

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2009
(1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009)

1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title:	Addressing Transboundary Concerns in the Volta River Basin and its Downstream Coastal Area
-----------------------	--

Executing Agency:	United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) in close collaboration with UNEP DHI Centre for Water and Environment
--------------------------	--

Project partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volta Basin Authority • Direction Générale de l'Environnement (Ministère de l'Environnement et la Protection de la Nature) – DGE Bénin • Direction Générale de l'Eau (Ministère de l'Energie et de l'Eau) – DGEau Bénin • Direction Générale des Ressources en Eau (Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Hydraulique et des Ressources Halieutiques) DGRE Burkina Faso • Direction Générale de la Conservation de la Nature (Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie) DGCN Burkina Faso • Direction des Ressources en Eau (Ministère de l'Environnement des Eaux et Forêts) Cote d'Ivoire • Direction des Politiques Environnementales et de la Coopération (Ministère de l'Environnement des Eaux et Forêts) Cote d'Ivoire • Water Resources Commission (Ministry of Water Resources, Works and Housing) – WRC Ghana • Environmental Protection Agency (Ministry of Environment Science and Technology) – EPA Ghana • Secrétariat Technique Permanent du Cadre Institutionnel de la Gestion des Questions Environnementales (Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Assainissement) - STP/CIGQE Mali • Direction Nationale de l'Hydraulique (Ministère de l'Energie, des Mines et de l'Eau) – DNH Mali • Direction de l'Environnement (Ministère de l'Environnement, du Tourisme et des Ressources Forestières) Togo • Direction Générale de l'Eau et de l'Assainissement – DGEA Togo • Interim Guinea Current Convention • Economic Community Of West African States/Water Resources Coordination Centre – ECOWAS/WRCC • EU Volta Project • Volta HYCOS Project • Projet d'Amélioration de la Gouvernance de l'Eau dans le Bassin de la Volta - PAGEV • Global Water Partnership /West Africa Water Partnership - GWP WAWP • Syndicat Interdépartemental pour l'Assainissement de l'Agglomération de Paris (SIAAP) France
--------------------------	--

Geographical Scope:	Regional/Multi-country (Africa)
----------------------------	---------------------------------

Participating Countries:	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali and Togo
---------------------------------	--

GEF project ID:	1111	IMIS number*¹:	GFL/2328-2731-4957
Focal Area(s):	International waters	GEF OP #:	
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:		GEF approval date*:	7 August 2006
UNEP approval date:	May 2007	First Disbursement*:	31 July 2007
Actual start date²:	July 2007	Planned duration:	48 months
Intended completion date*:	July 2011	Actual or Expected completion date:	March 2012
Project Type:	FSP	GEF Allocation*:	\$5,347,380
PDF GEF cost*:	\$497,500	PDF co-financing*:	\$151,000
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:	\$10,871,231	Total Cost*:	\$16,867,111
Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):	Not planned yet	Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	N/A
Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):	N/A	No. of revisions*:	1
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	13-15 May 2008	Date of last Revision*:	6 January 2009
Disbursement as of 30 June 2009*:	\$1,509,112	Date of financial closure*:	N/A
Date of Completion³:	N/A	Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2009⁴:	\$734,975
Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2009⁵:	Nil	Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2009*:	NIL
Leveraged financing:⁶	Nil		

¹ Fields with an * sign (in yellow) should be filled by the Fund Management Officer

² Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases where a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager.

³ If there was a "Completion Revision" please use the date of the revision.

⁴ Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager

⁵ Projects which completed mid-term reviews/evaluations or terminal evaluations should attach the completed co-financing table as per GEF format.

⁶ See above note on co-financing and Glossary (Annex 1)

Project summary ⁷	<p>This project for integrated management of the Volta River basin, titled “<i>Addressing Transboundary Concerns in the Volta River Basin and its Downstream Coastal Area</i>” has a primary focus on addressing the major environmental problems and issues of the basin leading causing degradation of the environment by human activities. The long-term goal is to enhance the ability of the countries to plan and manage the Volta catchment areas within their territories and aquatic resources and ecosystems on a sustainable basis. The Project has three main components with associated objectives identified by the root cause analysis carried out during the project preparation process: (i): <i>Build capacity and create a regional institutional framework for the effective management of the Volta Basin</i>; (ii): <i>Develop regional policy, legal and regulatory frameworks for addressing transboundary concerns in the Volta Basin and its downstream coastal areas</i>; and (iii): <i>Initiate national and regional measures to combat transboundary environmental degradation in the Volta Basin</i>. The activities to be undertaken will provide a strong foundation for the long term sustainable environmental management of the Volta Basin. A preliminary Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and a preliminary Strategic Action Programme have been prepared, and these serve as the basis for preparation of this project proposal. The full Global Environment Facility (GEF) project will update and expand the TDA, and will develop a regionally agreed SAP, following clarification of some aspects of the environmental status of the region as well as building grounds for SAP implementation. The project recognizes the complex and interlinked nature of Volta River basin and aims to develop a more sectorally-coordinated management approach, based on IWRM, both at the national and the regional level, with a strong emphasis on an expanded role for all stakeholders within a participatory management framework, especially the private sector. The Project will demonstrate in a replicable manner, integrated land and water management strategies. The demonstrations will stress the development of cross-sectoral management approaches which will address the requirements for institutional realignment and appropriate infrastructure; adoption of new modalities for sectoral participation; enhancement of regional capacity to manage the basin in a sustainable manner; linkages to the social and economic root causes of environmental degradation; and the overall need for sustainability</p>
-------------------------------------	---

Project status FY2009 ⁸	<p>The project is fully up and running. The Project Management structure consisting of the Project Management Unit, the Regional Project Steering Committee, National Focal Points (institutional and operational focal points) and National Implementation Committees have proven to be effective in ensuring stakeholder involvement at all levels. Implementation of the Project is still largely on course, despite delays in the initiation of certain activities. Also, the project work-plan has been updated in order to address changes required and to keep it abreast with ongoing processes. The demonstration projects are notably delayed and are still at the development stage. Much effort is being put in establishing partnerships with other projects, programmes and organisations active in the Volta region in order to enhance project outcomes as well as ensure longer-term sustainability.</p>
---	---

⁷ As in project document

⁸ Please include additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any)

	Upon UNEP recommendation, the second Project Steering Committee meeting was postponed. After initial studies at national and regional levels on stakeholder participation, information exchange and institutions, the project is in a position to undertake the TDA, which is a primary activity for the next reporting period.
--	---

Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets⁹	<p>The project has been developed based on the GEF International Waters Focal Area- Strategic Priorities in Support of WSSD Outcomes. In particular, the following two priorities are listed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority 2. Expand global coverage of foundational capacity building addressing the two key program gaps with a focus on cross-cutting aspects of African transboundary waters and support for targeted learning. • Priority 3. Undertake innovative demonstrations for reducing contaminants and addressing water scarcity issues with a focus on engaging the private sector and testing public-private partnerships. <p>Although specifics on how the GEF Volta project will contribute to addressing these priorities are not stated in the project document, it is clear that most activities of the project fall within the categories of capacity building (in various forms) and demonstration functions (whether through actual demonstration projects or the development of guidelines).</p>
---	---

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVE

State the global environmental objective(s) of the project¹⁰

<p>The project's overall objective is to enhance the ability of the riparian countries to plan and manage the Volta River Basin and its downstream coastal area (including aquatic resources and ecosystems) on a sustainable basis, by achieving sustainable capacity and establishing regional institutional frameworks for effective management; developing national and regional priorities; and effective legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks and management tools as a basis for action as well as initiating national and regional measures to achieve sustainable ecosystem management.</p> <p>The Project has three main components with associated objectives identified by the root cause analysis carried out during the project preparation process and updated during the inception phase as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific Objective n° 1: Build capacity, improve knowledge, and enhance stakeholders involvement to support the effective management of the VRB • Specific Objective n° 2: Develop river basin legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks and management instruments for addressing transboundary concerns in the Volta River Basin and its downstream coastal area • Specific Objective n° 3: Demonstrate national and regional measures to combat transboundary environmental degradation in the Volta Basin

⁹ For Full Size Projects this information is found in the front page of the project Executive Summary; for Medium-Sized Projects the information appears in the MSP brief cover page.

¹⁰ Or immediate project objective

Please provide a narrative of progress made towards meeting the project objective(s). Describe any **significant** environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the **objectives** or specific project **outcomes** (not more than 300 words)

1. **Specific Objective 1:** During the reporting period, the project management bodies have been established. The PMU is fully functional and executing the project in close collaboration with the Interim Volta Basin Authority. The Project Inception Report was finalised and the project monitoring and evaluation plan prepared. The project document (logframe, activities, work plan, budget, and institutional framework) has been revised taking into account developments which occurred after the submission of the project to GEF (signature of the Volta Basin Convention, establishment of the Volta Basin Authority, implementation of IUCN/PAGEV Project, etc). MOUs were signed with the 6 riparian countries to facilitate the implementation of the project activities at national level. In view of the plan to strengthen national institutions capacities, facilitate local stakeholders participation to the project activities and contribute to the establishment of the Volta Basin Observatory, 3 main studies were initiated both at national and regional levels on the following topics: i-) analysis of national institutions including ongoing/planned initiatives and their links with the GEF Volta Project, ii-) development of stakeholders involvement plan and iii-) establishment of regional information and data exchange mechanism in the Volta River Basin. Also the project activities and reports were widely disseminated through: the project website, project leaflet and presentation of the project at different meetings. To ensure the success of the TDA/SAP process, a training session in the approach and methodology of TDA and SAP development was organised in Cotonou, Benin with the participation of key representatives of the project from the 6 riparian countries. The training equally provided an opportunity for knowledge exchange and establishment of network between the GEF-Volta Project partners.
2. **Specific Objective 2:** A review of the preliminary TDA prepared during the PDF-B Phase (year 2002) has been carried out during the reporting period with the following results: identification and provision of recommendations for TDA gaps fillings, detailed methodology for TDA finalisation and SAP development including work plan and TORs for TDA and SAP experts both at national and regional levels. The process for the recruitment of experts for TDA finalisation is ongoing.
3. **Specific Objective 3:** In order to ensure good implementation of the 3 demonstration projects selected during the PDF-B Phase, consultants were recruited to review and update the project documents. The 3 studies led to the preparation of detailed Demo project documents including: i-) baseline situation analysis, ii-) feasibility study, iii-) redefinition of objectives and expected outcomes, iv-) review of objectively verifiable indicators, demo project activities, work plan, budget, v-) institutional arrangements and implementation strategy. Furthermore, key project partners have been contacted as potential demo executing agencies. Discussions are still going on and final decision will be made jointly with UNEP DGEF before the planning workshops

Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document ¹¹ (not more than 200 words)

- Most of the GEF Volta Project activities contribute to addressing the two strategic priorities. Some of the key achievements in the regard are:
- Operationalization of the project: establishment of project management bodies both at regional and national levels and the preparation of the Project Inception Report, including the review of the project brief (logframe, activities, work plan, budget, institutional framework) and the preparation of the project monitoring and evaluation plan
 - 3 main studies initiated both at national and regional levels on the followings thematic: i-) analysis of National Institutions including ongoing/planned initiatives, ii-) establishment of Regional Information and Data Exchange Mechanism in the Volta River Basin, iii-) development of the stakeholders' involvement plan
 - Training need of national institutions and stakeholders identified and prioritised
 - Training of national partners in the approach and methodology of TDA and SAP development

¹¹ Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

and processes

- review of the preliminary TDA carried out with the following results: identification and provision of recommendations for TDA gaps fillings, detailed methodology for TDA finalisation and SAP development including work plan and TORs for TDA and SAP experts both at national and regional levels
- Review and update of the 3 demonstration project documents including: i-) baseline situation analysis, ii-) feasibility, study, iii-) redefinition of objectives and expected outcomes, iv-) review of objectively verifiable indicators, demo project activities, work plan, budget, v-) institutional arrangements and implementation strategy.

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**¹² will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project objective(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

3.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Objective 1 ¹⁷ : Build capacity, improve knowledge, enhance stakeholders' involvement to support the effective management of the VRB						

¹² For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

¹³ Add rows if your project has more than 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.

¹⁴ Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).

¹⁵ Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

¹⁶ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions.

¹⁷ Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Outcome 1.1: <i>Project Managed and coordinated to partners satisfaction</i>	Project management and co-ordination bodies established	None	PMU and all project organs operational and effective		<p>The Project Management Unit (PMU) was established. The PMU is functional and its staff consists of one Regional Coordinator, one Scientific and Information Officer, one Administrative Assistant, and one Bilingual Secretary</p> <p>Project Task Force Members appointed and functional until Dec 2008</p> <p>Project Steering Committee (PSC) established and functional</p> <p>NIC established in the 6 riparian countries and functional</p> <p>1st PSC and NIC meeting conducted in May and December 2008</p> <p>MOAs were prepared by PMU, approved by UNEP/DGEF; MOAs signed with the 6 riparian countries as per project budget</p>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Outcome 1.2: <i>Capacity & participation of stakeholders in VRB management strengthened</i>	Ministries of environment and water resources are both represented in the Project Steering Committee	Original project proposed only GEF focal points. VBA on the other hand includes only representatives from Water Resources Ministries		Ministries of environment and water resources participate in the project activities	For each riparian countries, the ministries in charge of water and environment are represented at the PSC and NIC levels and participating in the project activities	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	All relevant stakeholders participate in project activities and have access to project reports, publications, database, etc	Not existing	All stakeholders identified and their actions understood; MOUs developed to support key collaborations, e.g. VBA, EU Volta project, IUCN PAGEV project		During the reporting period, ongoing and planned initiatives have been reviewed and a collaboration plan proposed based on the links established with the UNEP/GEF Volta Project outputs. The establishment of collaboration with key project partners is ongoing and specific areas of parallel activities and cooperation have been identified with GCLME, GLOWA, IUCN/PAGEV, Volta HYCOS, SIAAP, BFP-Volta, GWP West Africa, ECOWAS/WRCU, EU Volta Initiative, IWMI, GEF Niger, GEF Senegal, Volta Observatory project, 2 Studies were conducted on the analysis of national/regional institutions and stakeholders: the main activities, mandates, institutional frameworks, weakness, strength of national/regional institutions & stakeholders involved or likely to be involved in the implementation of the GEF Volta Project, their concerns,	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	Institutions have the capacity to manage and monitor data in support of the implementation of SAP and APNP-VRB, and provide coordinated data transfer to VBA observatory	None	Existing data is inventoried and CHM established	Countries contributing data to the CHM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training needs of data hosting institutions identified, prioritised and training plans prepared and discussed with the VBA • Inventory of existing metadata within each country was completed 	S
	Involvement of stakeholders in SAP and APNP-VRB process and roles detailed in SAP and APNP-VRB documents	None	Stakeholders contribute to the TDA process	Stakeholders have contributed to national and regional SAP processes	Plan for involving stakeholders in the TDA/SAP developed and incorporated in the methodology for TDA/SAP development Stakeholders participated in national validation workshops for the foundational studies supporting the TDA/SAP process	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	National institutions have the capacity to implement the SAP and APNP-VRB	None	National institutions and partners understand the TDA and SAP processes	National institutions engaged in TDA and SAP processes and are positioned to implement the SAP	A training session on TDA/ SAP process was organised in Cotonou, Benin from 15 to 19 September 2008 with the participation of National partners and key project stakeholders. The training equally provided an opportunity for knowledge sharing and exchange, including establishment of network between the GEF-Volta Project partners.	MS
Outcome 1.3: <i>Knowledge base expanded & basin-wide communication mechanism in place</i>	VBA database developed and updated at regional and national levels	No database for VBA exists	Equipment procured, development underway.	VBA database (CHM) developed by year 4 and functional	Discussions for the development of VBA database & data clearinghouse are ongoing. And, the Project has prepared and shared with its partners, a note on the implementation of the VB clearinghouse system.	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	Contributions to the establishment of regional Volta Basin Observatory completed and approved by the VBA	Volta Basin Observatory to be established, with funding by French GEF	Existing metadata understood and synthesized	CHM is functional and supports the observatory operations	Existing Metadata categories & data hosting institutions analysed and mechanism proposed for the circulation of data and information at national and regional levels. The PMU has also participated and contributed to different coordination meetings for the Observatory organised by the VBA	S
	At least 2 thematic studies carried out	Thematic studies to be identified will fill in gaps identified by TDA and national experts		2 thematic studies carried out on water and related natural resources of the Volta River Basin by year 3	No progress to date	MU
Objective 2: Develop river basin legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks, and management instruments for addressing transboundary concerns in the Volta River Basin and its downstream coastal area						

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Outcome 2.1: <i>VRB regional coordination mechanisms supported</i>	VRB Convention into force	Convention signed by the riparian countries	Convention ratified by at least 4 of the riparian countries	VRB convention enters into force and VBA functional	Importance of the VRB Convention and its ratification were discussed with high level authorities during different meetings and workshops VRB convention ratified by 5 of the riparian countries. Côte d'Ivoire yet to ratify the convention Ghana, Mali and Togo Governments have signed and deposited the Ratification document	HS
Outcome 2.2: <i>Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) updated and finalised</i>	TDA revised, finalized and endorsed by the Project Steering committee	Preliminary TDA prepared under PDF-B phase of the project	TDA endorsed by the project Steering committee by the end of year 2	TDA endorsed by the project Steering committee and informing management	A review of the preliminary TDA has been carried out with the following results: identification and provision of recommendations for TDA gaps fillings, detailed methodology for TDA finalisation and SAP development including work plan and TORs for TDA and SAP experts both at national and regional levels. TORs for the recruitment of TDA experts advertised	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Outcome 2.3: <i>Action Plans for the National Parts of the VRB (APNP-VRB) developed</i>	APNP-VRB finalised and endorsed at country level	IWRM plans at various stages of development for each country.	Methodology developed and agreed	APNP-VRB endorsed at country level by year 4	Detailed methodology and work plan for APNP-VRB development completed.	S
	Key inter-sectoral transboundary issues identified and plan for sectoral harmonisation developed with relevant sectors and agreed for inclusion in IWRM process	Inter-sectoral harmonization as part of the IWRM process needed in all countries and ongoing and substantial work	APNP-VRB methodology includes IWRM considerations; stakeholders understand links between APNP-VRB and SAP processes and IWRM	Issues arising from APNP-VRB process highlighted for mainstreaming into national IWRM processes	Methodology developed and reflects IWRM principles and process	MS
Outcome 2.4: <i>Strategic Action Programme (SAP) prepared</i>	SAP drafted, finalized and endorsed at ministerial level (Water and Environment Ministers)	No SAP exists for Volta River Basin	Methodology for SAP process developed; national partners trained on TDA/SAP processes	SAP endorsed at ministerial level by the end of year 4	Detailed methodology and work plan for SAP development completed A training session on TDA/ SAP process was organised in Cotonou, Benin from 15 to 19 September 2008 with the participation of National partners and key project stakeholders. The training equally provided an opportunity for knowledge sharing and exchange, including establishment of network between the GEF-Volta Project partners.	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	Volta Basin Authority (VBA) adopts SAP into their work plan	Volta River Basin Authority established in 2007 but with no SAP to implement or other strategic planning of activities based on agreed priorities	VBA participates in and advocates for TDA/SAP process	Volta Basin Authority (VBA) adopt SAP into their work plan as mechanism for the implementation of the Volta River Basin Convention by the end of year 4	The VBA has been involved in the review of the preliminary TDA, the establishment of methodology for TDA finalisation and SAP/APNP-VRB development, including TORs and work plan.	S
Objective 3: Demonstrate national and regional measures to combat transboundary environmental degradation in the Volta Basin						

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Outcome 3.1: 3 Demo Project successfully implemented	3 Demo projects executed resulting in stress reduction (see demo logframe) and analyzed for their replicability	None	Six demo project starting at the beginning of year 2	Six demo projects executed by year 4	In order to ensure good implementation of the Demo Projects, the demo documents have been revised and updated (situation analysis, logframe, activities, work plan and budget). During the review process, field visits were conducted to demo project areas and this created opportunities for exchange of information with government authorities and other key stakeholders of the project. The field visits and discussion with key stakeholders also reinforced the analyses already conducted on the environmental problems during the PDF-B phase, taking into account recent developments which occurred in the proposed demo project areas. Potential partners for the implementation of the Demo Projects identified and discussions are ongoing	MU

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator¹³	Baseline level¹⁴	Mid-term target¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating¹⁶
	Hydrometric and rain gauge networks reinforced and relevant data collected, monitored and published on yearly basis	HYDRACCESS (IRD database), Existing data and studies on historic floods		By year 1 and ongoing	No progress, pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating period
	Tools to mitigate floods impacts and improve Sourou river valley management including Lery dam, developed and implemented by year 3	To be clarified during the inception phase of the demo project		By end of year 3	No progress, pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating yet
	Framework convention for the joint management of the Sourou river valley prepared and signed by the two countries	None		By end of year 3	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating yet
	Capacity of local stakeholder and national institutions in charge of sanitations issues strengthened and population sensitised	None		By end of year 1	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating yet
	1 pilot macrophyte lagoon installed in the city of Kara and used for sewage treatment	None		By end of year 2	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating yet

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	Capacity of local stakeholder and national institutions in charge of forest and water resources management strengthened	None		By end of year 1	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating period
	Forest landscapes of the pilot plots targeted by the project are restored and protected	None		By end of year 3	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating yet
	Reduction in N, P, BOD, COD etc. and untreated sludge in line with targets (Statistics (baseline and targets) to be defined during the inception phase)	Will be defined during the inception phase of the demo project		By end of year 2	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating yet
	Sediment yield into selected rivers reduced by 20%	Will be defined during the inception phase of the demo project		By end of year 3	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating yet
	Water retention in the forest area increased by 25%	Will be defined during the inception phase of the demo project		By end of year 3	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating yet
	Surfaces burned by bush fires in selected areas are reduced by 50%	Will be defined during the inception phase of the demo project		By end of year 3	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	N/A for rating yet

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Outcome 3.2¹⁸: <i>Replication strategy for demonstration project developed and initiated</i>	Six national Demo projects are prepared to be submitted to co-funding partners	None	Demonstration projects underway	Key issues in demonstration projects have been identified and incorporated into a replication strategy	No progress pending initiation of demo projects	Not yet applicable

