



# Conservation, development and livelihoods for thriving people and nature

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11448

**Countries**

South Africa

**Project Name**

Conservation, development and livelihoods for thriving people and nature

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

10/19/2023

**Review completed by PM**

12/6/2023

**Program Manager**

Adriana Moreira

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments 10.30.23: Project is well aligned with Programming directions and is eligible for GEF funding.

Agency's Comments

### 2. Project Summary

**Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?**

Secretariat's Comments 10.30.23: Please, include an explanation on the strategies to deliver the proposed GEBs.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 27 Nov 2023

Proposed strategies to deliver on GEBs have been provided and the summary text revised accordingly, which now reads as follows:

South Africa is a megadiverse country with severe socio-economic developmental challenges. Human-induced activities have led to pressures on biodiversity and its benefits. Due to the legacy of apartheid and colonialism, conservation is not always seen as part of a sustainable and vibrant economy. Following the adoption of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, more than 16 million hectares must be conserved for South Africa to cover 30% of its area by 2030. In line with GEF8 strategy, the project goal is to expand conservation areas through integrated approaches that promote protection and sustainable use for thriving people and nature. It aims to directly contribute 360,000 ha to the conservation estate; benefit 65,466 (51.8% women) people; and contribute to GEF Core Indicators 1.1, 4.1, 5.4 and 11. To achieve this goal, the project will scale up the biodiversity stewardship programme which is established as a cost-effective mechanism for conserving privately or communally owned areas as protected areas or OECMs. This will include strengthening the enabling environment for mainstreaming biodiversity in key sectors and integration of OECM requirements in the Biodiversity

Stewardship Programme; enhancing capacity of provincial institutions and collaboration between public sector, private sector, NGOs and communities for sustainable management of landscapes and seascapes in Limpopo and Northern Cape provinces; enhance flow of biodiversity benefits for communities and local economic development; and strengthen evidence base of benefits of biodiversity for people and economy through natural capital accounting and modernised information management systems to make the case for more investment in biodiversity.

### 3 Indicative Project Overview

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

Secretariat's Comments 10.30.23: Proposed objective is adequate and ToC is well articulated.

#### Agency's Comments

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10.30.23: Project components include gender, KM and M&E with satisfactory funding levels. Please ensure that gender dimensions are captured / integrated in relevant outputs under Outcomes 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.2

11.29.23: Please, capture/intergrade gender dimensions in relevant outputs under Outcomes 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.2 as they were not included in the re-submission.

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP response: 4 Dec 2023

We apologies for missing this comment in the last resubmission. This has now been addressed as appropriate in response to comments and feedback. The changes have been highlighted with Green in the PIF as detailed below.

<b>Project outputs</b>
------------------------

1.1.1. Inter-government Authorities Committee (IAC) for Conservation with Transformative Outcomes is established and functions as a multi-sectoral coordination platform to accelerate the Biodiversity Stewardship Programme.

1.1.2. A **gender inclusive** centralised legal support unit is established and provides technical advice to the Biodiversity Stewardship Legal Reference Group and provincial authorities involved in the Biodiversity Stewardship Programme.

1.2.1. **Gender responsive** policy and guidelines developed/ revised to address barriers in declaration/ recognition and support expansion of conservation estate in all realms.

1.2.2. **Gender responsive** conservation objectives mainstreamed into policy and programmes of relevant sectors (such as tourism and agriculture).

1.2.3. Marine spatial plan for expansion of conservation estate in marine and coastal ecosystems developed **with equal participation of men and women.**

2.1.1. Four (4) new protected areas are created in landscapes of Limpopo (Mapungubwe to Makuleke; Kruger to Lephale-Kalahari) and Northern Cape (Augrabies to Namaqua; Kimberley to Kuruman;) provinces **with equal participation of men and women.**

2.1.2. **Gender inclusive** landscapes in Limpopo and Northern Cape and seascapes adjacent to Northern Cape coast are conserved and under improved management practices through terrestrial and marine OECMs.

2.2.1. **Gender responsive** analysis conducted characterising stakeholder livelihoods and status of designated groups in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the areas of implementation.

2.2.2. **Gender responsive** alternative livelihood opportunities and/or new economic activities from biodiversity conservation and sustainable use supported (e.g., community-based tourism, community horticulture initiatives or conservation agriculture) are created for designated groups in the target areas leading to transformation of the biodiversity sector.

2.2.3. Value created through **equal participation of men and women** in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, and benefits to communities and local economies measured, documented and used to make the case.

2.3.1. **Gender inclusive and responsive** communities of practice at national and more localised supporting biodiversity conservation for transformative outcomes are regularly convened.

2.3.2. **Gender inclusive and responsive** national learning exchanges, conferences and capacity building events targeting practitioners held.

3.1.1. Spatially explicit relational database of OECMS (compatible with the Protected Areas and Conservation Areas (PACA) database and linked to the biodiversity offset register) developed and functional.

3.1.2. **Gender responsive** framework and workflow for standardised spatially explicit measurement of investments in biodiversity and ecosystems (in terms of extent, employment and expenditure) by multiple actors to support knowledge of benefits and impact evaluation developed.

3.2.1. Ecosystem accounts for different realms (terrestrial, wetland and river) and accounts for protected areas and conservation areas developed with **equal participation of men and women** and data flows to enable regular production.

3.2.2. **Gender responsive** Biodiversity Economy Satellite Accounts and Environmental Protection Expenditure Accounts developed with data flows to enable regular production.

3.2.3. **Gender responsive** knowledge resources[1]<sup>1</sup>, drawing on science-based information from accounts and other analysis, translate information for uptake in relevant sectors and levels of government to support making the case for biodiversity conservation

4.1.1. **Gender responsive** project monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning (MERL) system set-up and supports quarterly and annual reporting, as well as mid-term and terminal evaluation.

4.1.2. Project-level safeguards and risk management measures, including gender action plan and stakeholder engagement plan developed and implemented

---

[1] Knowledge resources include knowledge products and communication materials such as science-policy briefs, newspaper articles, factsheets, videos and information resources for sharing with key sectoral partners.

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

10.30.23: On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$33,436,175 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,671,809 instead of \$1,036,226 (which is 3.1%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC

---

might be increased to reach a similar level. Please, amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will need to be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

	Sub Total (\$)	4,205,912.00	33,436,175.00
<b>Project Management Cost (PMC)</b>			
	GET	210,296.00	1,036,226.00
	Sub Total(\$)	210,296.00	1,036,226.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	4,416,208.00	34,472,401.00

**Agency's Comments**

UNDP response - 27 Nov 2023

We appreciate your feedback on this matter. Co-finance amount has been increased to align with the GEF requirements in response to review comments.

The GEF contribution to PMC remains \$210,296. The co-finance has been raised to \$1,723,397. The overall co-finance for the project at PIF is now \$35,265,699. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented with the development of the Project Document for CEO Endorsement stage.

**4 Project Outline**

**A. Project Rationale**

**4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS**

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

Secretariat's Comments 10.30.23: The baseline situation is described, including barriers and drivers of environmental degradation.

**Agency's Comments**

**4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT**

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments 10.30.23: Proposed project justification is adequate.

Agency's Comments

## **5 B. Project Description**

### **5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE**

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments 10.30.23: Theory of Change is consistent with proposed outputs and outcomes.

Agency's Comments

### **5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING**

**Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat's Comments

11.1.23: Incremental cost analysis is consistent with guidelines.

Agency's Comments

### **5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK**

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

**d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

## Secretariat's Comments

11.1.23: Please, provide more detailed information on potential executing partners and rationale. Also, please, complete the section on "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives?".

