

Integrated sustainable and adaptive management of natural resources to support land degradation neutrality and livelihoods in the Miombo-Mopane landscapes of North-east Botswana

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10255

Countries

Botswana

Project Name

Integrated sustainable and adaptive management of natural resources to support land degradation neutrality and livelihoods in the Miombo-Mopane landscapes of North-east Botswana

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/10/2020

Review completed by PM

4/9/2021

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

- However, please only retain the alignment with the IP Drylands SFM program for the total amount in Table A (same as in the parent PFD, from which this child project draws funding).

- Please set CCM Rio Marker to 2 (for projects financed by the SFM IP incentive).

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

-Table A changed per-request.

-Rio Marker changed as requested.

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

01/22/2021: Not fully.

Component 2 appears to lack outputs that are designed to achieve the intended outcome and achieve the set targets. Besides the farmer field schools (FFS), what other activities/outputs on the ground will achieve the outcomes and how does this related to the budget of \$3 million? For example, which outputs will achieve the sustainable management of 315,000 ha of forests? And which budget line items will support these activities? The detailed budget should also reflect those outputs (see also comments on the budget below).

Further, the co-financing ratio for the PMC is not proportional to total amount of co-financing. Please increase and/or justify why that is the case. As per GEF guidelines, PMC must be co-financed; at a minimum level we expect that PMC co-financing ensure that no management costs are charged to GEF project component budget. In this context it is also noted that the co-financing overview in paragraph 184 assigns the total amount co-financing to project components and nothing to the PMC.

03/16/2021: Not fully addressed.

The co-financing ratio for the PMC is still not proportional to total amount of co-financing. While the overall co-financing ration is 1 : 15.6, the ration of PMC is 1 : 2.5. Please increase the ratio of PMC co-financing in table B to an acceptable ratio.

04/09/2021: Addressed.

The PMC co-financing ratio has been discussed (see below) The increased ratio of 1 : 7 is considered adequate. However, there are still some charges that should be covered by PMC co-financing.

(i) Miscellaneous are generally operating expenses, so they should be charged to PMC but not to project components. Please utilize co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

(ii) Administrative and Finance Manager costs are spread among all three components and the PMC ? please use PMC to cover this (GEF portion and co-financing portion).

Program Manager can only approve the difference in PMC co-financing ratio and overall ratio if there the PMC charges to project components are removed.

04/27/2021: Addressed. After discussions with the agency and as per justification provided, Program Manager approves the increase in PMC from 5.0% to 5.4%. Program Manager also approves the difference in the co-financing ratio of 1:17 overall and 1:9 in PMC co-financing. Both approvals are made on an exceptional basis in the context of this particular project only.

Cleared

Agency Response

04/22/2021

Miscellaneous expenses have been removed from the budget. Admin and Finance Manger is now covered by the project's PMC. The government co-financing was increased (see last response) after consultation to support the PMU logistically and technically. The nature of the identified PMC co-financing does not allow a direct cost sharing arrangement for the PMU staff.

03/28/21

The co-financing amount has been increased as much as possible.

The GoB will now offer approximately US\$ 1,345,000 of realistic co-financing to support PMC.

Government of Botswana PMC Contributions		
Item	Description	Totals
Vehicles	US\$120,000/year x 5 years	US\$ 600,000
PM Staff time	US\$80,000/year x 5 years	US\$ 400,000
Office	US\$60,000/year x 5 years	US\$ 300,000
Staff allowance	US\$9,000/year x 5 years	US\$ 45,000

Total	US\$ 1,345,000
--------------	-----------------------

In addition FAO Botswana will contribute US\$ 518,050 of targeted co-financing to support PMC. The corresponding letter of co-financing has been uploaded.

FAO PMC Contributions		
Item	Description	Totals
Coordination Missions		US\$ 18,086
Field Visits		US\$ 110,304
Transport	(Fuel Cost & Vehicle Maintenance for 3 vehicles)	US\$ 5,100
Staff Time	25% staff time for M&E, Project Coordinator, Communication Officer, Project Officers & Drivers	US\$ 94,346.96
Office & Laboratory Space	25% contribution to Rental & Utilities/Services	US\$ 290,214
Total		US\$ 518,051

Component 2 intends to focus upon the implementation of actions designed to directly assist the private sector to shift agriculture, livestock management and forest use resource use through strategic demonstrations supported by FFS training.