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project objective(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect all prior year ratings*)

FY2009 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods
S/MS	Regional components well underway with quality workplans and processes. Demonstration projects require additional technical support to get quality documents and workplans.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating (*To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager*)

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Finalise the stakeholders involvement plan and begin implementation	Project Management Unit, National partners	Q4 - 2009
Identify training needs of national partners for the implementation of the SAP and APNP-VRB and propose action to be taken in the SAP document	Project Management Unit, National partners	End of the project
Ensure sure that key inter-sectoral transboundary issues are identified, captured and integrated into the final TDA Document and linked to SAP recommendations	Project Management Unit, National partners	Q2 - 2010
Finalise discussions and sign MOAs with national and other implementing partners identified for the execution of the demonstration projects. Where	PMU and UNOPS	Q4 - 2009

¹⁸ Add rows if your project has more than 5 Outcomes.

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
necessary (e.g. Demo 2), seek additional technical support on project design.		
Raise the issue of thematic studies to the Volta PSC to decide the way forward	PMU	Next PSC, Q4 2009

This section should be completed if project progress towards meeting **objectives** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
N/A			

3.2 Project implementation progress

Outputs ¹⁹	Expected completion date ²⁰	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance ²¹ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²²
Objective 1: Build capacity, improve knowledge, enhance stakeholders' involvement to support the effective management of the VRB				
Output 1: <i>Project Managed and coordinated to partners satisfaction</i>				
Activity 1.1.1. Establish the Project Management Unit and governance system including: PMU, MOUs, PSC, PTF, NFP, NIC etc	Q2-2008	Completed (100%)	The establishment of the project management bodies were delayed by administrative procedures during the inception phase. The signing of MOAs was extremely complicated and delayed by long	S

¹⁹ Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

²⁰ As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

²¹ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

²² To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

Outputs ¹⁹	Expected completion date ²⁰	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance ²¹ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²²
			<p>discussions and negotiations on national contributions. For example, some countries like Côte d'Ivoire and Togo felt that their current financial situation did not allow them to honour the co-finance commitments that were originally pledged to the project.</p> <p>UNEP/DGEF and UDC are yet to reach an agreement on technical support to the PMU as co-executing agency and as indicated in the initial project document. This contributed to the delay in the finalisation of the TORs for the Project Task Force (PTF) Members and their recruitment.</p> <p>Technical support to the project is weak: so far, no clear agreement with UDC and UNEP/UNOPS has recommended that the PTF should be on hold until clarity on TDA/SAP and UDC support finalised.</p>	
Activity 1.1.2. Develop and implement project monitoring and evaluation plan	Continuous	Ongoing (70%)	M&E plan developed, approved by PSC and currently under implementation	S
Activity 1.1.3. Identify linkages with other partners, develop and implement collaboration plan	Continuous	Ongoing (70%)	<p>Initially some partners' lack good understanding of the GEF Volta project focus and several discussions were undertaken for clarification.</p> <p>Collaboration with the GCLME Project has been impacted by the ongoing institutional challenges faced by the GCLME. Efforts have been made to coordinate with the other projects in the basin. With the EU project and despite several</p>	MS

Outputs ¹⁹	Expected completion date ²⁰	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance ²¹ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²²
			meetings with the project representative and VBA, the collaboration and coordination seems to remain at the level of meetings and information exchange. And still, there seems to be considerable risk that the EU and GEF projects will duplicate efforts, especially on training activities.	
Activity 1.1.4. Carry out project reports (inception report, Half Yearly and annual reports)	Continuous	IR, Annual report (2008) 2009 work plan & budget: completed (100%)	Reports prepared as planned. TM requested some changes to the format and PMU accommodated	S
Output 1.2: Capacity & participation of stakeholders in VRB management strengthened				
Activity 1.2.1. Conduct training on TDA/SAP process for NFPs	Q3-2008	Completed (100%)	Training completed, but it will take some time for NFPs to really absorb and understand the process.	MS
Activity 1.2.2. Analysis of national institutions and stakeholders and preparation of stakeholders involvement plan	Dec-2008	Ongoing (80%)	For the study on the development of the stakeholders' involvement plan, there is a delay in the submission of reports by some national consultants (Only 3 of the 6 national consultants on the stakeholders' analysis and involvement plan have completed their reports as per the TORs). This is mainly due to the lack of coordination/monitoring of national studies at the national level and also due to the competence of some consultants appointed by national partners to deliver on the assignment as stated in the TOR. This did not allow some regional consultant to complete his report during the reporting period and therefore it is expected that the	MU

Outputs ¹⁹	Expected completion date ²⁰	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance ²¹ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²²
			consultants would complete their reports during 3rd quarter of the year 2009 using available information.	
Activity 1.2.3. Conduct training sessions for national institutions and stakeholders on IWRM and IRB management	Q2-2009		Training gaps were identified through different studies conducted by project and shared with its partners. Potential overlaps in training with the EU Volta Project have been noted but so far, coordination of training activities with the EU Volta Project has remained very difficult. However negotiations & discussions are still going on and it is expected that the EU project will implement the training.	MS
Activity 1.2.4. Conduct training sessions for national institutions on data management and monitoring and, clearinghouse system	Q3-2009	50% completed	Studies completed, but training is awaiting the development of the CHM	S
Activity 1.2.5. Conduct training on SAP implementation at national and regional levels	Q4-2011	N/A	Awaiting development of SAP	N/A
Output 1.3: Knowledge based expanded & basin-wide communication mechanism in place				
Activity 1.3.1. Conduct study on data inventory and assessment	Dec-2008	Completed (100%)	Delay in the submission of reports by national consultants and lack of coordination/feedback from national partners	S
Activity 1.3.2. Develop hydrological and coastal hydrodynamic model of the Volta basin and its Downstream Coastal Area	June 2010	3%	The coordination of this activity with the EU Volta Project is difficult: negotiations & discussions are still going on	MU
Activity 1.3.3. Carry out thematic study on relations between catchments area and stream flow	Q2-2010	N/A	Depends on hydrology model. N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 1.3.4. Carry out thematic study on the relations between Volta basin and its Downstream Coastal Area, using ICARM concept	Q2-2010	N/A	Depends on hydrology model. N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 1.3.5. Support and/or contribute to studies on the	Dec 2009	Ongoing (80%)	Underway	S