### **Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.**

**Does the GEF Agency expect to play an execution role on this project?**

**If so, please describe that role here. Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing**



## Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 27 Nov 2023

Potential executing partners: details on potential executing partners have been provided after the "Stakeholders" section.

SANBI will lead the execution of the project. SANBI has sufficient experience in managing GEF financed projects and has required fiduciary and institutional capacity as a National GEF Agency. The Northern Cape Department: Agriculture, Environmental Affairs, Rural Development and Land Reform (DAELR) and Limpopo Economic Development, Environment and Tourism (LEDET) will be sub-executing partners in the identified provinces. They are responsible for biodiversity conservation and economic development and a biodiversity stewardship coordinator and ecologist in each province appointed through the project will be hosted locally by these partners. Sub-executing NGO and CSO partners that are locally based or have locally based operations are extremely important to the success of the identified project. This is recognized as important for broad acceptance by IPLCs to mitigate risks such as social resistance and fear of potential exclusion. A stakeholder analysis will be conducted, FPIC applied where relevant, and an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework will be prepared during the PPG, and a transparent process will be run during the PPG phase to determine the role of these sub-executing partners, local communities and IPLCs.

Coordination and Cooperation with ongoing initiatives: Details have been elaborated in the PIF in line with the review comments:

DFFE and SANBI are involved in structures that enable coordination and cooperation across a wide range of ongoing initiatives and projects. Key ones are listed below with some capacity already assigned to these: Cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects is enabled by DFFE and SANBI's active role in:



? Biodiversity conservation planning: SANBI leads national biodiversity planning and reporting, driving research into ecological conditions and integrity across land and seascapes. Existing platforms and projects that support this (e.g., two annual biodiversity planning workshops, NBA working groups) **foster participatory, integrated and biodiversity inclusive spatial planning information sharing between identified partners.**

? Biodiversity stewardship and protected areas: SANBI convenes the BDS TWG, National Biodiversity Stewardship Legal Reference Group, and a BDS TWG sub-group focused on OECMs, the Biodiversity Offsets TWG, and the Land Reform and Biodiversity Stewardship Reference Group, which **coordinate activities across all provinces, and includes public and private sector stakeholders, local and indigenous people and civil society.** DFFE convenes the Protected Areas Technical Task Team (PATT), on which SANBI sits. These report to the DFFE intergovernmental structures (Working Groups, MinTech and MinMec).

? Development planning and coordination: through structures to support the implementation of the National Spatial Development Framework (NSDF), engaging directly with municipalities through DFFE's Local Government Support and SANBI's Municipal Support Programme.

? Biodiversity economy: DFFE and SANBI are actively involved in the Operation Phakisa Biodiversity Economy Laboratory, the National Biodiversity Economy Strategy, Biodiversity Economy Investment Platform, BIOFIN programme in SA and associated working groups, all of which drive decision making and guide implementation of finance solutions and will support co-finance and sustainability of the identified project.

? Landscape coordination: SANBI convenes, in partnership with many national and local, public and private stakeholders, landscape platforms in several areas across the country including Limpopo. **Local partner organization's might offer facilities for co-location of staff in the project.**

? Human Capital Development (HCD): DFFE and SANBI sit on the IPBES Capacity Building Task Force, and lead implementation of the Biodiversity HCD Strategy, including the Groen Sebenza graduate programme **which will support capacity in the identified project.** SANBI works with UNICEF and other partners on digital platforms to support capacity development of youth.

? Climate change: SANBI is a National Implementing Entity and accredited Direct Access Entity of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), which supports projects in line with South Africa's Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation ambitions. Cross-functional steering committees ensure coordination between donor-funded projects, current and future.

? Regional and global coordination: through the Multi-Environmental Agreements Forum, the African Group of Negotiators and African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN). DFFE and SANBI provide expert input and convene relevant stakeholders to participate in CBD processes and coordinate implementation and review of the NBSAP.

