ecohydrology and aquifer resources management, including transboundary aquifers. The UNESCO ISARM has completed a preliminary continent wide inventory of shared aquifers and two major regional conferences have been held to address this specific issue. Other regional meetings have also been supported and sponsored over the last half decade in all regions of the Continent. Building on the global 'Petersberg Process' the MSP will develop an Africa-specific ‘Windhoek Process’ focused on groundwater which would receive support from bilateral donors as a ‘twinned’ set of actions – each with its own long term objectives.
- 64)** UNDP is the Implementing Agency for this MSP, which builds on the foundations of GEF IW:LEARN and other learning projects supported by GEF/UNDP in the International Waters focal area. As such, GEF/UNDP Regional Coordinators for North Africa, West and Central Africa, and Southern and Eastern Africa actively assisted GEF-IW:LEARN and InWEnt in developing iterative on-the-ground targeted learning activities at the sub-regional level and in the case of lake basins to test region-wide and global knowledge-sharing mechanisms with a view to setting the stage for a comprehensive lake basin management regime for which future GEF support could be requested. Core UNDP experience and expertise on governance is brought into the process through its interventions in North Africa with the Program On Governance in the Arab Region (POGAR). This program transfers expertise and provides advice in relation to legal and policy reforms and working with parliamentarians; this kind of link will have a dual effect of internalizing water management in UNDP’s core governance work while strengthening South-South exchanges between North and Sub-Saharan Networks. The extent of this commitment is reflected in the co-finance provided by UNDP through POGAR and its support to the NBI. UNDP’s portfolio in GEF international waters and its mainstream water governance work is mostly focused on Africa with either single or joint IA interventions.

B) CONSULTATION, COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN AND AMONG IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES, EXECUTING AGENCIES, AND THE GEF SECRETARIAT, IF APPROPRIATE.

- 65)** The German government (Ministry of Development Cooperation, GTZ, InWEnt) engaged leadership from key institutions addressing water governance in Africa (AMCOW, UNECA, African Development Bank) with GEF partners including the World Bank Water Advisor, Africa and water advisors from UNEP, and GEF-IW:LEARN in the preparation of the “Petersberg Process-Africa” component of this project, focused on balancing multiple uses of transboundary water resources. The international planning committee has met repeatedly in 2006.
- 66)** In addition, components of the project were proposed by African basin, regional and other institutions involved in the project. The draft proposal was circulated widely and shared with and has received the endorsement of institutions and agencies involved in relevant aspects of

water resource management in Africa e.g. UNESCO, GWP, IAEA, OSS, SIWI, PALDIF, SADCs, NBA, NBI¹¹....

- 67)** UNU-INWEH has led the development of the lake twinning component and will facilitate its implementation while ensuring linkages and contributions to cross-cutting activities such as the parliamentary dialogues or providing information for the media and outreach related activities.
- 68)** The World Bank Water Advisor contributed to the development of this project Through participation in BMZ-organized Preparatory Workshop in Kampala, October 2006, and WBI (World Bank Institute) is interested to assist in preparing dialogue processes to cultivate mentoring of change agents and champions within targeted communities of practice.

C) PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT

- 69)** The overall project executing agency agreed upon by all partners and contracted by UNDP through UNOPS, is InWEnt as the key partner of the German government and convener of the Petersberg-Africa process. In executing the project, InWEnt will liaise closely with IW:LEARN (until September 2008), UNESCO and UNU-INWEH.
- 70)** Given the specific nature of the project and its multi-dimensional learning levels, a matrixed implementation arrangement has been agreed among partners with the specific aim to ensure African leadership and capacity building through active implementation, execution and management of specific activities.
- 71)** An added value of this approach consists in long-term sustainability of networks, results and activities through ownership and increased capacity of African institutions. An illustrative organigram of project implementation arrangements is presented in Annex c.
- 72)** The project will establish a steering committee consisting of the main agencies and institutions involved in the overall planning and oversight of the project (e.g. InWEnt; UNU-INWEH; UNESCO; IW:LEARN; UNDP/GEF); representatives of AMCOW, AMCEN, NEPAD and other leading African institutions will provide strategic advice and guidance to the project partners.
- 73)** Focused technical or thematic committees will be established for the execution of specific components of the project and will include at least one of the members of the project steering committee to ensure feedback into the overall project strategy and enhance cross-component fertilization.

¹¹ IAEA: International Atomic Energy Agency; OSS: Observatoire du Sahara et du Sahel; SIWI: Stockholm International Water Institute; NBA: Niger Basin Authority; NBI: Nile Basin Initiative.

1. REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS

- a) Country Endorsement Letter
- b) Confirmed letters of commitments from co-financiers

c) PART II – SUPPLEMENTAL ANNEXES

- a) Project logframe
- b) Project detailed budget
- c) Implementation organigram
- d) “Petersberg Process” concept note
- e) River Basin Dialogue concept and approach
- f) Towards A Parliamentary Transboundary Natural Resources Management (TBNRM) Strategy for SADC
- g) PALDIF partnership document
- h) COMPSUD Corfu declaration
- i) GWP/EA Water Life Media
- j) Concept note “Twinning” International Lake Management Commissions
- k) Summary table of meetings

PART III - RESPONSE TO PROJECT REVIEWS

- a) Convention Secretariat comments and IA/ExA response
- b) STAP expert review and IA/ExA response (if requested)
- c) GEF Secretariat and other Agencies’ comments and IA/ExA response

REFERENCES: