

Catalyzing Financing and Capacity for the Biodiversity Economy around Protected Areas

Basic Information

GEF ID

10341

Countries

South Africa

Project Title

Catalyzing Financing and Capacity for the Biodiversity Economy around Protected Areas

GEF Agency(ies)

World Bank, UNEP

Agency ID

World Bank: P170213, UNEP: 01745

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The STAR Allocation?

The STAK allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-10-19

The PPG and Agency fee are as in the Letter of Endorsement and within the limits established for projects above \$10 million (PPG of \$333,486)

A. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Amount (\$)	PPG Agency Fee (\$)
333,486	30,014

The Project amount (\$13,427,982) is as in the Letter of Endorsement and the Agency Fee is 9.0% as for Programs above \$10 million

GEF Child Project Financing(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)
13,427,982	1,208,518

Modifications needed:

1. In Other Executing Partner remove "thru the WB" and in the Executing Partner Type enter the corresponding category for DEFF (not GEF Agency)

Other Executing Partner(s)	Executing Partner Type
Department of Environmental Forest and Fisheries (DEFF) thru World Bank	GEF Agency

2. Please remove "UNEP will request PPG separately". This PPG is for the two agencies as stated in the rest of the proposal and in the table

with the amounts for WB and UNEP. Funding will be divided accordingly.

LIMITS FOR PPG AMOUNT

- (a) For MSPs of up to USD 2 million, the limit is up to USD 50,000;
- (b) For FSPs up to USD 3 million, the limit is up to \$100,000;
- (c) For FSPs up to USD 6 million, the limit is up to USD 150,000;
- (d) For FSPs up to USD 10 million, the limit is up to USD 200,000; and
- (e) For FSPs above USD 10 million, the limit is up to USD 300,000.

Please provide justification

UNEP will request PPG separately.

10-26-19

Under Programming of Funds, World Bank and UNEP should charge this against South Africa's BD STAR allocation - The BD Global/Regional Set-Aside is exclusively for the Global Project that would coordinate all the child projects. Please amend and re-submit. Thanks.

10-28-19

Cleared

1.

Agency Response

Noted and revisions have been made.

The project is designed to deliver high impacts and has been designed to capture the comparative advantage of both agencies which will implement specific aspects of the project. This request for PPG is based on discussions with the counterpart on the scope of interventions and extensive baseline work needed in the spread-out sites, to develop cost effective project component activities. In addition given that preparation will require travel and analysis through two respective agencies, the estimated costs as requested by the Government are slightly higher than the threshold.

Core indicators

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines?
(GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-10-19

Please address issues under item 5. Thanks

10-17-19

This PPG is recommended for Technical Clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/10/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/17/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/26/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval