

Integrated approach to proactive management of human-wildlife conflict and wildlife crime in hotspot landscapes in Namibia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10244

Countries

Namibia

Project Name

Integrated approach to proactive management of human-wildlife conflict and wildlife crime in hotspot landscapes in Namibia

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/4/2020

Review completed by PM

4/14/2021

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, addressed.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Differences with the initial concept are explained and justified.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. cofinancing is well defined and with evidences.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request The Annex C is available.

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 14, 2021

Addressed.

April 9, 2021

In the portal, 711,000 ha are entered under the core indicator 4.1, meanwhile 689,500 ha are mentioned in the project document and the annex F of the request for CEO endorsement. Please correct and confirm the agreed target.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: April 13, 2021

Thank you for alerting us to this error. The correct figure is 689,500 ha and this has been corrected in the Portal and cross-checked throughout the documentation.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Addressed.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, Addressed.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project is innovative in its way to address Human-Wildlife conflict and wildlife crime together, proposing a dedicated institutional mechanism and testing various tools.

Sustainability is anchored in the project, building on a strong policy framework and institutional ownership.

The project's outputs and outcomes have a high potential for scaling up, both within the three target landscapes, and beyond ? including in neighboring countries, especially in the KAZA Trans-Frontier Conservation Area.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the contribution to this project to the GWP outcomes is described.

This project will also be connected to the global coordination project.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes (annex 7).

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes (Annex 9), a very comprehensive gender action plan is proposed.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The private sector is empowered in several aspects of the project (outputs 3.1 and 3.2).

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 9, 2021

Risks are identified with mitigation measures, including on COVID-19.

Addressed.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 14, 2021

Addressed.

April 9, 2021

Not fully.

- We would appreciate to find a description of mechanisms to coordinate the implementation of several GEF projects on NRM in the same landscapes (Etosha, Kunene). It seems important to find synergies and especially avoid risks of duplication between the current proposal and the NILALEG project for instance (GEFID 9426).

- Similarly, GEF projects developed by other agencies also target the same regions in Northern Namibia (GEFID 10251). Some coordination mechanisms with FAO and the authorities would be appreciated for the same reasons (finding potential synergies, reducing risks of duplication). Please, complete.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: April 13, 2021

Thank you for the feedback. The mechanisms through which coordination with related initiatives will be achieved have been further elaborated in the Prodoc, in the section on Partnerships (para 97, page 29 and para 106, page 30), and the CEO ER (Item 6, Institutional arrangements and coordination, page 42). They include, but may not be limited to, the following:

1. At the **national** level, MEFT will co-ordinate the implementation of all Natural Resource Management-related initiatives (irrespective of sub-theme or geographical landscape) through a formal Donor Co-ordination Forum, which this project (GEF ID 10244/UNDP PIMS 6303) will support in its start-up phase by providing limited operating costs and some facilitation support. The Donor Co-ordination Forum (formal name yet to be decided), to be launched in June 2021, will convene bi-annually to ensure synergies and complementarity between initiatives funded and supported through various development parties including UNDP, UNEP, USAID, FAO, UNESCO, GiZ, KfW, WWF, and others as relevant.
2. At the **landscape** level, the MEFT will coordinate implementation and ensure synergies between this project and related initiatives (financed through GEF and other agencies) by working through and enhancing existing coordination platforms established through the Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organizations - NACSO (for Etosha, Kunene and Bwabwata-Mudumu landscapes) and the KAZA TFCA (for Bwabwata-Mudumu) that have legitimacy and credibility and established operational procedures and stakeholder bases. These platforms will enable site-level coordination between this project, the GEF-financed/UNDP-supported NILALEG project (GEF ID 9426) and the FAO-supported Drylands Sustainable Landscapes project (GEF ID 10251) and other initiatives to address wildlife crime and human-wildlife conflict. For human-wildlife-conflict related work in the Bwabwata-Mudumu landscape these include the KAZA Working Group on Conservation, and 9 Community Forums. For work related to Wildlife Crime Prevention and the Illegal Wildlife Trade, the newly-launched ?National Strategy on Wildlife Protection and Law Enforcement ?(March 2021) provides for a national-level coordination mechanism. At landscape level, this is augmented by the KAZA Working Group on Safety and Security, and the KAZA Working Group on Conservation.

The Project Board will also ensure effective alignment between this project and other government-led interventions, and will monitor the project's participation in the coordination mechanisms described above.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The project fits the fifth National Development Plan and the NBSAP.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

YEs.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 14, 2021

We take note and appreciate the response. We approve the use of GEF funds for car rentals and operating costs for cars provided by other projects, notably from cofinancing.

Cleared.

April 9, 2021

Budget:

- It seems that the budget does not include the purchase of vehicles, only operating costs and car rental (#71600 under the different components for \$123,000, \$45,000, \$35,000, \$9,000, for a total of \$212,000) Please, confirm.

- Please, confirm if vehicles will be provided by cofinancing.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: April 13, 2021

We can confirm that the project budget does not include provision for the purchase of vehicles, but, rather includes provision for vehicle hire/lease and operating costs (where the project makes use of vehicles managed by MEFT and funded through non-project resources). The project domain is vast and much of the territory is rugged, so mobility using appropriate all-terrain vehicles in the three target landscapes will be an important ingredient for effective implementation of this project. Where lease/rental of vehicles does not meet the project's mobility needs adequately, the MEFT will ensure that the project has access to vehicles supported through parallel investments under their cofinancing commitments - these vehicles may not be dedicated to this project, however, and the impact of this on efficiency and effectiveness of implementation will be carefully monitored.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request See annex B, Request for
CEO endorsement.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request See annex B, Request for
CEO endorsement.

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 20 2021

The point is addressed.

Control Quality: Please note that ?public investment? co-financing should be used only for expenditures from recipient country government budgets. As such, please revise the type of co-financing from donor Agency (KfW). Based on the information provided in the letter, this co-financing can be considered as ?grant?.

April 14, 2021

The project is recommended for clearance.

April 9, 2021

Please, address the comments above. Upon receipt of a revised project package, the project will be recommended for clearance.

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/9/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations