



## Zambezi Regional: Investment Plan Preparation Grant (IPPG) (NPC)

Comment Type	Commenter Name	Commenter Profile	Comment	Date
--------------	----------------	-------------------	---------	------

Comment 1	gisella.berardi@mef.gov.it	Italy	<p>Dear CIF Secretariat,</p> <p>Thank you for the informative documents, that we considered carefully.</p> <p>We understand the rationale behind the request to increase the IPPG allocation to USD 1 million. However, we believe some expenses could be rationalized.</p> <p>While we do not have intention to micromanage, we would like to request a more cost-effective management of the IPPG resources and not to consider this approval as a precedent. We therefore would like to see the following revisions (in red) to the Decision text:</p> <p><b>The GCAP Sub-Committee, having reviewed the request submitted by the Government of Zambia, as the lead country of the Zambezi Regional proposal, and the African Development Bank (AfDB), notes the exceptional request for additional funding for this regional IP and approves up to USD 1,000,000 as an Investment Plan Preparation Grant (IPPG) to support the development of the Zambezi Regional Investment Plan under the Nature, People and Climate (NPC) Program.</b></p> <p><b>The GCAP Sub-Committee further requests to consider this specific approval of the IPPG as an exception, not creating a precedent for other IPPG allocations.</b></p> <p>Looking forward to your reply.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Gisella</p> <p><b>Gisella Berardi</b></p> <p>Global Public Goods Office</p> <p>International Financial Relations Directorate</p> <p>Department of Treasury</p> <p>Ministry of the Economy and Finance</p> <p>Via XX Settembre, 97 - 00187 Rome – Italy</p> <p><b>Tel.</b> +39 06 4761 4141</p> <p><b>Mobile</b> +39 360 1050 170</p> <p><b>E-mail:</b> <a href="mailto:gisella.berardi@mef.gov.it">gisella.berardi@mef.gov.it</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.dt.mef.gov.it">www.dt.mef.gov.it</a></p> <p><b>Descrizione: Descrizione: Descrizione: Descrizione: C:\Users\Simone\Desktop\image002.jpg</b>  <b>Respect the environment. Do not print this message if not necessary</b></p> <p><i>This e-mail and any attachments are confidential. If you have received this e-mail by mistake, please inform the sender immediately by reply e-mail and then delete it from your system. Any processing of this e-mail and its attachments is not authorized. Thank you for your cooperation.</i></p>	11/20/2023 1:32:19 PM
-----------	----------------------------	-------	--	--------------------------

Response 1	dlevymolner@worldbankgroup.org	CIF AU	<p>The CIF Secretariat appreciates Italy's proposed decision text revision. Since the exceptionality of this request is already captured in the first sentence of the decision text, the CIF Secretariat proposes the following revised text, which still captures Italy's main point:</p>	11/21/2023 8:12:04 PM
------------	--------------------------------	--------	--	--------------------------

**The GCAP Sub-Committee, having reviewed the request submitted by the Government of Zambia, as the lead country of the Zambezi Regional proposal, and the African Development Bank (AfDB), notes the exceptional request for additional funding for this regional IP and approves up to USD 1,000,000 as an Investment Plan Preparation Grant (IPPG) to support the development of the Zambezi Regional Investment Plan under the Nature, People and Climate (NPC) Program.**

**The GCAP Sub-Committee further notes that this exceptional IPPG amount should not create a precedent for other NPC IPPG allocations.**

The CIF Secretariat will modify the decision text accordingly.

Response 2 gisella.berardi@mef.gov.it

Italy

Dear CIF Secretariat,

thank you for your response.

We can endorse the revised proposed Decision text.

Best,

Gisella

11/22/2023  
7:01:23 AM

Comment 2

Sherwin.Cotta@energysecurity.gov.uk

United Kingdom

Dear MDB colleagues, CIF Secretariat,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Zambezi regional IPPG and for the informative documents.

We have reviewed the documentation and have the following questions to raise:

1) The UK notes that the projected Consultancies Expenditure for consultants' fees/accommodation/travel seems unusually high at US\$700,000, in addition to the US\$300,00 projected for Workshops, Stakeholder Consultations and Meetings.

a. As 70% of a US\$1m IPPG is being spent on consultation expenditure, we request a detailed breakdown of these costs, including: the number of individual consultants, whether they are local or international and the rationale for their selection and their total cost.

b. We would like to understand the rationale behind the balance between consultant fees and workshops being held and how this might be amended to deliver improved value for money?