Output 2.2's budget allocates approximately US\$ 1.2 million to support communities to implement concrete demonstrations (note expendable and non-expendable procurement). This investment focuses entirely upon provisioning on-the-ground activities. The investment is beyond the approximately US\$ 1.8 million allocated for FFS, full-time field support, extension service training, etc.

Output 2.2 and the corresponding budget lines provide illustrative practices to be funded through the project. As noted in the Project Document, on the ground demonstrations will include the following:

Rangeland Management

? Conservation Agriculture

- ? Seed Varieties and Storage
- ? Business Planning
- ? Community Gardens
- ? Sustainable Fuelwood Management
- ? Financial Management
- ? Forest Rehabilitation
- ? Agro-Forestry
- ? Fire Management
- ? Rainwater Harvesting

These priorities were identified with community stakeholders during the PPG phase. The cumulative actions will lead to the realization of the intended project results. However, it is critical that these on-the-ground actions are further prioritized and refined by a strategic planning process and that implementation is supported by a strong FFS and extension service capable of providing necessary technical capacity building and support. As noted above, nearly US\$ 1.4 million is allocated to support implementation of these schemes in addition to technical enhancements.

These precise actions to be adopted and implemented under Component 2 must be fully informed by the decision-making platforms established under Component 1. This will make certain on-the-ground investments are strategically directed to achieve intended LDN targets, SLM and SFM objectives and contribute to achievement of the project's results framework indicators.

As noted in the barriers and baseline discussions, too often in Botswana investments have focused upon providing assistance while failing to first provide a strategic context and direction for this assistance. Investments made without this contextual framework and accompanying M&E generally do not result in meaningful impacts.

Component 1's LUP and associated monitoring activities will help define the parameters for on-the-ground actions, including making certain that these actions are directed towards achieving the project results and LDN objectives.

Component 1 is designed to be inclusive with a strong focus upon working with community members to identify targeted interventions so that on-the-ground actions support the advanced LUP process and, again, the realization of LDN objectives.

Although the entire project is directed towards improving sustainable management of the Miombo-Mopane landscape and associated forests, the following Outputs will directly target this result:

Output 1.2 Land use management plans operational at both target sites and effectively addressing SLM and SFM issues.

Output 1.3 Strategic land use management plans rigorously monitored with reporting informing decision-making and adaptive management.

Output 2.2 Private producers implement sustainable production practices that deliver SLM, SFM and LDN benefits.

Forests covered by this project are located on three different land use designations: Tribal Lands, Forest Reserves, and National Parks.

Direct resource use within Forest Reserves, National Parks and Game Reserves is highly restricted. Resource use across most Tribal Lands is generally often defined by 'open-access' regimes leading to overgrazing, unsustainable agriculture, and unsustainable forest management.

As the Project Document states: *Originally created primarily to safeguard commercial timber resources, Forest Reserves were also used by local communities for grazing and collection of building materials, fuelwood, traditional medicines, and other non-timber forest products known in Botswana as 'veld' products. Forest Reserves are now generally considered as important conservation buffer zones to more strictly protected game reserves and national parks. As a result, most Forest Reserves having extremely limited economic function beyond photographic and hunting tourism.*

This distinction is important to how the GoB prioritized investments and determined targets.

1. Component 1 Actions:

The GoB recognizes that in order to secure the conservation of the Miombo and Mopane landscapes at the target sub-basins the sustainable management of both conserved and productive landscapes and associated woodlands must be improved.

All forests within the project area will benefit from management defined by strategic and informed land and resource use planning and management. This is currently absent with regards to the entire Miombo and Mopane landscape for each land use designation: Tribal Lands, Forest Reserves and National Parks. This is a major obstacle to sustainable management, including the establishment and realization of LDN targets.

Therefore, under Component 1, ILUP will establish the much-needed platform for strategic forest management along with complimentary LDN targets. This will directly lead to sustainable management of this area using a coherent, landscape level approach.

