

**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2011  
(1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012)**

**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>• InterimGuineaCurrent 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>   | 22 May 2007          | <b>First Disbursement*:</b>   | 31 July 2007       |
| <b>Actual start date<sup>2</sup>:</b>                              | 31 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>                       | January 2011         | <b>Terminal Evaluation (actual date):</b>                           | N/A                |
| <b>Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):</b>                        | July 2011            | <b>No. of revisions*:</b>   | 2                  |
| <b>Date of last Steering Committee meeting:</b>                    | 28 February 2012     | <b>Date of last Revision*:</b>                                      | 13 March 2012      |
| <b>Disbursement as of 30 June 2012*:</b>                           | US \$4,134,726       | <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 2012<sup>4</sup>:</b> | US \$3,441,747     |
| <b>Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2012<sup>5</sup>:</b> | US \$4,105,711       | <b>Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2012*:</b>     | US \$3,205,975     |
| <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<sup>7</sup></b> | <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<sup>8</sup></b> | <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. 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> <p>Upon UNEP recommendation, the second Project Steering Committee meeting was postponed. After initial studies at national and regional</p> |
|--|---|

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

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>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.</p>  |
| <p><b>Project status<br/>FY2010</b></p> | <p>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.</p>  |
| <p><b>Project status<br/>FY2011</b></p> | <p>During the reported period, six national TDA reports have been drafted and reviewed by the PMU and TDA Regional Experts. In view of the regional TDA finalization, the causal chain analysis has been conducted and regional thematic reports on water resources, ecosystems, economy and governance are currently under review.</p> <p>The population of the VB ISS is still going on as planned and the project has contributed to support VBA coordination activities including the establishment of the observatory and implementation of joint activities with key project partners and capacity building activities (training and awareness creation).</p> <p>Despite the initial delays in starting the demonstration projects, their implementation is ongoing though there have been some challenges e.g. in Cote d'Ivoire (owing to security) and Benin (planning activities).</p>   |
| <p><b>Project status<br/>FY2012</b></p> | <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. The MTE was conducted and its recommendations including PMU management response discussed during the 4<sup>th</sup> PSC meeting.</p> <p>During the reported period, thematic reports on basin water resources, ecosystems, governance analysis and economic status were prepared by TDA regional experts. The regional TDA document has also been prepared, reviewed, updated and translated into French. SAP team established at national and regional level and, note for SAP development prepared (including its link with VB water charter and master plan, methodology and updated work plan) and SAP methodology and work plan updated. Preparation of TDA validation and SAP workshop completed. The population of the VB ISS is still going on as planned and the project has contributed to support VBA coordination activities including the establishment of the observatory, stakeholder's forum, contribution/review of studies and implementation of joint activities with key project partners and capacity building activities (training and awareness creation). Despite the initial delays in starting the demonstration projects, their implementation is ongoing.</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets<sup>9</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>10</sup>*

|   |
|---|
| <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"> <li>• Specific Objective n° 1: Build capacity, improve knowledge, and enhance stakeholders involvement to support the effective management of the VRB</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Specific Objective n° 3: Demonstrate national and regional measures to combat transboundary environmental degradation in the Volta Basin</li> </ul> |
|---|

<sup>9</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>10</sup> Or immediate project objective

Please provide a narrative of progress made towards meeting the project objective(s). Describe any **significant** environmental or other changes (results) 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 this reporting 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 project staff was trained and regularly updated on UNOPS procedures, rules and regulations and also participated in the training workshop organised by UNOPS KEOC on UNOPS project management methodology and implementation. The 4<sup>th</sup> Project Steering Committee Meeting was held in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire in February 2012 and participants were briefed on the status of the implementation of project activities planned for year 2011, the work plan and budget for 2012 and challenges faced by the project since 2008. Support was provided to the VBA for the review, editing, printing and dissemination of its strategic plan as recommended during the VBA Expert and VBA Council of Ministers meetings. Study reports were disseminated, and used by different project partners and also for the TDA and SAP analyses. The population of the Volta Basin Information Sharing System is still going on as planned. As part of its collaboration plan with ongoing initiatives, the project has contributed and/or co-organised joint activities with the IUCN/PAGEV and, VB Observatory mainly. The project monitoring and evaluation plan was implemented as per the approved inception report. The main mandatory reports (2011 annual report, 2012 work plan, project implementation report, quarterly and financial reports) were prepared by the PMU and approved by the UNEP/DGEF and the PSC. The MTE was completed and report discussed during the 4<sup>th</sup> PSC meeting. Upon VBA request, the budget allocated for awareness raising campaigns on IRB management for stakeholders has been reallocated to support the organisation of VBA 2nd Technical forum extended to discussions on stakeholders involvement. Nevertheless, sensitization and awareness creation activities were conducted during various field visits: implementation of Demo 3 in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire, Demo 1 in Burkina Faso and Mali and Demo 2 in Togo, IUCN/PAGEV activities in Ghana, Burkina Faso and Togo. IWRM, IRB management, transboundary water and associated environmental issues, agricultural practices, land and river bank degradation were discussed with stakeholders at the local and grassroots levels.
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 a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) and Action Plan for the National Parts 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. This reporting period was mainly dedicated to the finalisation of the TDA document of the Volta River Basin both at national and regional level with a strong implication of major stakeholders involved in the sustainable management of water and associated environmental resources of the basin. Thematic reports on basin water resources, ecosystems, governance analysis and economic status were prepared by TDA regional experts, reviewed and commented by the PMU and finalised. Thematic reports were updated with long delays affecting the overall process mainly the validation of the regional TDA and the launching of the SAP process both at national and regional level. The regional TDA document has been drafted, reviewed by key partners, updated and translated into French. TORs for SAP consultants prepared and SAP team established at national and regional level. Note for SAP development prepared (including its link with VB water charter and master plan) and SAP methodology and work plan updated. Preparation of TDA validation and SAP workshop completed (TORs, information note, involvement of decision makers and stakeholders, etc.)
3. **Specific Objective 3:** Based on the revised Demo Project documents, discussions with national partners and MOAs signed with countries, national project implementation bodies are

implementing the Demo Projects as per updated work plans and budgets. As result of a study funded by MCA Burkina Faso for the development of the early warning system in the framework of the Demo Project 1, the HEC-RAS model has been chosen as the hydrological model for flood forecasting including management, rehabilitation and management of the Lery Dam. Its adaptation to the project area is completed. Testing of the model is ongoing and MCA Burkina Faso will share the first results and organise training for partners from Mali and Burkina Faso shortly. In Mali the collection of data needed to run the hydrological model is ongoing. **With regard to the Demo Project 2 in Togo**, MOA was drafted by the PMU, reviewed by SIAAP and national partners (Togo), shared with UNEP for non-objection, and signed by UNOPS KEOC and SIAAP. The construction of the wastewater network initially planned (about 5000 linear meters) in Ewawu area (Kara, Togo) and funded by the SIAAP has been completed. Several studies were conducted on the construction of a small scale treatment plant and its connection to the network in Ewawu area. Also, the environmental impacts assessment and the feasibility study for the connection of mosques, schools, restaurants and other major public/private institutions to the network were completed and the reports are available. Kara Municipality organised several sensitisation and awareness creation activities mainly in the framework of the resettlement and water and environmental sanitation issues were addressed during this exercise. In **Benin**, the Demo brief has been prepared and grant agreement signed by UNOPS and Benin government. Inception phase of the Demo is ongoing. As for the **Demo project 3**, the PMU is yet to receive updated project stress reduction indicators, work plan and budget but the other activities are ongoing as planned. Project Management Structures established in the 2 countries are functioning while administrative assistance/support appointment still pending in Cote d'Ivoire. A Joint Water Resources Commission/Ministry of Environment/GEF-Volta Project monitoring mission was organised to support project implementation in Ghana. Also Project implementation activities assigned to partners' are ongoing as per work plan following the community entry phase. Support was provided to national institutions for a better understanding of key issues addressed by Demo 3. Several consultative meetings and discussions were organised in demo side (Ghana) and nurseries established in Ghana side for subsequent planting in view of river bank protection (about 15000 seedling of different species as at reporting period). Discussions were held with Côte d'Ivoire partners on project implementation which is picking up following the resolution of the political crises in the country. Also, trainings, awareness creation and reforestation activities were conducted and according to information received from national partners 12 000 seedlings were raised during the reported period.

*Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document <sup>11</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/GEF, UNOPS KEOC)
- Training/updating of PMU staff on UNOPS procedures, rules and regulation, project management
- TDA prepared, reviewed, updated and translated into French
- SAP process ongoing: Team established at national and regional level, implementation note completed, methodology and work plan updated
- 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
- Development of the VB ISS and its ongoing population
- Support provided for the review and editing of VBA Strategic Plan

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

- Participation, contribution, organisation/co-organisation of joint activities (meetings, workshops, trainings) with project partners: IUCN/PAGEV, VB Observatory, WASCAL, GWSP, VBA, GCLME, etc.
- Finalisation of national TDA reports
- Regional TDA document regional TDA thematic reports drafted, reviewed and updated
- Implementation of Demo projects in riparian countries as per demo work plans and approved budgets



### 3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**<sup>12</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 Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline | Mid-term target                                      | End of Project Target | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012  | Rating |
|---|---|----------|--|-----------------------|--|--------|
| Outcome 1.1:<br><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 |                       | <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>• Project staff trained and regularly updated on UNOPS policy, administrative instructions, procedures, rules and regulation (including UN mandatory courses, Prince 2 and project Management Certification)</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup>PSC meeting conducted in February 2012.</li> <li>• Several meetings organised at national levels by the NIC (TDA/SAP process, National coordination, Demo project, etc): at national level, project activities have been jointly implemented by ministries</li> </ul> | S      |

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

| Project Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline     | Mid-term target  | End of Project Target   | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012  | Rating |
|---|---|--------------|--|---|--|--------|
|   |   |              |  |   | charge of water and environment; recruitment of consultants, meeting, workshops, review of national/regional reports, implementation of demo projects, policy briefs, etc.   |        |
| <b>Outcome 1.2:</b><br><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                        |              | (None)   | 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 and are participating in the project activities</li> </ul>  | S      |
|   | 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.</li> <li>Stakeholders involved in project activities both at national and regional levels (TDA, trainings, demo project, PSC, NIC, etc.)</li> <li>NOFPs updated new /amended UNOPS procedures, rules and regulations</li> <li>Abridged version of the VBA Strategic plan prepared and translated into French. Proposed design has been discussed and agreed upon with the VBA. Printing company selected on competitive basis and selection report approved by UNOPS KEOC. Printing completed and document disseminated</li> <li>The collaboration with key project partners is ongoing and the project has contributed to, participated in and/or co-organised activities, workshops or meetings with GCLME, GLOWA, IUCN/PAGEV, Volta HYCOS, SIAAP, GWSP, WASCAL, IWMI, and Volta Observatory.</li> </ul> | S      |

| Project Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline | Mid-term target | End of Project Target | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012   | Rating |
|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|--------|
|                  |           |          |                 |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project supported and financed the VBA for the organisation of its second technical forum involving major VBA partners and stakeholders both at regional, national and local levels. The forum debated how to harmonize various water related initiatives in the basin, including the GEF project.</li> <li>• Support provided to IUCN/PAGEV for the preparation of PAGEV 3</li> <li>• Participation of project team (including national focal points, VBA, representatives of ongoing initiatives, local stakeholders and NGOs) in several meetings, mainly: IUCN PAGEV 11th and 12th steering committee meetings, ii 6th GEF Biennial International Waters Conference, 1st African Regional Targeted Workshop for GEF IW Projects., 1st regional forum on the status of water quality in the Volta Basin, Volta Basin water audit validation workshop, etc.</li> <li>• Contribution to the preparation and participation in: i-) the 3rd VBA ground water workshop, ii-) the first VBA workshop on water related diseases held in Benin in August 2011, iii-) 1st Meeting of the Forum of Parties Involved in the Development of the Basin held in Burkina Faso in January 2012,</li> <li>• The Project has participated in the Meeting of the Forum of Parties Involved in the</li> </ul> |        |

| Project Outcomes | Indicator  | Baseline | Mid-term target                                  | End of Project Target  | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012   | Rating |
|------------------|--|----------|--|--|---|--------|
|                  |  |          |  |  | Development of the Basin held in Ouagadougou Burkina Faso in January 2012, the Volta Basin Authority's (VBA) 5th meeting of the Experts Committee and its 4th Meeting of the Council of Ministers of the VBA held February 2012 in Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire  |        |
|                  | 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>The reports (national and regional) of the study on data inventory and assessment, including data sharing mechanism, training gaps and training plan were disseminated during the reporting period and used as guideline/reference for the preparation of regional TDA reports and other studies conducted by various partners at national and regional levels</li> <li>List of existing metadata within each country updated during the TDA process</li> <li>Volta Basin Information Sharing System (VB-ISS) development discussed with key project partners. The population of the VB-ISS is on-going; the population is currently being done by VB Observatory (with the support of UNEP DEWA and PMU) based on information (meta data) available at the observatory (including those received from countries)</li> </ul> | MS     |
|                  | 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 Stakeholders participated in national/regional TDA/SAP discussions/meetings, meetings,</li> </ul>   | S      |

| Project Outcomes | Indicator   | Baseline | Mid-term target   | End of Project Target  | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012  | Rating |
|------------------|---|----------|---|--|--|--------|
|                  |   |          |   |  | <p>provided support to consultants for data collection, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft regional TDA report shared and commented on by project stakeholders</li> <li>• Key stakeholders involved are: scientists, resources persons (water resources experts, lawyers, environmentalists, and economist), NGO, project partners, national/regional institutions, decentralized communities, etc: national/regional TDA planning/validation workshops, national thematic meetings, data and information collection, review on various TDA reports (nation/regional TDA, regional thematic TDA documents, etc), advocacy in view of the involvement of high level authorities, etc.</li> </ul> |        |
|                  | 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<br><br><i>by incorporating SAP priorities into other national and/or regional initiatives</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshops and meetings organized during the reported period provided an opportunity for knowledge sharing and exchange, including establishment of network between the GEF-Volta Project partners. During these workshops, project partners were regularly updated on development related to the TDA/SAP: presentation of TDA/SAP methodology/concept, its implication for the Volta River Basin and the role of national/regional institutions, key findings of the Volta Basin TDA (including priority problems and areas of</li> </ul>   | MS     |

| Project Outcomes  | Indicator  | Baseline  | Mid-term target                              | End of Project Target                                     | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012  | Rating |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|--------|
|   |  |   |  |   | concerns, governance analysis and socioeconomic context)   |        |
| <b>Outcome 1.3:</b><br><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>Equipment procured (server, ArcGIS hardware and associated accessories) in 2009 and development completed in 2010.</li> <li>The VB ISS data set hosted by UNEP DEWA has been migrated to the VBA server host. Also the Volta Basin data portal page was developed and linked with the VBA web page and this is be the point of access for all data portal related to Volta Basin.</li> <li>The population of the VB-ISS by VBA is ongoing as planned. It's difficult to quantify the quality of information at the present stage. Major data are: hydrometeorological data, socioeconomic data, data on basin ecosystem, existing reports, documents, maps and metadata</li> <li>Participation and contribution to different coordination meetings of the Observatory organized by the VBA</li> </ul> | MS     |
|   | 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>Participation to VBA and VBO meetings, workshops (see above) and i-) contribution to 2 key studies on the assessment of the basin's socioeconomic and environmental situation and analysis of the problem areas and issues regarding sustainable management of water resources, ii-)</li> </ul>   | MS     |

| Project Outcomes   | Indicator   | Baseline   | Mid-term target   | End of Project Target  | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012  | Rating |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--------|
|  |   |  |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>updating of the basin water audit, iii) stakeholders meeting and fora, etc.</li> <li>Sharing of data and information collected during the TDA process</li> <li>CHM is functional and supports the observatory operations: studies, basin characterisation and monitoring, information, sensitization, and awareness creation, development of indicators, HYCOS Project, etc.</li> </ul>                       |        |
|  | 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>  | N/A    |
| <b>Outcome 2.1: VRB regional coordination mechanisms supported</b> | 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>The Convention entered into force in August 2009.</li> <li>During the reported period, Côte d'Ivoire has joined the other 5 riparian countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mali and Togo) by ratifying and depositing the ratification document</li> <li>Importance of the VRB Convention and its ratification were discussed with high level authorities during different meetings and workshops</li> </ul> | HS     |
| <b>Outcome 2.2: Transboundary</b>                                  | TDA revised, finalized and endorsed by the Project Steering committee | Preliminary TDA prepared   | TDA endorsed by the project Steering                        | TDA endorsed by the project Steering committee and   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several TDA discussions organised with VBA, UNEP, UDC and other key partners</li> <li>Six national TDA documents completed</li> </ul>   | MS     |

| Project Outcomes  | Indicator  | Baseline  | Mid-term target                  | End of Project Target                        | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012   | Rating |
|---|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| <i>Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) updated and finalised</i>  |  | under PDF-B phase of the project                              | committee by the end of year 2   | informing management                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 Thematic reports prepared by TDA regional experts, reviewed and finalised: Ecosystems, Water resources, Governance and Economy.</li> <li>• Additional data and information collected</li> <li>• Regional TDA document drafted, , UDC, VBA, VBO and other resource persons, updated, translated into French and shared with project partners</li> <li>• Due to budget constraints the validation workshop has been combined with SAP planning workshop scheduled for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter of 2012 and will be reflected in the next PIR</li> </ul>  |        |
| <b>Outcome 2.3:</b><br><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>• Taking into consideration national development in terms of IWRM and, to avoid duplication, it has been decided to prepare Action Sheets for the National Part of the Volta River Basin (ASNP-VRB) which will be annexed to the SAP document. Indeed, plan to addressed problems in national parts of the basin are part of national IWRM plans</li> <li>• National Action Sheet template with associated guidelines have been prepared, translated into French and shared with project partners</li> <li>• TORs for the recruitment of national facilitators in view of the development of ASNP-VRB prepared, reviewed and finalised by PMU and shared with national partners</li> </ul> | MS     |



| Project Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline  | Mid-term target  | End of Project Target   | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012  | Rating |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--------|
|   |   |   |  |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work plan updated and note for the implementation of the SAP process including (ASNP-VRB) prepared taking into consideration experience of west Africa international river basins, ongoing and planned initiative and VBA context</li> <li>• National facilitators recruited and grant agreements with countries prepared by UNOPS</li> <li>• Transboundary issues to be addressed by the ASNP-VRB discussed during national/regional meetings, workshops, and also in national/regional TDA documents and regional thematic reports</li> </ul> |        |
|   | 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 | APNP-VRB process highlighted for mainstreaming into national IWRM processes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major inter-sectoral transboundary issues highlighted both in national TDA and IWM plans and links discussed during various TDA and IWRM meetings and workshops organised at regional and national levels</li> </ul>  | MS     |
| <b>Outcome 2.4:</b><br><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  | SAP endorsed at ministerial level by the end of year 4                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several conceptual and coordination discussions/meetings with UNEP, VBA, UDC and other partners</li> <li>• Action Sheet template with associated guidelines have been prepared, translated into French</li> </ul>   | MS     |

| Project Outcomes | Indicator   | Baseline  | Mid-term target                                       | End of Project Target   | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012   | Rating |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
|                  |   |   | processes   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TORs for the recruitment of SAP regional consultants prepared, reviewed and finalised by PMU</li> <li>• SAP regional team established on a competitive basis</li> <li>• Note for the implementation of the Volta Basin SAP process prepared taking into consideration experience of west Africa international river basins, ongoing and planned initiative and VBA context (mainly its plan to also have a water charter and master plan)</li> <li>• Key steps of the Volta Basin SAP process (including roles, responsibilities and deadlines) prepared and discussed with key partners</li> <li>• Transboundary issues to be addressed by the SAP discussed during national/regional meetings, workshops, and also in national/regional TDA documents and regional thematic reports</li> <li>• TORs and agenda of the SAP planning workshop finalised and workshop rescheduled to July/August 2012 taking into consideration availability constraints of important stakeholders</li> </ul> |        |
|                  | Volta Basin Authority (VBA) adopts SAP into their work plan | Volta River Basin Authority established in 2007 but with no SAP | 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The VBA has been involved in the TDA/SAP process: establishment and review of national TDA reports and regional thematic reports, regional TDA document, national/regional TDA/SAP workshops and meetings; preparation of</li> </ul>   | MS     |

| Project Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline  | Mid-term target                                      | End of Project Target                | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012  | Rating  |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
|   |   | to implement or other strategic planning of activities based on agreed priorities |  | Convention by the end of year 4      | <p>TORs for the recruitment of SAP national/regional consultants, outlines and guidelines of various reports, discussions on TDA/SA methodology and work plan, link between Volta Basin SAP, water charter and master plan, etc:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VBA collaboration framework includes commitment to endorse the project outcomes</li> </ul>   |   |
| <b>Outcome 3.1:</b><br><i>3 Demo Project successfully implemented</i> | 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 | <p><b>Demo Project 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upon MTE and PSC recommendations, MOA signed with Mali government has been extended to 31 December 2012</li> <li>• National project implementation bodies established in Mali and functional.</li> <li>• Inception report finalised and disseminated</li> <li>• Support provided to project team in Mali for the budget reallocation, updating of demo work plan and implementation of planned activities</li> <li>• Organisation of coordination meetings with MCA Burkina Faso and national partners (Mali and/or Burkina Faso) for the implementation of the Demo Project</li> <li>• Adaptation of the hydrological HEC RAS model to the basin area has been completed. Testing of the model has been completed but MCA Burkina Faso is yet to share the 1<sup>st</sup> results.</li> <li>• In Mali, Collection of data needed to run the hydrological model is on-going as planned and hydro-meteorological</li> </ul> | <p>Demo 1: MU</p> <p>Demo 2 Togo: S</p> <p>Demo 2 Benin: MU</p> <p>Demo 3: MS</p> <p>Overall: MS/MU</p> |

| Project Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline | Mid-term target | End of Project Target | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012  | Rating |
|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|--------|
|                  |           |          |                 |                       | <p>equipment procured and installed well-maintained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GIS mapping of the project area in Burkina Faso updated. Its extension to the project area in Mali discussed and planned with national partners and MCA Burkina Faso and budget reallocation for bathymetric measurement in Mali side completed</li> <li>• The project has contributed to the establishment of the bilateral committee in view of a joint management of the basin funded by the IUCN Sourou IWRM project</li> </ul> <p><b>Demo Project 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report of the study on the appropriate technology for the construction of the small scale treatment plant and its connection to the network in Ewawu area has been reviewed and validated by SIAAP, the GEF Volta Project and Kara Municipality.</li> <li>• The construction of the wastewater network initially planned (about 5000 linear meters) in Ewawu area (Kara, Togo) and funded by SIAAP has been completed during the reported period.</li> <li>• Study for the construction of the additional collector linking the network to the treatment plant completed.</li> <li>• Study for the construction of the treatment plant has been completed and the option envisaged is the construction of small scale treatments plants and the outlet of the 3 tertiary wastewater networks</li> </ul> |        |

| Project Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline | Mid-term target | End of Project Target | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012   | Rating |
|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|--------|
|                  |           |          |                 |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feasibility study completed and report available. Sensitisation of Ewawu's inhabitants in ongoing</li> <li>• Pending the completion of the treatment plants</li> <li>• Kara Municipality organised several sensitisation and awareness creation activities mainly in the framework of the resettlement and water and environmental sanitation issues were addressed during this exercise</li> <li>• In Benin the Demo Document has been prepared, reviewed by PMU and finalised. This includes (situation analysis, logframe, activities, work plan, institutional framework, budget</li> <li>• MOA drafted by the PMU, reviewed by Benin Partners and signed by UNOPS KOEC and Benin Directorate of environment</li> <li>• Establishment of Demo Team in Benin is ongoing and inception workshop planned for August 2012.</li> </ul> <p><b>Demo Project 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upon MTE and PSC recommendations, MOAs signed with the governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana have been extended to 31 December 2012</li> <li>• National project implementation bodies established and functional.</li> <li>• Demo project activities are ongoing as planned. Project Management Structures</li> </ul> |        |

| Project Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline | Mid-term target | End of Project Target | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012   | Rating |
|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|--------|
|                  |           |          |                 |                       | <p>established in the 2 countries are functioning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organisation of coordination meetings with national partners in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire for the implementation of the Demo Project</li> <li>• Inception phase of the Demo project completed in the 2 countries and project partners mobilised for activities' implementation</li> <li>• Project implementation partners' activities are ongoing as per work plan following the community entry phase. Support provided to national institutions for a better understanding of key issues addressed by Demo 3. Several consultative meetings and discussions were organised in demo side and nurseries established in Ghana side for subsequent planting in view of river bank protection (about 15000 seedlings of different species as at reporting period).</li> <li>• In Côte d'Ivoire, project implementation is picking up following the resolution of the political crises in Côte d'Ivoire. Also, reforestation activities were conducted and according to information received from national partners 12 000 seedlings were raised during the reported period</li> <li>• Community awareness carried out at project hotspot and initial community entry discussion undertaken to establish</li> </ul> |        |

| Project Outcomes  | Indicator  | Baseline | Mid-term target                 | End of Project Target  | Project Manager Report 30 June 2012   | Rating |
|---|--|----------|---------------------------------|--|---|--------|
|   |  |          |                                 |  | <p>community implementation committees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trainings on Improved Charcoal production conducted, and the preparation for the flood monitoring and river channels dredging have been completed in Ghana, while awareness creation activities have been conducted in Côte d'Ivoire.</li> </ul> <p><b>Demo Projects. Midterm evaluation3</b><br/>Report of the 3 Demo midterm evaluation finalized and discussed during the 4<sup>th</sup> PSC meeting</p> |        |
| <b>Outcome 3.2<sup>13</sup>:</b><br><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>• <b>Removed from project work plan following MTE assessment</b></li> </ul>  | NA     |