Sustainable utilization of species: coordination through the existing SANBI hosted Scientific Authority (supporting CITES decision-making processes), a Southern African

working group on sustainable management of utilized plant species across borders, GEF-funded project on developing the South African Wildlife Population System (SAWPS), a GEF-funded project developing a biotrade certification system for South Africa; and the Access to Benefit Sharing through value chain development implemented by DFFE.

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Proposed core indicators and contributions to GEBs are satisfactory for PIF stage. Please, provide WDPA IDs for PAs under core indicator 1.1.

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 27 Nov 2023

The proposed PAs under core indicator 1.1 are indicative areas that will be established through the project. As such, the proposed areas have not yet been assigned WDPA IDs. In line with the GEF8 results framework guidance, WDPA IDs will be provided at MTR or TE once the proposed areas have been gazetted by government through decree, gazette or other formal means of establishment and assigned by UNEP-WCMC.

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

#### Agency's Comments

##### 5.6 RISKS

**a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?**

**b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Potential risks associated with project are adequately described.

Agency's Comments

#### **5.7 Qualitative assessment**

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
  
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
  
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Proposed project is aligned with national and global priorities, with potential for scaling up.

Agency's Comments

#### **6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

- 6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Proposed project is well aligned with BD Focal area strategy.

Agency's Comments

- 6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Project is well aligned with national policies and will contribute to target 3 of the new Global Biodiversity Framework.

Agency's Comments

- 6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Project will contribute directly to target 3 of the new Global Biodiversity Framework.

Agency's Comments

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

- 7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: The UNDP's checklist is missing, please include in the Portal.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 27 Nov 2023

Checklist is included in the portal.

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: List of stakeholder's consultations is satisfactory.

Agency's Comments

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Project is consistent with the country's STAR allocation.

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Project is consistent with FA allocation.

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments11.1.23: PPG request is consistent with guidelines.

Agency's Comments

**8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments11.1.23: Proposed co-financing is satisfactory for PIF stage.

Agency's Comments

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: The LOE template used for this project removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: *Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?*. The GEF Sec issued an e-mail message to all Agencies in March, 2023, informing that that LoEs *with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned?*. While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please, either send a new LoE including the footnote, or alternatively, ask the OFP to send a message to the GEF Sec officially indicating its concurrence/acceptance of this footnote to be part of the existing LoE (The LoE needs to be referenced in the message).

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 27 Nov 2023

The LOE has been updated and includes the required footnote as per standard template. Revised copy has been uploaded to the GEF portal.

**Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: OFP endorsement letter has been uploaded to the GEF Portal.

#### Agency's Comments

**Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

#### Agency's Comments

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

#### Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Maps are satisfactory.

Agency's Comments

**Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Safeguard screening is adequate for PIF stage.

Agency's Comments

**Annex E: Rio Markers**

**8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Rio Markers are adequate.

Agency's Comments

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments 11.1.23: Taxonomy worksheet is adequate.

Agency's Comments

## Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

## 9 GEFSEC Decision

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

11.3.23: Please, address the comments above and resubmit for further review. Thanks!

• 11.29.23: Please, capture/intergrade gender dimensions in relevant outputs under Outcomes 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.2 as they were not included in the re-submission. Thanks!

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 27 Nov 2023

We appreciate the feedback and guidance provided on the PIF submission. We confirm that all issues have been addressed in line with the feedback and guidance including strategies for achieving GEBs under summary section; PMC co-financing has been increased to align with GEF requirements; Details on execution partners have been provided; coordination mechanisms elaborated and LoE revised as per standard template to include the footnote earlier excluded.

Changes made to the PIF have been highlighted in green.

UNDP response - Dec 04 2023



We apologize for missing this comment in the last resubmission. This has now been addressed as appropriate in response to comments and feedback. The changes have been highlighted with Green in the PIF.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Review Dates**

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

PIF Review

Agency Response

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>