

**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2009  
(1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010)**

**1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION**

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

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

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

<b>Geographical Scope:</b>	Regional/Multi-country (Africa)		
<b>Participating Countries:</b>	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali and Togo		
<b>GEF project ID:</b>	1111	<b>IMIS number<sup>1</sup>:</b>	GFL/2328-2731-4957
<b>Focal Area(s):</b>	International waters	<b>GEF OP #:</b>	
<b>GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:</b>		<b>GEF approval date*:</b>	7 August 2006
<b>UNEP approval date:</b>	May 2007	<b>First Disbursement*:</b>	31 July 2007
<b>Actual start date<sup>2</sup>:</b>	July 2007	<b>Planned duration:</b>	48 months
<b>Intended completion date*:</b>	July 2011	<b>Actual or Expected completion date:</b>	December 2012
<b>Project Type:</b>	FSP	<b>GEF Allocation*:</b>	\$5,347,380
<b>PDF GEF cost*:</b>	\$497,500	<b>PDF co-financing*:</b>	\$151,000
<b>Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:</b>	\$10,871,231	<b>Total Cost*:</b>	\$16,867,111
<b>Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):</b>	Not planned yet	<b>Terminal Evaluation (actual date):</b>	N/A
<b>Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):</b>	N/A	<b>No. of revisions*:</b>	1
<b>Date of last Steering Committee meeting:</b>	07-08 April 2010	<b>Date of last Revision*:</b>	January 2010
<b>Disbursement as of 30 June 2010*:</b>	\$2,170,274	<b>Date of financial closure*:</b>	N/A
<b>Date of Completion<sup>3</sup>:</b>	N/A	<b>Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2010<sup>4</sup>:</b>	\$1,862,833
<b>Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2010<sup>5</sup>:</b>	US\$605,300	<b>Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2010*:</b>	\$1,394,571
<b>Leveraged financing:<sup>6</sup></b>	Nil		

<sup>1</sup> Fields with an \* sign (in yellow) should be filled by the Fund Management Officer

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

<sup>3</sup> If there was a "Completion Revision" please use the date of the revision.

<sup>4</sup> Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager

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

<sup>6</sup> See above note on co-financing and Glossary (Annex 1)

<b>Project summary</b> <sup>7</sup>	<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 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>
-------------------------------------	---

<b>Project status FY2009</b> <sup>8</sup>	<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. Upon UNEP recommendation, the second Project Steering Committee</p>
---	---

<sup>7</sup> As in project document

<sup>8</sup> Please include additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any)

	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.
--	---

<b>Project status FY2010<sup>9</sup></b>	Even if there was an initial delay in signing MOAs with riparian countries, the demonstration projects activities are ongoing: establishment of demo project management bodies, organisation of coordination meetings at national level, ongoing preparation of the inception reports by each country (including revue of demo logframe, work plan and budget), construction of wastewater network in Kara (funded by SIAAP). The Volta Basin Information Sharing System has been developed and national partners trained in its use and population in collaboration with the VBA. After initial studies at national and regional levels on stakeholder participation, information exchange and institutions, the project has initiated the process for TDA finalisation and draft TDA reports have been submitted by national consultants.
--	---

<b>Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets<sup>10</sup></b>	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <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 project<sup>11</sup>*

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.

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

<sup>9</sup> Please include additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any)

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> Or immediate project objective

as follows:

- 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

*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 reported period the Project Management Unit (PMU) was fully functional and has executed the project in close collaboration with the Interim Volta Basin Authority and with the support of key institutions/partners (National Focal Points, UNEP/DGEF, UNOPS KEOC). The 6 NOFPs appointed by national authorities have provided support to the National Project Coordinators to manage, on a day-to-day basis, the project activities at the country level. The effectiveness of their contribution was monitored by the PMU through the submission of monthly reports approved by the National Project Coordinators. The PMU organised a training session for National Operational Focal Points on UNOPS procedures, rules and regulations. Study reports were used by different project partners mainly for the scaling up of the PAGEV Project in Togo, the drafting of the Water Charter for the Volta River Basin as well as the preparation and implementation and training plan on IWRM by the EU Volta Project. These reports also form a Framework for the TDA and SAP analyses. The project has developed and trained key partners on the Volta Basin Information Sharing System. Also support was provided to the VBA for the finalisation of its Strategic Plan. As part of its collaboration plan with ongoing initiatives, the project has contributed and/or co-organised joint activities with the IUCN/PAGEV, VB Observatory and the EU Volta Project. The project monitoring and evaluation plan was implemented as per the approved inception report. The main mandatory reports (2008 annual report, 2009 work plan, project implementation report) were prepared by the PMU and approved by the UNEP/DGEF. The 2010 work plan & budget prepared and submitted to PSC for approval.
2. **Specific Objective 2:** The specific objective 2 of the project aims to finalize and agree on a geographically specific, quantitative TDA and contribute to the development of Strategic Action Programme (SAP) and Action Plan for the National Part of the VRB (APNP-VRB) that address issues of priority transboundary concerns. A transboundary diagnostic analysis is an important tool/approach that GEF has adopted towards the development of a Strategic Action Programme. The report of the review of the preliminary TDA was translated into French and widely disseminated through the project network. It presents the gaps of the preliminary TDA, detailed methodology for TDA finalisation and SAP development including work plan and TORs for TDA and SAP experts both at national and regional levels. A concept note on the TDA finalisation was prepared by the PMU to guide the TDA process based on the key findings of the review. It was shared with the UNEP/DGEF and the VBA and adopted as working document. Regional TDA Consultants and national consultants for TDA finalisation were recruited and TDA regional and national planning workshops convened. Thematic TDA meetings were organised at national level and the review of draft national TDA reports submitted by national teams is ongoing.
3. **Specific Objective 3:** Based on the key findings of the review of Demo project documents, the PMU has prepared a concept note for the implementation of each Demo project and organised four planning workshops with national partners and local stakeholders in Burkina Faso and Mali for Demo 1, in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana for Demo 3. MOAs were prepared and signed with

the governments of Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana and Mali. With regard to the Demo Project 2, the construction of the wastewater network in Ewawu area (Kara, Togo) funded by the SIAAP is ongoing and during the joint field visit (PMU and UNEP) conducted in August 2009 a recommendation was made to readjust the Demo Project in Togo by constructing small scale wastewater treatment plants in Ewawu area (Kara city) and connect them to the wastewater networks funded by SIAAP. As for the implementation of the Demo Project 2 in Benin, a field visit conducted by national partners and discussions with them led to the conclusion that the main concern and priority of local stakeholders is the proliferation of aquatic weeds and its impacts on the ecosystems.

*Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document <sup>12</sup>(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 this regard are:

- Operationalization of the project: During the reported period the Project Management Unit (PMU) was fully functional and has executed the project in close collaboration with the Interim Volta Basin Authority and with the support of key institutions/partners (National Focal Points, UNEP/DGEF, UNOPS KEOC)
- Training of NFP on UNOPS procedures, rules and regulation
- Implementation of collaboration framework signed with the VBA
- Volta basin convention entered into force and accord de siege signed between VBA and Burkina Faso government
- Support provided for the finalisation of VBA Strategic Plan
- Participation, contribution, organisation/co-organisation of joint activities (meetings, workshops, trainings) with project partners: EU Volta, IUCN/PAGEV, VB Observatory, WASCAL, GWSP, VBA, GCLME, etc.
- Regional and national TDA planning workshops
- Draft national TDA reports
- Implementation of 3 Demo projects: planning workshops, MOAs signed with riparian countries, management bodies and activities planned for each demo project

---

<sup>12</sup> Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

### 3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**<sup>13</sup> 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 <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<b>Objective 1</b> <sup>18</sup> : Build capacity, improve knowledge, enhance stakeholders' involvement to support the effective management of the VRB						

<sup>13</sup> For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

<sup>14</sup> Add rows if your project has more than 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.

<sup>15</sup> Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).

<sup>16</sup> Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

<sup>17</sup> 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.