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.   |
| <b>FY2011 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods</b>  |
| MU                   | Implementation challenges (e.g. resignation of TDA Team Leader, security situation in Cote d'Ivoire, various challenges with demos) are now seriously impacting the progress towards achieving project objectives. An additional no cost extension of a year will be necessary to complete the TDA/SAP process and the demo projects. |
| <b>FY2012 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods</b>  |
|                      |   |

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?      |
|--|-----------------------|---------------|
| Better document the involvement of stakeholders in TDA/SAP process   | PMU                   | March 2013    |
| Finalise the TDA document and prepare a draft SAP by December 2012   | PMU/UNEP              | December 2012 |
| Document the population of the VB ISS and make it online to key stakeholders selected by VBA, including UNEP and GEF   | PMU/VBA               | December 2012 |
| Finalize the update of project website, including recent documents and information   | PMU                   | December 2012 |
| Demo Project: conduct field visits, support demo team for the review of work plan and budget reallocation, better monitor the implementation update demo work plan | PMU, Demo Teams, NIFP | January 2013  |

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                     |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Following recommendations of the MTE, reallocate project | Project budget has been reallocated to support the TDA/SAP process | PMU in collaboration with UNEP, VBA | November – December 2011 |



| Problem(s) identified in previous PIR  | Action(s) taken  | By whom  | When                     |
|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| resources to support TDA/SAP process as highest priority   |  |  |                          |
| Following the recommendations of the MTE, reassess the demo projects, scaling back in cases where it is unlikely projects can achieve objectives in remaining period | Completed: Demo project activities, work plan and expected results reviewed/updated and budget reallocated   | National partners in collaboration with PMU  | November – December 2011 |
| Rapid recruitment of a new TDA Team Leader; Finalization of the TDA and start of the SAP processes to take place simultaneously so as to recoup lost time            | Team Leader recruited, Regional TDA finalised and validation workshop planned for Q3-2012. TORs finalised and SAP regional and national team in place as planned. SAP planning and TDA validation workshops planned for Q3-2012 as back to back workshops. SAP methodology and work plan updated. Note and guidelines for the implementation of the SAP prepared (including its link with VB water charter and Master plan) TDA/SAP process ongoing as planned | Project Management Unit in collaboration with UNEP, VBA ,UDC, national partners and consultants, | Q2-2011 - Now            |

### 3.2 Project implementation progress

| Outputs  | Planned completion date <sup>14</sup> | Project Manager Status as of 30 June 2012 (%) | Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs | Progress rating |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| <i>Output 1.1: 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%)                              | PMU and all project organs operational and effective              | S               |

<sup>14</sup>Planned completion dates are from on the 2010 PIR the extension of the project to December 2012

| Outputs  | Planned completion date <sup>14</sup> | Project Manager Status as of 30 June 2012 (%)                      | Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs  | Progress rating |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| Activity 1.1.2. Develop and implement project monitoring and evaluation plan   | Continuous                            | 100% of activities planned for the reported period                 | M&E plan developed, updated based on MTE recommendations, approved by PSC and currently under implementation   | S               |
| Activity 1.1.3. Identify linkages with other partners, develop and implement collaboration plan (including collaboration framework with the VBA)   | Continuous                            | 100% of activities planned for the reported period                 | 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. Also new collaboration opportunities have been discussed with US EPA, USAID and Kfw | S               |
| Activity 1.1.4. Carry out project reports (PIR and annual report, monthly brief, study reports)  | Continuous                            | IR, Annual report (2011) 2012 work plan & budget: completed (100%) | Reports prepared as planned and widely disseminated. Key study, meeting and workshop reports were prepared and disseminated  | S               |
| Activity 1.1.5. Document project implementation and communicate results through publications, regional and internal reports, project newsletter and project website ( <i>just for the record</i> ) | Continuous                            | 100% of activities planned for the reported period                 | Reports on project implementation (including briefing notes) prepared, shared and discussed with project partners during various regional and international meetings/workshops   | S               |
| <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                               | <i>Completed (100%)</i>  | <i>N/A for this period</i>   | <i>NA</i>       |
| Activity 1.2.2. Analysis of national institutions and stakeholders and preparation of stakeholders involvement plan  | Dec-2008                              | <i>Completed (100%)</i>  | Studies reports used for the preparation of thematic and TDA reports and by VBA and other partners for various studies on the Volta Basin<br>1 <sup>st</sup> VBA forum of parties held based on the results of institutions and stakeholders analysis  | MS              |
| Activity 1.2.3. Conduct training sessions for national   | Q2-2009                               | Completed in 2011  | As recommended by the MTE no activity  | MS              |

| Outputs   | Planned completion date <sup>14</sup> | Project Manager Status as of 30 June 2012 (%) | Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs   | Progress rating |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| institutions and stakeholders on IWRM and IRB management  |                                       |   | planned for the reported period.  |                 |
| Activity 1.2.4. Conduct training sessions for national institutions on data management and monitoring and, clearinghouse system | Q3-2009                               | Completed (100%)                              | No activity planned for the reported period   | S               |
| Activity 1.2.5. Conduct training on SAP implementation at national and regional levels(cancelled, pending additional funds)     | Q4-2011                               | Not planned for the reported period           | As recommended by the MTE, cancelled, pending additional funds  |                 |
| <b>Output 1.3: Knowledge base expanded &amp; basin-wide communication mechanism in place</b>                                    |                                       |   |   |                 |
| Activity 1.3.1. Conduct study on data inventory and assessment  | Dec-2009                              | Completed (100%)                              | Although the study has been completed in 2009, one should highlight the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study result used for the establishment of the VB ISS</li> <li>• Study result used by VB Observatory, national partners and national/regional consultants for the finalisation of the TDA and by VBA and project partners for the preparation of technical reports</li> <li>• Information related to existing Metadata categories &amp; data hosting institutions updated during the TDA process, shared with VB Observatory</li> </ul> | S               |
| Activity 1.3.2. Develop hydrological and coastal hydrodynamic model of the Volta basin and its Downstream Coastal Area          | June 2010                             | NA  | N/A, owing to the delays and need to reallocate budget, his activity 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   | NA              |
| Activity 1.3.3. Carry out thematic study on relations between catchments area and stream flow                                   | Q2-2010                               | NA  | N/A; As result of coordination discussions undertaken with the VBA and the EU Volta project, it has been decided to develop the   | NA              |