2) The UK **welcomes the** strong focus on livelihoods and gender mainstreaming analysis and multi-sectoral stakeholder engagement. However, we do not see extensive evidence of wider CIF-specific Just Transitions considerations.

a. Please could the AfDB detail how CIF-specific Just Transitions and/or ILO frameworks are being met in the IPPG process, and how the process is aligning with these frameworks and criteria?

b. As this is a NPC programme IPPG, a key consideration is engagement and inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities according to CIF Just Transitions criteria. Please could the AfDB detail what activities are being carried out to meet this requirement and align with the programme criteria?

We look forward to your reply,

Best wishes,

Sherwin

11/23/2023  
11:44:13  
AM

**1) The UK notes that the projected Consultancies Expenditure for consultants' fees/accommodation/travel seems unusually high at US\$700,000, in addition to the US \$300,00 projected for Workshops, Stakeholder Consultations and Meetings.**

**a. As 70% of a US\$1m IPPG is being spent on consultation expenditure, we request a detailed break-down of these costs, including: the number of individual consultants, whether they are local or international and the rationale for their selection and their total cost.**

**AfDB Answer:**

The breakdown was already provided, as reproduced below (Table 1). In this case, 4 individual consultants will be recruited to cover the participating countries. Recruitment will be open and competitive, so we cannot indicate whether consultants will be international or local. However, the estimation of fees is based on the consultants' experience and qualification and includes consultants' fees, accommodation, and air travel to 5 participating riparian states. The fees also included the facilitation of national stakeholders consultative workshops which will include key stakeholders and direct beneficiaries. As requested, the detailed budget has separated the consultants' fees and national stakeholders consultative workshops (Refer to Table 2).

Table 1 Submitted IPPG Budget

**1. Consultancies (Individual Consultants):**

- #1: *Inclusive and Sustainable Land Management Diagnosis Assessment – inclusive hotspot analysis and drafting/developing of the IP (Team Leader, extra days & fees);*
- #2: *Livelihoods and Gender Mainstreaming Analysis;*
- #3: *Integrated inclusive water management analysis including the transboundary aspect; and* **700,000**
- #4: *Private sector engagement/market analysis.*

**(Estimated cost includes consultants' fees, accommodation and air travel to 5 participating riparian states).**

**2. Workshops, Stakeholder Consultations and Meetings:**

2.1 Gender-responsive regional level consultation during the diagnostics and stocktaking assessment study in selected regions of the participating countries **(Two regional workshops)**. **70,000**

2.2 Gender-responsive national stakeholder consultation to discuss and validate priority projects, gaps and provide guidance on the development of the IP based on diagnostics analysis / stocktaking assessment results **(Two national workshops per country)**. **60,000**

2.3 First MDB Joint Mission to discuss the outcome of the diagnostics analysis **(MDBs cover their respective costs. Amount is for ZAMCOM + 5 riparian states & venue)** **50,000**

2.4 Second MDB Joint Mission, during the validation workshop **(MDBs cover their respective costs. Amount is for ZAMCOM + 5 riparian states & venue)** **50,000**

2.5 IP steering committee meetings **(Monthly meetings/Virtual)** **N/A**

**3. Travel/Transportation - local** **45,000**

<b>4. Others (Admin Costs/Operational Costs)</b>	<b>25,000</b>
<b>Total, including contingencies (USD)</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>

Table 2 Breakdown of the IPPG Budget

**Country/Riparian State**

<b>N</b>	<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Malawi</b>	<b>Mozambique</b>	<b>Namibia</b>	<b>Tanzania</b>	<b>Zambia</b>	<b>Total</b>
1	#1: Inclusive and Sustainable Land Management Diagnosis Assessment – inclusive hotspot analysis and drafting/developing of the IP (Team Leader, extra days & fees, 3.5 calendar months). (Estimated cost includes consultants' fees, accommodation and air travel to 5 participating riparian states)	v	v	v	v	v	105,000
1	#2: Livelihoods and Gender Mainstreaming Analysis (2 calendar months). (Estimated cost includes consultants' fees, accommodation and air travel to 5 participating riparian states)	v	v	v	v	v	70,000
1	#3: Integrated inclusive water management analysis including the transboundary aspect (3 calendar months). (Estimated cost includes consultants' fees, accommodation and air travel to 5 participating riparian states)	v	v	v	v	v	85,000
1	#4: Private sector engagement/market analysis (2 calendar months). (Estimated cost includes consultants' fees, accommodation and air travel to 5 participating riparian states)	v	v	v	v	v	70,000
1						<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>330,000</b>