<sup>18</sup> 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 <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
Outcome 1.1: Project Managed and coordinated to partners satisfaction	Project management and co-ordination bodies established	None	PMU and all project organs operational and effective		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PMU is fully functional and executing the project in close collaboration with the Volta Basin Authority and with the support of key institutions/partners (National Focal Points, UNEP/DGEF, UNOPS KEOC)</li> <li>• National Operational Focal Points trained on UNOPS procedures, rules and regulations (Accra, November 2009)</li> <li>• 2nd PSC meeting conducted in April 2010.</li> <li>• Several meetings organised at national levels by the NIC (TDA process , National coordination, Demo project, etc)</li> <li>• TORs prepared for UDC technical assistance and discussed with UNEP/DGEF and UDC colleagues</li> </ul>	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<b>Outcome 1.2:</b> <i>Capacity &amp; 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For each riparian country, the ministries in charge of water and environment are represented at the PSC and NIC levels and participating in the project activities</li> </ul>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of key stakeholders, Ongoing and planned initiatives updated. Stakeholders involved in project activities both at national and regional levels (TDA, trainings, demo project, PSC, NIC, etc.)</li> <li>• NOFPs trained on UNOPS procedures, rules and regulations</li> <li>• Support provided to VBA for the finalisation of its programming document and the organisation of coordination meeting with key partners</li> <li>• The collaboration with key project partners is ongoing and the project has contributed to participated in and/or co-organised activities/workshops/meetings with GCLME, GLOWA, IUCN/PAGEV, Volta HYCOS, SIAAP, EU Volta, GWSP, ECOWAS/WRCC, WASCAL, IWMI, GEF Niger, Volta Observatory project.</li> <li>• Support provided by the project for</li> </ul>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	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"> <li>• List of existing metadata within each country updated through different studies undertaken by the project</li> <li>• National and regional partners trained on the Volta Basin Information Sharing System (VB-ISS)</li> <li>• Support provided to IUCN/PAGEV for the training of national partners on IWRM process (Togo)</li> </ul>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan for involving stakeholders in the TDA/SAP implemented and</li> <li>• stakeholders participated in national/regional TDA workshops, meetings, support to consultants for data collection, etc. Key stakeholders involved are: scientist, resources persons (water resources experts, environmentalists, lawyers, and economist, NGO, decentralised communities, etc.</li> </ul>	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidelines for TDA finalisation prepared and discussed with national partners during TDA starting workshops (regional and national) and used for national TDA studies</li> <li>• National partners briefed on TDA Process, methodology adopted for the Volta Basin TDA, their role and responsibility</li> <li>• Workshops and meetings organised during the reported period provided an opportunity for knowledge sharing and exchange, including establishment of network between the GEF-Volta Project partners.</li> </ul>	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<b>Outcome 1.3:</b> <i>Knowledge base expanded &amp; 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volta Basin Information Sharing System (VB-ISS) developed with the support of UNEP/DEWA, discussed with VBA Observatory and used as reference for the training of national partners (March 2010)</li> <li>• The population of the VB-ISS is ongoing : for the moment the population is done in coordination with VB Observatory based on information (meta data) available at the observatory (including those received from countries)</li> <li>• Participation and contribution to different coordination meetings for the Observatory organised by the VBA</li> <li>• Procurement of server equipment to the VBA in support to the operation and population of the VB-ISS</li> </ul>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information related to existing Metadata categories &amp; data hosting institutions updated during the TDA process, shared with VB Observatory and mechanism for the circulation of data and information at national and regional levels discussed with partners during VBO steering committee and during the training on VB ISS.</li> <li>• Preparation of different national and regional thematic maps of the Volta River Basin.</li> <li>• The PMU has also participated in and contributed to different coordination meetings for the Observatory organised by the VBA</li> </ul>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity cancelled owing to similar work being undertaken by VBO with ADB funding</li> </ul>	NA
<b>Objective 2:</b> 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						
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Importance of the VRB Convention and its ratification were discussed with high level authorities during different meetings and workshops</li> <li>5 countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mali and Togo) have signed and deposited the Ratification document</li> <li>Côte d'Ivoire yet to ratify the convention</li> <li>The Volta Basin Convention entered into force on 14 August 2009</li> </ul>	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<b>Outcome 2.2:</b> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TDA national/regional teams established and functional</li> <li>• Detailed methodology, work plan and guideline for TDA development and reports (national/regional) outlines finalised and discussed with key stakeholders</li> <li>• TDA Regional and national starting workshops organised in December 2009 and March 2010</li> <li>• Draft National TDA reports submitted and review by regional consultants is ongoing</li> </ul>	MS
<b>Outcome 2.3:</b> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed methodology and work plan for APNP-VRB development completed and discussed with project partners during TDA programming workshops.</li> </ul>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TDA, SAP and APNP-VRB Methodology developed and reflects IWRM principles and process</li> <li>National IWRM issues analyse through governance analysis during the TDA process</li> </ul>	MS
<b>Outcome 2.4:</b> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed methodology and work plan for SAP development completed and discussed with project partners during TDA programming workshops</li> </ul>	S
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VBA has been involved in the establishment of TDA regional team, the establishment of methodology for TDA finalisation and SAP/APNP-VRB development, including TDA programming workshops.</li> </ul>	MS
<b>Objective 3:</b> Demonstrate national and regional measures to combat transboundary environmental degradation in the Volta Basin						

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<b>Outcome 3.1: 3 Demo Project successfully implemented</b>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning workshops held with national partners in Burkina Faso, Mali, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire for Demo Projects 1 &amp; 3</li> <li>• MOAs prepared and signed with the Governments of Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana for the implementation of Demo 3</li> <li>• MOA prepared and signed with the Government of Mali for the implementation of Demo 1</li> <li>• Relevant technological option for the implementation of DP 2 in Togo identified and discussed with project partners</li> <li>• Coordination/harm onisation discussions conducted with SIAAP and MCA Burkina Faso</li> <li>• Construction of wastewater network in Kara through SIAAP support is ongoing (Demo 2)</li> <li>• Demo projects activities launched in Mali (DP1) and, Côte d'Ivoire/Ghana (DP3): projects bodies established</li> </ul>	U

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	N/A for rating yet

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
	Capacity of local stakeholder and national institutions in charge of forest and water resources management strengthened	None		By end of year 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	N/A for rating yet

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<b>Outcome 3.2<sup>19</sup>:</b> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No progress, pending the approval of inception report of demo projects</li> </ul>	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*)

<b>FY2009 rating</b>	<b>Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods</b>
S/MS	Regional components well underway with quality workplans and processes. Demonstration projects require additional technical support to get quality documents and workplans.
<b>FY2010 rating</b>	<b>Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods</b>
MS	Regional activities, such as TDA/SAP process, now well underway. Some demos are still significantly delayed. This is common at this stage in a project (and therefore not too worrying), but it is highlighted here especially to focus effort on this during the next critically important year of implementation.

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?
Demonstration Projects – During next supervision visit, DGEF and PMU discuss plan for overcoming the remaining challenges with demos and recouping delays.	PMU in consultation with DGEF	March 2011
Maintain momentum in TDA/SAP process	PMU	2010-2011

<sup>19</sup> Add rows if your project has more than 5 Outcomes.

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
-----------------------	----------	----------

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
Delay in the finalisation of the Project stakeholders involvement plan	After discussions with the VBA, the stakeholders involvement plan will be developed in the framework of its Strategic Plan Stakeholders participating in project activities based on TDA/SAP methodology, Demo project institutional framework, trainings, meetings and workshops organised by the PMU, VBA and other partners	Project Management Unit, VBA, National partners	Q4 - 2009
National partners capacity to implement SAP and APNP-VRB	Training needs of national partners identified during national TDA studies and also discussed during thematic workshops organised by the VBA	Project Management Unit, VBA, National partners and Consultants	Q1-Q2 2010
Link between key inter-sectoral transboundary issues TDA and SAP	As part of the TDA guidelines, Key inter-sectoral transboundary issues addressed in the draft national TDA report	PMU, National partners and Consultants	Q2 - 2010
Agreements with Demo project executing agencies	MOAs signed with the governments of Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana and Mali Discussion finalised with SIAAP and MOAs will be signed with SIAAP, Togo and Benin government for the implementation of DP 2 by Q4 - 2010	PMU and UNOPS	Q2 - 2010
Way forward for the implementation of thematic studies	Thematic studies issues raised and discussed during the 2 <sup>nd</sup> PSC meeting, VB Observatory SC meeting, EU Volta Project meetings and different thematic meetings/workshops organised by VBA. During its last meeting, the PSC has approved the PMU recommendation to implement the activity in the framework of the VB Observatory	PMU and project partners	Q4 2009 and Q1-Q2 - 2010