| Outputs  | Planned completion date <sup>14</sup> | Project Manager Status as of 30 June 2012 (%)                | Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs  | Progress rating |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
|  |                                       |  | hydrological model and carry out the thematic studies through the implementation of the EU Volta Project and also in framework of the Volta Basin Observatory activities   |                 |
| Activity 1.3.4. Carry out thematic study on the relations between Volta basin and its Downstream Coastal Area, using ICARM concept                                   | Q2-2010                               | NA   | N/A; As result of coordination discussions undertaken with the VBA and the EU Volta project, it has been decided to develop the hydrological model and carry out the thematic studies through the implementation of the EU Volta Project and also in the framework of Volta Basin Observatory activities | NA              |
| Activity 1.3.5. Support and/or contribute to studies on the establishment of the Volta Basin Observatory through database, data collection and data sharing protocol | Continuous                            | 100% of activities planned for the reported period completed | The project has contributed to 100% of activities planned in the framework of the VB Observatory<br>Population of the VB ISS is ongoing as planned   | MS              |
| Activity 1.3.6. Organize one scientific workshop in collaboration with key partners (UNESCO, GTZ, GLOWA, WASCAL, etc.)   | End of the project                    | N/A  | Not planned for the reported period  |                 |
| Activity 1.3.7. Develop and update project website   | Continuous                            | Website developed and regularly updated                      | Website updated as planned   | MS/MU           |
| <b>Output 2.1: VRB regional coordination mechanisms supported</b>  |                                       |  |  |                 |
| Activity 2.1.1. Advocate at Ministerial level and through project meetings, workshops and reports, the importance of ratifying the basin convention                  | Q4-2009                               | 100%   | VB convention entered into force in 2009   | S               |
| Activity 2.1.2. Insert and mainstream the TDA, SAP   | Dec 2013                              | 100% of activities planned for the reported                  | VBA fully participates in the TDA/SAP process  | MS              |

| Outputs  | Planned completion date <sup>14</sup> | Project Manager Status as of 30 June 2012 (%)                | Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs  | Progress rating |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| and APNP-VRB into the VBA policies, strategies and plans   |                                       | period completed   |  |                 |
| <b>Output 2.2: <i>Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) updated and finalised</i></b>  |                                       |  |  |                 |
| 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%)   | Completed in 2008<br>Report disseminated and used by project's consultants and partners for various studies  | S               |
| Activity 2.2.2. Organize starting regional/national workshops with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders                | Q2-Q3-2009                            | 100%   | Not planned for the reported period.<br>Completed in 2010  | S/MS            |
| Activity 2.2.3. Update and complete the TDA document including situation analysis and causal chain analysis  | April 2012                            | 100% of activities planned for the reported period completed | Regional TDA document updated (including 4 regional thematic reports, 6 national TDA documents) and subject to initial reviews and then revised.   | S               |
| Activity 2.2.4. Organize regional validation workshop with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders, including PSC and VBA | July 2012                             | 100% of activities planned for the reported period completed | Validation workshop planned for August 2012. TORs for the validation workshop completed and invitation letter sent to participants. PMU has made practical arrangement for a successful organization of the workshop in Cotonou, Benin<br>Activity significantly delayed, though optimistic that things are back on track now. | MS              |
| Activity 2.2.5. Finalise the regional TDA document (including thematic reports) based of the validation workshop recommendations                     | Dec 2012                              | N/A  | Not planned for the reported period,<br>Activity significantly delayed, though optimistic that things are back on track now.   | MS              |
| Activity 2.2.6. Edit, print and the regional TDA   | May 2013                              | N/A  | Not planned for the reported period  | NA              |

| Outputs   | Planned completion date <sup>14</sup> | Project Manager Status as of 30 June 2012 (%)                | Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs  | Progress rating |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| document (including thematic reports)   |                                       |  |  |                 |
| Activity 2.2.7. Disseminate TDA document (including regional/national TDA, Thematic TDA reports)                                      | May 2013                              | N/A  | Not planned for the reported period  | NA              |
| <b>Output 2.3: Action Plans for the National Parts of the VRB (APNP-VRB) developed</b>  |                                       |  |  |                 |
| Activity 2.3.1. Prepare the National Action Plans documents   | Q4-2012                               | 100% of activities planned for the reported period completed | TORs for the recruitment of national facilitators prepared and recruitment completed by Project National Focal Points based on countries procedures  | MS              |
| Activity 2.3.2. Organize APNP-VRB validation workshops in each riparian country   | Q4-2012                               | N/A  | Not planned for the reported period  | MS              |
| Activity 2.3.3. Finalize and submit APNP-VRB documents to national authorities for endorsement  | Q4-2013                               | N/A  | Following the revisions to work program after the MTE, this is not planned for the reported period   | NA              |
| Activity 2.3.4. Edit, print and disseminate APNP-VRB documents  | Q4-2013                               | N/A  | Following the revisions to work program after the MTE, this is not planned for the reported period   | NA              |
| <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 | July 2012                             | 100% of activities planned for the reported period completed | Starting workshop planned for July 2012. TORs for the starting workshop completed and invitation letter sent to participants. PMU has made practical arrangement for a successful organization of the workshop in Cotonou, Benin | MS              |
| Activity 2.4.2. Prepare the Strategic Action Programme document, including SAP implementation guideline, monitoring                   | Q1-2013                               | 100% of activities planned for the reported period completed | TORs prepared for regional SAP consultants Recruitment of regional SAP consultants completed   | MS              |