1	National gender-responsive key stakeholders and direct beneficiaries consultative workshops during the diagnostics and stocktaking assessment study. To discuss and validate priority projects, gaps and provide guidance on the development of the IP based on diagnostics analysis / stocktaking assessment results <b>(Two national workshops per country, each USD 37,000, to be facilitated by all 4 consultants)</b> . Estimated cost includes stakeholders/beneficiaries allowances, transport and accommodation.	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	185,000
1		37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	185,000
1						<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>370,000</b>
1						<b>Total</b>	<b>700,000</b>
2	2.1 Gender-responsive regional level consultation during the diagnostics and stocktaking assessment study in one of the participating countries. Participants will include key stakeholders and direct beneficiaries <b>(Two regional workshops)</b> . Estimated cost includes stakeholders/beneficiaries allowances, transport and accommodation.						70,000
2							70,000
2						<b>Total</b>	<b>140,000</b>
3	2.3 First MDB Joint Mission to discuss the outcome of the diagnostics analysis <b>(MDBs cover their respective costs. Amount is for ZAMCOM + 5 riparian states &amp; venue)</b>						50,000

3		<b>Total</b>	<b>50,000</b>
4	2.4 Second MDB Joint Mission, during the validation workshop <b>(MDBs cover their respective costs. Amount is for ZAMCOM + 5 riparian states &amp; venue)</b>		50,000
4		<b>Total</b>	<b>50,000</b>
5	3. Travel/Transportation - local		35,000
5		<b>Total</b>	<b>35,000</b>
6	4. Others (Admin Costs/Operational Costs)		25,000
6		<b>Total</b>	<b>25,000</b>
		<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>

**b. We would like to understand the rationale behind the balance between consultant fees and workshops being held and how this might be amended to deliver improved value for money?**

**AfDB Answer:**

As indicated in the above table, the workshops, as specified, are totally different from the consultants' fees. In this case, workshop costs will only cover the participation of the direct beneficiaries and key stakeholders within the participating country and not the consultants expenses.

**2) The UK welcomes the strong focus on livelihoods and gender mainstreaming analysis and multi-sectoral stakeholder engagement. However, we do not see extensive evidence of wider CIF-specific Just Transitions considerations.**

**a. Please could the AfDB detail how CIF-specific Just Transitions and/or ILO frameworks are being met in the IPPG process, and how the process is aligning with these frameworks and criteria?**

**AfDB Answer:**

The IPPG-IP preparation process is in line with the CIF NPC Criteria and is responding to the IP Template. Moreover, the CIF secretariat – E&L team members participated in the scoping mission, and detailed discussions on transformational change, including the just transition, were held. Together with the IP preparation team, the CIF E&L team plans to organize a regional workshop to map out transformational change including just transition elements in the Zambezi river basin to provide evidence-based input to the IP. In addition, the Just Transition issues have been included under the gender consultant ToRs and addressed, accordingly. The ToRs for the consultancy on Gender Mainstreaming Analysis to also identify and analyze transition issues along the selected value chains and across the target areas in the riparian

countries. This will support the identification of potential distributional impacts to be discussed during the planned national and regional consultations and a participatory approach in identifying relevant just transition activities to be included in the investment plan to ensure equitable access to the benefits and sharing of the costs in promoting the selected nature-based solutions. The CIF-specific toolbox will be the main reference material for this exercise.

**b. As this is a NPC programme IPPG, a key consideration is engagement and inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities according to CIF Just Transitions criteria. Please could the AfDB detail what activities are being carried out to meet this requirement and align with the programme criteria?**

**AfDB Answer:**

Local communities have been duly considered in the process and will be widely consulted since they will be the core beneficiaries. In Addition, CIF NPC has provided separate Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) targeting Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities whose process is complementary to the NPC IP process.

Thank you.

Response 2 Sherwin.Cotta@energysecurity.gov.uk United Kingdom

Dear CIF Secretariat, dear AfDB colleagues,

12/4/2023  
1:09:07 PM

We thank the AfDB for their response. Given that COP28 is taking place which is a particularly busy time, we request for additional time to review the response provided and would look to respond by 13 December 2023.

Many thanks,

Sherwin

Response 3 eva.fisher@energysecurity.gov.uk United Kingdom

Dear AfDB colleagues and CIF Secretariat colleagues,

12/13/2023  
7:29:02 PM

We would like to thank the AfDB team for responding to our questions on the NPC Zambezi Regional IPPG request, and for the detail shared on the proposed funding allocations across consultancies expenditure and regional and national workshops, as well as additional detail on plans for fully integrating the CIFs Just Transitions criteria into the IPPG. We would also like to thank the CIF Secretariat for the additional time to enable us to review.

We would also like to voice our support of the text amendment put forward by Italy and reiterate that we fully support its inclusion in the final text.

Given the above points, the UK is content to approve the extension request. We look forward to seeing progress on this important IPPG to set the direction for the NPC Zambezi Regional IP scheduled for 2024.

Best wishes,

Eva Fisher