### 3.2 Project implementation progress

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2010 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
<b>Objective 1:</b> Build capacity, improve knowledge, enhance stakeholders' involvement to support the effective management of the VRB				
<b>Output 1:</b> <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%)	Technical support to project execution is weak. A contractual agreement for UDC to provide technical assistance to the project is still pending. Also, in the light of budget constraints, UNOPS and UNEP/DGEF took a decision to suspend the input of the project task force until a point that there were additional project outputs needs. Inadequate feedback on national financial contribution	S
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%)	Collaboration with key partners ongoing as discussed and planned. The project continues to follow up and when necessary strengthen the initiated collaboration arrangement. VBA has remained the coordinating body for this collaboration	MS
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	Reports prepared as planned.	S

<sup>20</sup> Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

<sup>21</sup> As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

<sup>22</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

<sup>23</sup> To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

<b>Outputs</b> <sup>20</sup>	<b>Expected completion date</b> <sup>21</sup>	<b>Implementation status as of 30 June 2010 (%)</b>	<b>Comments if variance</b> <sup>22</sup> . <b>Describe any problems in delivering outputs</b>	<b>Progress rating</b> <sup>23</sup>
		(100%)		
<b>Output 1.2: Capacity &amp; participation of stakeholders in VRB management strengthened</b>				
Activity 1.2.1. Conduct training on TDA/SAP process for NFPs	Q3-2008	Completed (100%)	N/A for this period	MS
Activity 1.2.2. Analysis of national institutions and stakeholders and preparation of stakeholders involvement plan	Dec-2008	Completed (100%)	Reports from consultants completed and the stakeholders involvement plan finalisation transferred to the VBA in the framework of its strategic plan	MU
Activity 1.2.3. Conduct training sessions for national institutions and stakeholders on IWRM and IRB management	Q2-2009		Contribution/participation to training and awareness workshops organised by IUCN/PAGEV, EU Volta, VB Observatory and VBA	MS
Activity 1.2.4. Conduct training sessions for national institutions on data management and monitoring and, clearinghouse system	Q3-2009	50% completed	Training on VB ISS successfully organised by the PMU with the support of UNEP/DEWA	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
<b>Output 1.3: Knowledge based expanded &amp; basin-wide communication mechanism in place</b>				
Activity 1.3.1. Conduct study on data inventory and assessment	Dec-2008	Completed (100%)	Study result used for the establishment of the VB ISS Study result used by VB Observatory, national partners and national/regional consultants for the finalisation of the TDA	S
Activity 1.3.2. Develop hydrological and coastal hydrodynamic model of the Volta basin and its Downstream Coastal Area	June 2010	N/A	This activities has been transferred to the VB Observatory at the end of the EU Volta project and IUCN is providing support to VB Observatory in that regard	MU
Activity 1.3.3. Carry out thematic study on relations between catchments area and stream flow	Q2-2010	N/A	Depends on the outcomes pf hydrology model to be developed by the VB Observatory	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 the outcomes pf hydrology model to be developed by the VB Observatory	N/A
Activity 1.3.5. Support and/or contribute to studies on the	Continuous	Ongoing (80%)	Ongoing as planned	S

<b>Outputs</b> <sup>20</sup>	<b>Expected completion date</b> <sup>21</sup>	<b>Implementation status as of 30 June 2010 (%)</b>	<b>Comments if variance</b> <sup>22</sup> . <b>Describe any problems in delivering outputs</b>	<b>Progress rating</b> <sup>23</sup>
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	This activity has been cancelled	N/A
Activity 1.3.7. Develop and update project website	Continuous	Website developed and regularly updated	Website updated as planned	S
<b>Objective 2:</b> 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				
<b>Output 2.1:</b> <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	100%	VB convention entered into force in 2009	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
<b>Output 2.2:</b> <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	100%	Workshops successfully organised	MS
Activity 2.2.3. Update and complete the TDA document including situation analysis and causal chain analysis	Dec 2010	Ongoing (80%)	Review of draft national TDA reports ongoing	MS
Activity 2.2.4. Organize validation regional workshop with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders	Dec 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 2011	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
<b>Output 2.3:</b> <i>Action Plans for the National Parts of the VRB (APNP-VRB) developed</i>				
Activity 2.3.1. Organize 6 workshops at country level (with	Q1-2010	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A