| Outputs  | Planned completion date <sup>14</sup> | Project Manager Status as of 30 June 2012 (%) | Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs  | Progress rating |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| & evaluation system for SAP implementation, long term financing strategy for the SAP   |                                       |   | Note of the implementation of SAP (including its link with VB water charter and Master plan) completed<br>Several coordination and harmonization discussions and meetings with VBA, UNEP, UDC and other key partners   |                 |
| Activity 2.4.3. Organize validation regional workshop with national, regional and international institutions and stakeholders  | Q1-2013                               | N/A   | Not planned for the reported period  | MS              |
| 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 VBA Ministerial meeting) | Q2-2013                               | N/A   | Following the revisions to work program after the MTE, this is not planned for the reported period   | NA              |
| Activity 2.4.5. Start the fundraising process by establishing contact and involving some donors/partners in the TDA/SAP process: American EPA, World Bank, African Water Facility, BOAD, KfW, etc<br>New Activity has been added             | Continuous                            |   | A briefing note on the GEF Volta Project has been prepared by the PMU in collaboration with the VBA and used as basis for discussion during visits paid to KfW, World Bank and American EPA headquarters and also USAID West Africa Office by the regional project coordinator and the VBA Executive Director. Key issues discussed during these visits are additional financial support requested for SAP preparation and implementation, implementation of demo projects, capacity building activities and also for the finalization of VBA establishment. | S               |

| Outputs  | Planned completion date <sup>14</sup> | Project Manager Status as of 30 June 2012 (%)                | Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs  | Progress rating            |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| <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   | ?                          |
| 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                              | 90% of activities planned for the reported period completed  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HEC-RAS model adapted to project area and testing ongoing</li> <li>• Hydro-meteorological installed in Mali and data collection ongoing in the 2 countries</li> <li>• Delay in the finalisation and dissemination on the model testing report</li> <li>• Several coordination meetings organised with MCA and national partners from Burkina Faso and Mali</li> <li>• Bilateral convention prepared as agreed with IUCB IWRM Project</li> </ul> | MU                         |
| 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                              | 100% of activities planned for the reported period completed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As explained in the section 3.1 activities are ongoing as planned.</li> <li>• Also a project brief has been prepared for the national part of the basin in Benin and Grant agreement signed with the country for its implementation</li> <li>• Demo in Togo: technical reports finalised and network construction and awareness creation activities completed as planned</li> </ul>   | S for Togo<br>MU for Benin |
| 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                              | 75% of activities planned for the reported period completed  | As explained in the section 3.1 activities are ongoing as planned. The only problem one could highlight was the delay in the extension of contractual agreements between UNOPS and national institutions. This has been solved early March 2012  | MS                         |
| Activity 3.1.5. Evaluate the implementation of the   | Dec 2012                              | 100% of activities   | Implementation of demo evaluated during the  | S                          |



| Outputs  | Planned completion date <sup>14</sup> | Project Manager Status as of 30 June 2012 (%) | Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs                     | Progress rating |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| three Demo projects  |                                       | planned for the reported period completed     | project MTE and report finalized and discussed during the 4 <sup>th</sup> PSC meeting |                 |
| <b>Output 3.2:</b> Replication strategy for demonstration project developed and initiated (on hold, could be part of the SAP and APNP VRB process) |                                       |   |   | NA              |
| Activity 3.2.1. Develop six national Demo projects based and TDA/SAP priorities, including financial plan and replication plan                     |                                       |   | On hold, could be part of the SAP and APNP VRB process                                |                 |
| Activity 3.2.2. Submit the six national Demo projects to riparian countries for approval   |                                       |   | On hold, could be part of the SAP and APNP VRB process                                |                 |
| Activity 3.2.3. Incorporate the replication plan in the SAP  |                                       |   | On hold, could be part of the SAP and APNP VRB process                                |                 |

Overall project implementation progress <sup>15</sup> (To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect prior years' ratings):

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>FY2009 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>  |
| S                    | Work well underway, though partners will inevitably introduce some delays.  |
| <b>FY2010 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>  |
| 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). |

<sup>15</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)

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>FY2011 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>  |
| MU                   | The TDA/SAP process is now significantly delayed and the resignation of the Team Leader will bring additional delays to the process, necessitating an extension of the project. A number of the demonstration projects are now also significantly delayed. Some of these delays (e.g. Cote d'Ivoire) are outside the control of the project, whereas for others (e.g. Benin) additional efforts must be made to establish activities or alternatively they must be abandoned. |
| <b>FY2012 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>  |
|                      |   |

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. *(To be completed by UNEP Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager<sup>16</sup>)*

| Action(s) to be taken  | By whom?              | By when?      |
|--|-----------------------|---------------|
| Better document the involvement of stakeholders in TDA/SAP process   | PMU                   | March 2013    |
| Finalise the TDA document and prepare a draft SAP by December 2012   | PMU/UNEP              | December 2012 |
| Document the population of the VB ISS and make it online to key stakeholders selected by VBA, including UNEP and GEF   | PMU/VBA               | December 2012 |
| Finalize the update of project website, including recent documents and information   | PMU                   | December 2012 |
| Demo Project: conduct field visits, support demo team for the review of work plan and budget reallocation, better monitor the implementation update demo work plan | PMU, Demo Teams, NIFP | January 2013  |

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       |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|------------|
| Following recommendations of          | Project budget has been reallocated to support the | PMU in collaboration | November – |

<sup>16</sup> UNEP Fund Management Officer should also be consulted as appropriate.

| Problem(s) identified in previous PIR  | Action(s) taken  | By whom  | When                     |
|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| the MTE, reallocate project resources to support TDA/SAP process as highest priority   | TDA/SAP process  | with UNEP, VBA   | December 2011            |
| Following the recommendations of the MTE, reassess the demo projects, scaling back in cases where it is unlikely projects can achieve objectives in remaining period | Completed: Demo project activities, work plan and expected results reviewed/updated and budget reallocated   | National partners in collaboration with PMU  | November – December 2011 |
| Rapid recruitment of a new TDA Team Leader; Finalization of the TDA and start of the SAP processes to take place simultaneously so as to recoup lost time            | Team Leader recruited, Regional TDA finalised and validation workshop planned for Q3-2012. TORs finalised and SAP regional and national team in place as planned. SAP planning and TDA validation workshops planned for Q3-2012 as back to back workshops. SAP methodology and work plan updated. Note and guidelines for the implementation of the SAP prepared (including its link with VB water charter and Master plan) TDA/SAP process ongoing as planned | Project Management Unit in collaboration with UNEP, VBA ,UDC, national partners and consultants, | Q2-2011 - Now            |