Outputs ¹⁹	Expected completion date ²⁰	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance ²¹ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²²
establishment of the Volta Basin Observatory through database, data collection and data sharing protocol				
Activity 1.3.6. Organize one scientific workshop in collaboration with UNESCO	Q3-2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 1.3.7. Develop and update project website	Continuous	Website developed and regularly updated		S
Objective 2: Develop river basin legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks, and management instruments for addressing transboundary concerns in the Volta River Basin and its downstream coastal area				
Output 2.1: <i>VRB regional coordination mechanisms supported</i>				
Activity 2.1.1. Advocate at Ministerial level and through project meetings, workshops and reports, the importance of ratifying the basin convention (just for the record)	Q4-2009	80%	Delay in: i-) the ratification of the convention by Benin due to administrative procedures, ii-) the signing of the ratification documents due to the change of government in Ghana and administrative procedures in Burkina Faso	S
Activity 2.1.2. Insert and mainstream the TDA, SAP and APNP-VRB into the VBA policies, strategies and plans (just for the record)	Dec 2011		VBA fully participates in the TDA/SAP process	S
Output 2.2: <i>Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) updated and finalised</i>				
Activity 2.2.1. Review the preliminary TDA, identify gap and prepare detailed methodology for TDA finalisation and SAP/APNP-VRB development	Dec 2008	Completed (100%)		HS
Activity 2.2.2. Organize starting regional/national workshops with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders	Q2-Q3-2009	0%	But planning and training completed	MS
Activity 2.2.3. Update and complete the TDA document including situation analysis and causal chain analysis	Jan 2010	Ongoing	The recruitment of TDA experts is ongoing	MS
Activity 2.2.4. Organize validation regional workshop with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders	Jan 2010	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 2.2.5. Submit the TDA document to the PSC and VBA for approval	March 2010	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Output 2.3: <i>Action Plans for the National Parts of the VRB</i>				

Outputs ¹⁹	Expected completion date ²⁰	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance ²¹ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²²
<i>(APNP-VRB) developed</i>				
Activity 2.3.1. Organize 6 workshops at country level (with national institutions and stakeholders) as input to the APNP-VRBs elaboration	Q1-2010	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 2.3.2. Prepare the National Action Plans documents, including APNP-VRBs implementation guideline, monitoring & evaluation system for APNP-VRBs implementation, long term financing strategy for the APNP-VRBs	Q4-2010	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 2.3.3. Organize APNP-VRB validation workshops in each riparian country	Q4-2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 2.3.4. Submit APNP-VRB document to national authorities for endorsement	Q4-2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Output 2.4: Strategic Action Programme (SAP) prepared				
Activity 2.4.1. Organize starting regional/national workshops with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders	Jan 2010	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 2.4.2. Prepare the Strategic Action Programme document, including SAP implementation guideline, monitoring & evaluation system for SAP implementation, long term financing strategy for the SAP	Q4-2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 2.4.3. Organize validation regional workshop with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders	Q4-2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 2.4.4. Submit the SAP document to: i-) the Steering Committee for approval and, ii-) the Ministers in charge of Water and Environment for the endorsement of the SAP document (ideally in conjunction with RBO Ministerial meeting)	Q4-2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Objective 3: Demonstrate national and regional measures to combat transboundary environmental degradation in the Volta Basin				
Output 3.1: 3 Demo Project successfully implemented				
Activity 3.1.1. Review and update demo project documents (logframe, activities, budget, M&E plan and work plan) and prepare inception reports	Dec 2008	Completed (100%)	The completion of the review was delayed by lack of coordination/feedback from national partners, non-mobilization of national contributions for the field visits phase and difficult access to	S

Outputs ¹⁹	Expected completion date ²⁰	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance ²¹ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²²
Activity 3.1.2. Implement the Demo project no 1: Joint management by Burkina Faso and Mali of a flow release warning system in the Sourou river valley (tributary of Black Volta River or Mouhoun)	Dec 2011	10%	available data and information Due to the strong link between the project and the Volta HYCOS project, it was expected during the inception phase that the Volta HYCOS project will play the role of executing agency. But the HYCOS has been transferred to the VBA and the VBA does not have a legal status yet to enable it dealing with UNEP. It is therefore recommended to hire a consultant for hydrological studies and development of the early warning system. The PMU will organise a planning meeting with key national partners to agree on role, responsibilities, budget par activities and budget management.	S
Activity 3.1.3. Implement the Demo project no 2: Installing and comparing technological models of waste water treatment in the Cities of Kara (Togo) and Natitingou (Benin)	Dec 2011	10%	The initial budget does not allow implementing the project in the 2 countries as expected. In addition to this and despite the recommendation of the feasibility study, the construction of sanitation plant does not seem to be the best option for demonstrating the transboundary objective. Final decision will be taken during the joint field visit (UNEP, PMU) planned for August 2009.	MU
Activity 3.1.4. Implement the Demo project no 3: Restoring and protecting the river beds of the Black Volta River (Côte d'Ivoire & Ghana) and its tributaries through participative campaigns of reforestation	Dec 2011	10%	The project implementation could be affected by the non-mobilization on national contributions, mainly from Côte d'Ivoire side.	S
Activity 3.1.5. Evaluate the implementation of the three Demo projects	Dec 2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Output 3.2: <i>Replication strategy for demonstration project developed and initiated</i>				

Outputs ¹⁹	Expected completion date ²⁰	Implementation status as of 30 June 2009 (%)	Comments if variance ²¹ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²²
Activity 3.2.1. Develop a plan for the replication of the Demo projects	Q2-20011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 3.2.2. Develop six national Demo projects based on TDA/SAP priorities	Q3-2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 3.2.3. Submit the replication plan and National Demo Projects to riparian countries for approval	Q3-2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 3.2.4. Incorporate the replication plan in the SAP	Dec-2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A

Overall project implementation progress²³ (*To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect prior years' ratings*):

FY2009 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
S	Work well underway, though partners will inevitably introduce some delays.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. (*To be completed by UNEP Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager*²⁴)

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Prepare and sign collaboration framework agreements with IUCN/PAGEV, EU Volta Initiative and SIAAP Projects	PMU	December 2009
Training of national partners on TDA/SAP process	PMU and consultants will reinforce these aspects throughout the development of TDA and SAP	Thru TDA and SAP development, until end of project
Finalise the regional stakeholders involvement plan	PMU and National Partners	December 2009
Conduct training sessions for national institutions and stakeholders on IWRM and IRB management	EU Volta Project in collaboration with PMU and national partners	Q1-2010
Develop hydrological and coastal hydrodynamic model of the Volta basin and its Downstream Coastal Area	EU Volta Project in collaboration with PMU and national partners	End of the EU Volta Project

²³ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

²⁴ UNEP Fund Management Officer should also be consulted as appropriate.

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Organize TDA starting workshops with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders	PMU	March 2010
Finalise the TDA document	PMU, VBA, UNEP and project partners	Q3 - 2010
The PMU recommends to reduce the scope of the Demonstration Project 2 at the level of the Ewawu quarter and update stress reduction indicators in collaboration with SIAAP. A clear collaboration and coordination mechanism with SIAAP is recommended. Also a field visit to Natitingou is recommended to prepare a briefing note on the implementation of the demo 2 in Natitingou (Bénin) UNOPS should sign MOAs with Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire governments for the implementation of demo 3 UNOPS should sign MOAs with Mali and Burkina Faso governments for the implementation of demo 1	PMU, UNOPS and demo project partners	December 2009

This section should be completed if project **progress** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
N/A			

3.3. Risk

There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** or **High** and who is responsible to for it.

RISK FACTOR TABLE
<p>Project Managers will use this table to summarize risks identified in the Project Document and reflect also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (PM) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (TM). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The UNEP Task Manager should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.</p>

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
INTERNAL RISK																	
Project management																	
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems	X							PM: No comments TM: Potential confusion among partners regarding EU project and its responsibilities.		X				
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear	Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR	X							PM: No comments TM: No comments	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment	X						PM: No comments	X					
										TM: Ok, but TM has few observations on this.						
Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation		X					PM: Delay in feedback from national partners. Delay in receiving feedback from UNEP/DGEF and UNOPS/KeOC on requests sent for budget approval and activities implementation Delay due to the need for the new TM to understand the project and its institutional framework discuss and agree with the PMU on project activities, work plan, roles and responsibilities.		X				
										TM: Agreed.						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
INTERNAL RISK																	
Project management																	
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize			X					PM: Some countries like Côte d'Ivoire and Togo are of the view that their current financial situation could not allow them to honour the co-finance commitments that were originally pledged to the project. Apart from the financial contribution (cash and kind) received from Ghana for both the establishment of the PMU office and the field visit for the review of the Demonstration Project 3, cash contribution pledged by other riparian countries are not redeemed. ECOWAS contribution as parallel funding partner through the EU Volta Project is yet to be effective despite several discussions and negotiations undertaken by the PMU and with VBA support on the issue. TM: Agreed			X			
Budget	Activities are progressing	Minor budget reallocation	Reallocation between budget		X						PM: No comments		X				

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
	within planned budget	needed	lines exceeding 30% of original budget							TM: No comments						
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds	X						PM: No comments		X				
										TM: Delays in financial reporting						
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting	X						PM: No comments		X				
										TM: Some initial discussions on reporting format with new TM, but this is now resolved.						
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from	Consultation and participation process seems strong but	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or	X						PM: No comments	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
	critical stakeholders and partners	misses some groups or relevant partners	evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders								TM: No comments					
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident		X						PM: No comments		X			
											TM: No comments					
Short term/long term balance	Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected	X							PM: No comments	X				
											TM: Too early to tell					
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well	Project testing approaches, methods or	Many scientific and /or technological		X						PM: No comments		X			

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
	established technologies	technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	uncertainties							TA: TDA/SAP methodology is new in the basin and there is a risk that partners do not understand or duplicate planning efforts with, e.g. MasterPlan or IWRM plans. Also uncertainty if new technologies in demo projects will prove useful and sustainable?						
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives	X						PM: No comments	X					
										TM: No comments						
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary																

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																
Political stability	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile		X					PM: Countries are stable, but elections bring a risk of slowed project implementation TM: Agreed		X				
Environmental conditions	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions	X						PM: No comments TM: No comments	X					
Social, cultural and economic factors	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers			X				PM: The overall economic situation makes it difficult for countries to honor co-finance commitments. Also, the prevailing economic conditions will make SAP implementation a challenge. TM: Agreed.			X			

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
EXTERNAL RISK																	
Project context																	
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance			X					PM: Technical and managerial capacity in most of the project countries is limited. This has delayed the project activities and affected its performance. Training gaps have been identified and prioritised and capacity-building activities will be undertaken to address these weaknesses. TM: No comments			X			
Others, please specify																	

If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the **Task Manager** should be provided below

N/A

TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN	
Rank – importance of risk	
Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)	
Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk	
Who – person(s) responsible for the action	
Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed	

Rank	Risk Statement ²⁵		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

FY rating	FY2009rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
No previous ratings	Medium	Co-finance uncertainties, capacity issues and delays associated with demo projects put the overall project at medium risk.
		If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation

²⁵ Only for Substantial to High risk.

4. RATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Based on the answers provided to the questions in 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below, the **UNEP Task Manager** will provide ratings for the following aspects of project monitoring and evaluation:

- (i) Overall **quality** of the Monitoring & Evaluation plan
- (ii) Performance in the **implementation** of the M&E plan

4.1. Does the project M&E plan contain the following:

- Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator Yes No
- SMART indicators to track project outcomes Yes No
- A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. Yes No

4.2. Has the project budgeted for the following M&E activities:

- Mid-term review/evaluation Yes No
- Terminal evaluation Yes No
- Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators' related information Yes No (as part of the demonstration projects)

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): S

4.3 Has the project:

- Utilized the indicators identified in the M&E plan to track progress in meeting the project objectives; Yes No
- Fulfilled the specified reporting requirements (financial, including on co-financing and auditing, and substantive reports) Yes No
- Completed any scheduled MTR or MTE before or at project implementation mid-point; Yes No N/A yet
- Applied adaptive management in response to M&E activities Yes No
- Implemented any existing risk mitigation plan (see previous section) Yes No N/A yet

Please rate the performance in **implementing** the M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): S

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period²⁶

²⁶ Do not include routine project reporting. Examples of M&E activities include stakeholder surveys, field surveys, steering committee meetings to assess project progress, peer review of documentation to ensure quality, etc.

The Project Inception Report was prepared; including the review of the project brief (logframe, activities, work plan, budget, and institutional framework) and the project monitoring and evaluation plan.

The 1st Project Steering Committee meeting took place in Mali (May 2008): the Inception report, including the revised project brief and M&E plan was discussed and approved by the Project Steering Committee members

The 1st National implementation committee meetings were organised in each riparian, countries and the meetings reports shared with the PMU.

The half Yearly report, annual report and annual work plan were prepared by the PMU and shared with UNEP and Project partners

The Monthly reports were prepared by National Operational Focal Points, approved by the National Project Coordinators and shared with the PMU

The Quarterly financial reports and annual budgets were prepared and discussed with UNEP

Some technical reports were prepared at national and regional levels as per the project work plan

4.5. Provide information on the quality of baseline information and any effects (positive or negative) on the selection of indicators and the design of other project monitoring activities

Baseline information for the tracking of stress reduction indicators is very limited. For example, data on water quality (N, P, BOD, COD, etc.), sediment yield into rivers, Water flow, Runoff, Infiltration, Evaporation, Precipitation, Basin protection and Vegetation index are scarce, incomplete and sometimes non-existent. This will affect the monitoring of stress reduction indicators and the general state of the environment as a result of the demonstration projects.

4.6. Provide comments on the usefulness and relevance of selected indicators and experiences in the application of the same.

The initial set of indicators as defined in the initial Project Document was found inadequate. A revised set of indicators has been developed and inserted in M&E Plan developed during the inception period. Nevertheless the monitoring of the stress reduction through the implementation of demo projects could be affected by the lack/quality of data and also the capacity of project partners to collect relevant data and information as expected. It is therefore recommended to review and update stress reduction indicators during the inception phase of each demo project planned for the second semester of 2009.

4.7. Describe any challenges in obtaining data relevant to the selected indicators; has the project experienced problems to cover costs associated with the tracking of indicators?

No problem identified during the reporting period

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions²⁷ are still valid

The fact that the indicators defined in the initial project brief were not appropriate has led to the deep review of the project M&E plan. Even though a proper M&E framework is now in place and functional, stress reduction indicators may be reviewed during the inception phase of the demo projects

4.9. Describe how potential social or environmental negative effects are monitored

Potential social or environmental negative effects will be monitored through the implementation of demo projects

4.10. Please provide any other experiences or lessons relevant to the design and implementation of project monitoring and evaluation plans.

²⁷ Assumptions refer to elements of the “theory of change” or “intervention logic” (*i.e., the problem is a result of A, therefore, if we change B, this will lead to C*) and not to pre-conditions for project implementation. It is a common mistake to include statements such as “political will” as an assumption. This is rather a necessary condition to implement the project.

5. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

5.1. Please summarize any experiences and/or lessons related to project design and implementation. Please select relevant areas from the list below:

- Conditions necessary to achieve global environmental benefits such as (i) institutional, social and financial sustainability; (ii) country ownership; and (iii) stakeholder involvement, including gender issues.
- Institutional arrangements, including project governance: the involvement of national partners from the ministries of water and environment has created opportunity for a better application of IWRM principles. The expansion of this experience at the VBA level will present incremental environmental benefit for the Volta River Basin management
- Engagement of the private sector;
- Capacity building: Capacity of the project partners in the riparian countries is extremely limited. Even if there are highly skilled and committed individuals, they are relatively few in number, and have multiple responsibilities.
- Scientific and technological issues;
- Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines;
- Factors that improve likelihood of outcome sustainability;
- Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies;
- Financial management and co-financing.