<b>Outputs</b> <sup>20</sup>	<b>Expected completion date</b> <sup>21</sup>	<b>Implementation status as of 30 June 2010 (%)</b>	<b>Comments if variance</b> <sup>22</sup> . <b>Describe any problems in delivering outputs</b>	<b>Progress rating</b> <sup>23</sup>
national institutions and stakeholders) as input to the APNP-VRBs elaboration				
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
<b>Output 2.4: Strategic Action Programme (SAP) prepared</b>				
Activity 2.4.1. Organize starting regional/national workshops with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders	Jan 2011	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
<b>Objective 3: Demonstrate national and regional measures to combat transboundary environmental degradation in the Volta Basin</b>				
<b>Output 3.1: 3 Demo Project successfully implemented</b>				
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%)	Completed in Q1-2009	MS
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 2012	30%	Burkina Faso Government has signed an agreement with the MCA to support water resources management development, including activities planned much	MS

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2010 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
			earlier by the GEF Volta Project in the Demo area. To avoid confusion and duplication, a coordination meeting was held in Burkina Faso with MCA Burkina Faso and representative of the national water directorate. Most of the budget for the DP1 was therefore reallocated to Mali Government in the framework of the MOA signed for the DP 1 implementation	
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 2012	50%	Network construction in Kara ongoing (80% completed) through SIAAP support: activities on track in Togo SIAAP is yet to received the report of feasibility study on appropriate treatment technology The project will sign MOA with SIAAP (100 000\$) upon approval of SIAAP board during its upcoming meeting (Quarter 3 - 2010) Discussions are ongoing with Benin partners for the preparation of project document	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 2012	30%	MOAs signed with Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana and project implementation is ongoing	MS
Activity 3.1.5. Evaluate the implementation of the three Demo projects	Dec 2012	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
<b>Output 3.2:</b> <i>Replication strategy for demonstration project developed and initiated</i>				
Activity 3.2.1. Develop a plan for the replication of the Demo projects	Q2-2012	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 3.2.2. Develop six national Demo projects based on TDA/SAP priorities	Q3-2012	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A
Activity 3.2.3. Submit the replication plan and National Demo	Q3-2012	N/A	N/A for this period	N/A

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2010 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
Projects to riparian countries for approval				
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 progress<sup>24</sup> (*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.
FY2010 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
MS	Delays and challenges with demos now impacting implementation progress. Getting all of the demos on track (and at the same time, not delaying the SAP process too much) should be main priorities. Some delays in management processes (e.g. vehicle procurement and UDC contract).

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. (*To be completed by UNEP Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager<sup>25</sup>*)

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Demonstration Projects – During next supervision visit, DGEF and PMU discuss plan for overcoming the remaining challenges with demos and recouping delays.	PMU in consultation with DGEF	March 2011
Maintain momentum in TDA/SAP process	PMU	2010-2011
Increased information exchange between EA and IA	UNOPS circulates trip reports and monthly updates.	August 2010

<sup>24</sup> 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)

<sup>25</sup> UNEP Fund Management Officer should also be consulted as appropriate.

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
Collaboration framework agreements with IUCN/PAGEV, EU Volta Initiative and SIAAP Projects	The EU Volta Project started its activities in October 2009 but the project ended in December 2009 and the VBA has taken over the project including the results and planned activities. There is an ongoing collaboration between VBA and IUCN/PAGEV. In view of this, the collaboration agreement between the GEF Volta Project and the VBA has taken into consideration relationship between the GEF Volta project and other Volta basin related projects including the IUCN/PAGEV and EU Volta projects. SIAAP office yet to communicate to the PMU the non objection from its board on the need to sign a collaboration agreement with the GEF Volta Project	PMU, VBA, SIAAP	Since Q3-2009
Training of national partners on TDA/SAP process	Training need highlighted in draft TDA national reports and also partners capacity discussed during TDA regional/national planning workshops	PMU, Consultants, NFP	Since December 2009
Regional stakeholders involvement plan	This activity has been transferred to the VBA in the framework of its strategic plan	PMU	Q3-2009
Training sessions for national institutions and stakeholders on IWRM and IRB management	Training workshops organised by EU Volta project and IUCN/PAGEV	EU Volta Project and IUCN/PAGEV	Q4-2009
Hydrological and coastal hydrodynamic model of the Volta basin and its Downstream Coastal Area	Partially conducted by EU Volta project and ongoing in the framework of the VB Observatory	EU Volta Project, VB Observatory	Since Q4-2009
TDA starting workshops with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders	Completed	PMU and national partners	Q4 2009 and Q1-2010
Final TDA document	Ongoing as planned	PMU, VBA, UNEP and project partners	Since Q2 2009
Collaboration and coordination mechanism with SIAAP Field visit to Natitingou is recommended MOAs with Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire governments for the implementation of demo 3	PMU and SIAAP office agreed on the content of the collaboration framework but SIAAP office is yet to communicate to the PMU the non objection from its board on the need to sign a collaboration agreement with the GEF Volta Project 1 <sup>st</sup> Field visit to Natitingou undertaken by national partners MOAs signed with the governments of Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana	PMU, SIAAP NFP Benin UNOPS, PMU NFP Mali, Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana	From Q3 2009 to Q2 - 2010