### 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><b>Project Managers</b> will use this table to summarize risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflect also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <b>Notes</b> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b>. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (<b>PM</b>) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (<b>TM</b>). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The <b>UNEP Task Manager</b> 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 |
| <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:  |                     | X      |             |      |                |                  |
|                           |   |  |   |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: Individuals generally understand their own roles, however, there has been some confusion over IA and EA roles in the request for pre-selection letters |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
| Governance structure      | Steering Committee and/or other project bodies                        | Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to                        | Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its                          | X                      |        |             |      |                |                  | PM:  |                     | 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> |  |  |  |                        |        |             |      |                |                  |  |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
|                           | meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs | project is inadequate. TOR unclear   | TOR  |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: PSC certainly fulfils its role during the annual meetings, the challenge is to maintain the role and influence between meetings and for them to assume ownership and responsibility for the project. |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
| 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:<br><br>TM: No concerns.  | X                   |        |             |      |                |                  |
| Work flow                 | Project progressing according to                         | Some changes in project work plan but without major                                  | Major delays or changes in work plan or method of  | X                      |        |             |      |                |                  | PM:  |                     | 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> |   |   |  |                        |        |             |      |                |                  |  |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
|                           | work plan   | effect on overall timetable                       | implementation   |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: There will be at least two no-cost extensions to the project, so work plans and budgets have had to be adjusted accordingly, but things seem largely under control now.  |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
| 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: Countries account for in-kind contribution but some of them still have challenge in mobilising cash contribution. This should not affect the deliverables since cash contribution are in most cases less than 20% of amounts pledged by countries<br>TM: Mobilizing co-finance remains a challenge and risk, though there have been some positive developments on this side. |                     |        | 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> |   |  |  |                        |        |             |      |                |                  |   |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
| Budget                    | Activities are progressing within planned budget                          | Minor budget reallocation needed   | Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget           |                        | X      |             |      |                |                  | PM: Budget reallocated based on MTE recommendations. No cost extension anticipated for 2013 will have budget implication and lead to the reduction of projection staff<br>TM: Budget reallocations needed to sustain the PMU operations in light of no-cost extensions. |                     | 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:<br>TM: No concerns.   | X                   |        |             |      |                |                  |
| Reporting                 | Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and | Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of | Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting           | X                      |        |             |      |                |                  | PM:   | 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> |  |   |   |                        |        |             |      |                |                  |  |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
|                           | accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues  | progress and implementation issues  |   |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: Project reporting is generally of high-quality and without delays.                                   |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
| 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:  |                     | X      |             |      |                |                  |
|                           |  |   |   |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: MTE noted that stakeholder involvement is strong on government agencies and weaker in civil society. |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
| 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:  | X                   |        |             |      |                |                  |
|                           |  |   |   |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: No concerns.   |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |



| 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>        |  |  |  |                        |        |             |      |                |                  |   |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |  |  |
| 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:   |                     | X      |             |      |                |                  |  |  |
|                                  |  |  |  |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: Its difficult to assess this now.   |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |  |  |
| 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:   | X                   |        |             |      |                |                  |  |  |
|                                  |  |  |  |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: Earlier concerns expressed about the relationship to or duplication with other basin processes has minimized now. |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |  |  |
| 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:   | X                   |        |             |      |                |                  |  |  |
|                                  |  |  |  |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: No concerns.  |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |  |  |

| 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>                    |                       |                          |                        |                        |        |             |      |                |                  |        |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
| Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary |                       |                          |                        |                        |        |             |      |                |                  |        |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |
|  |                       |                          |                        |                        |        |             |      |                |                  | TM: NA |                     |        |             |      |                |                  |

| 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<br>Also ongoing situation in Mali and the risk of new clashes in Côte d'Ivoire could be an issue<br><b>TM: Noted and agreed.</b> |                     | 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:<br><b>TM: No special concerns.</b>   | 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 honour co-finance commitments.<br><b>TM: Agreed. There is a risk that these challenges could remain in the SAP implementation project.</b>      |                     |        | 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 and its partners are addressing this issue with VBA coordination<br>TM: Agreed. |                     |        | 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>17</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*):

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>FY2012 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>  |
| Medium               |  |
| <b>FY2011 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>  |
| Substantial          | Delays in the TDA/SAP process during this reporting period signal substantial risk to the project achieving its objective. Some progress in demos since last PIR reporting, but still some delays. |
| <b>FY2010 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>  |
| Medium               | Significant delays in demo projects and TDA development  |
| <b>FY2009 rating</b> | <b>Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>  |
| Medium               | Co-finance uncertainties, capacity issues and delays associated with demo projects put the overall project at medium risk.   |

<sup>17</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  (MTE completed) No
- 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>18</sup>

- Key project report prepared and disseminated: 2010 PIR, 2011 Annual report (narrative and financial), 2012 work plan and budget, PSC meeting report

<sup>18</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.

- Quarterly reports (narrative and financial) prepared as requested
- 4<sup>th</sup> PSC meeting held in Abidjan in February 2012, report finalised and disseminated
- MTE completed and report discussed during PSC meeting
- National implementation committee meetings were organised in each riparian country
- Some technical reports were prepared at national and regional levels as per the project work plan
- Demo project indicators updated by national partners based on MTE recommendations
- Overall project indicators, activities and expected outputs/outcomes updated by national partners based on MTE recommendations
- Project staff meeting organised on monthly basis
- Quarterly engagement discussions held as planned

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?

The project could experience challenges in obtaining data for stress reduction indicators through the implementation of demo projects. Realistic stress indicators can't be monitored in a so short period allocated to the overall project.

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions<sup>19</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. Indicators could be updated by the end of the project MTE

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

<sup>19</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.

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



## 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: 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 finalising financial agreement between the project and private sector like SIAAP for the implementation of the demo project 2 in Togo
- Capacity building: combining capacity building activities with similar project partners helps to reduce capacity building costs while achieving better results. 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 helped to reduce individual project commitment while reaching expected results
- Scientific and technological issues: addressed through the implementation of demo projects: hydrological model for early warning system in the Sourou basin, construction of wastewater network and treatment plant in view of water pollution control and reduction in Kara, tree planting in view of river bank protection and reduction of soil loss, erosion and river sedimentation
- Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines: The project generally used TDA/SAP 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: addressed within the demo 3 through the promotion of improved charcoal production by the women's groups that are traditionally reasonable for charcoal production through tree cuttings
- Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies: local stakeholders commitment, involvement and interest, use of local competencies and materials and possibility to replicate IUCN/PAGEV model for community involvement in river bank restoration
- Financial management and co-financing: it has been difficult to mobilise cash co-finance contribution pledged by riparian countries during the project development phase