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
MOAs with Mali and Burkina Faso governments for the implementation of demo 1	and Mali for the implementation of Demo 3 and 1		

### 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

**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.

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	
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project management</b>																	
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	X					
											TM: No comment						
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	X					
											TM: No comments						

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
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
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: Fluid and cordial communications, but sometimes TM has to chase information and updates						
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: No comments			X			
										TM: Major delays in contracting UDC, procuring vehicle and demos.						

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	
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project management</b>																	
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. TM: Agreed			X			
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget	X							PM: No comments TM: No comments		X				
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 TM: Significant delays in financial reporting		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
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
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 critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders	X						PM: No comments	X					
										TM: No comments						
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners 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
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
	understand project and are regularly updated on progress	successfully transmitted	misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident							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 established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties		X					PM: No comments		X				
										TM: 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?						

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
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
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
<b>EXTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project context</b>																
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
<b>EXTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project context</b>																
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. The Project is its partners are addressing this issue with VBA coordination 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 <sup>26</sup>		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.
		<b>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</b>

<sup>26</sup> 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 period<sup>27</sup>

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

<sup>27</sup> 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.

project monitoring and evaluation plan.

- The 1<sup>st</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 implementation of each demo project

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 assumptions<sup>28</sup> 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.

---

<sup>28</sup> 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:

Special request from GEF Sec for FY10 is to highlight Best Practices and Lessons learned from the following categories:

- i. CLO1<sup>29</sup>: Enhancing social impacts through the improved understanding of the causal relationships between environmental management and local community welfare
- ii. CLO2: Enhancing the catalytic effect of GEF financing with the aim of: identifying, scaling up and replicating best practices, improving the science evidence base to develop projects, strategies and policies, and capturing learning from demonstrations across all focal areas.
- iii. CLO3: Enhancing the impact of capacity development support provided across focal areas: The project has helped in strengthening the capacity of the Volta Basin Authority and its country partners to develop its Strategic Plan. Indeed, during its interim phase efforts were made to develop VBA strategic plan; however due to technical capacity and weak VBA national partners involvement, the strategic plan could not be finalized. To address this concern and challenge and ensure that the VBA has a strategic basis for the fulfillment of its mandate the GEF Volta Project provided support for the programming of the VBA activities and the development of its strategic plan. This plan was discussed during VBA expert meeting and approved during VBA ministerial council meeting.
- iv. CLO4 : Improving performance monitoring at project and portfolio level

If the Lessons Learned from this project does not fit the above CLO categories, please provide them in the relevant categories 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: the approach by which the project engages with community partners and government institutions is different from the one of private sector. This sometimes constitutes a challenge to finalise financial agreement between the project and private sector like SIAAP for the implementation of the demo project 2 in Togo

---

<sup>29</sup> CLO: Corporate Learning Objective of GEF Sec.

- Capacity building: combining capacity building activities with similar project partners help to reduce capacity building cost while achieving better result. For example the facilitation support provided to IUCN project for training of national partners in Togo, co-organisation of joint workshops with IUCN/PAGEV and VB Observatory on groundwater, agricultural water and Volta Basin Information Sharing system has help to reduce individual project commitment while reaching expected results
- Scientific and technological issues;
- Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines: The project globally used TDA approach toward the creation of knowledge base to develop the action plan for the basin. This reduces the stress and rigour of reinventing approaches to understand the root cause of the problems in the basin ;
- Factors that improve likelihood of outcome sustainability;
- Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies;
- Financial management and co-financing: it's difficult to mobilise cash co-finance contribution pledged by riparian countries during the project development phase