Component 1 and associated activities will cover approximately 565,000 total ha including 315,000 ha of forest.

Within the Chobe target area, Component 1 will extend beyond the sub-basin to match the boundaries of the Forest Reserves and CH1 (the district). This is an area of approximately 365,500 ha including approximately 87,000 hectares of Tribal Lands and 22,000 hectares for forest within these Tribal Lands. Component 1 will cover approximately 200,000 hectares of the Tutume-Mosetse Sub-Basin, including approximately 14,260 hectares of high priority woodlands located on Tribal Lands. There are no designated Forest Reserves, National Parks, or Game Reserves within the Tutume-Mosetse.

Approximately US\$ 700,000 is allocated to Component 1 focused upon the establishment of ILUP and associated implementation activities designed to drive sustainable management.

2. Component 2 Actions:

The remaining and potential forest areas within Tribal Lands at both locations are under intense use pressure due to unsustainable forest, agriculture and livestock management.

Under Component 2, the current unsustainable practices that drive forest loss will be directly addressed through ?on-the-ground? demonstrations facilitated by FFS programming.

Component 2 (Practice) activities within both sub-basins will focus tribal lands. As noted, lands within the Chobe Enclave are directly associated with proximate Forest Reserves. The Enclave is located in the middle of a highly critical wildlife area/corridor. SLM and SFM improvements under Component 2 will help address on-going human-wildlife conflicts while simultaneously generating habitat/BD benefits covering approximately 148,000 ha under better coordinated sustainable management and production regimes. Forest areas located on tribal lands at both locations will benefit from sustainable management improvements.

Approximately US\$ 3 million is allocated for Component 2 activities designed to enhance sustainable management of the Mopane-Miombo landscape. This includes forest restoration, lessened agricultural expansion, improved forest practices, and improved grazing management all directed towards improving sustainable management of the Mopane-Miombo landscape.

3. M&E, Upscale, and Sustainability

M&E and informed decision-making platforms established under both Components 1 and 3 will assist to make certain that these targets are being met and adaptive management principles are applied across the entire Mopane-Miombo landscape including 315,000 hectares of woodlands inclusive of Forest Reserves, National Parks, and Tribal Lands within each sub-basin.

Approximately US\$ 1.1 million has been allocated to support these activities that will lead to sustainable management of the targeted 315,000 hectares of forests located on associated Tribal Lands and Forest Reserves.

The Project Budget was amended to increase the Component 2 budget and provide greater clarity regarding the intended use of Component 2 funds designed to support on-the-ground interventions, again based upon the strategic directions of the inclusive LUP activity.

Each of these investments and related actions are designed to deliver the project's intended results. Activities will be closely monitored to make certain the investment is on track to deliver.

The following budget lines are designated to support Component 2 on-the-ground activities designed to support the ILUP targets, achieve LDN objectives and deliver relevant project results framework indicators.

? SLM/SFM FFS Expert: Field coordinator and community outreach person responsible to facilitate FFS and implementation "on-the-ground" Component 2 Activities (Chobe): US\$ 200,000

? SLM/SFM FFS Expert: Field coordinator and community outreach person responsible to facilitate FFS and implementation "on-the-ground" Component 2 Activities (Tutume): US\$ 200,000

? Field based operations and technical support for "on-the-ground" outscaling Component 2 Actions: Forest Restoration, Green VC, FFS, etc.: US\$ 360,000

? FFS Program Implementation: Chobe: FFS programming support to provide financing for communities to improve technical capacity to implement strategic, on-the-ground actions/demonstrations to support achievement of LDN targets through FFS: US\$ 270,000

? FFS Program Implementation: Tutume: FFS programming support to provide financing for communities to improve technical capacity to implement strategic, on-the-ground actions/demonstrations to support achievement of LDN targets through FFS: US\$ 266,000

? Component 2: (expendable) FFS Implementation (Chobe): Fencing, irrigation, seeds, and other items required to implement FFS programming: US\$ 290,000

? Component 2: (expendable) FFS Implementation (Tutume): Fencing, irrigation, seeds, and other items required to implement FFS programming: US\$ 290,000

? Component 2: (non-expendable) Equipment for Extension Services to support on-the-ground demonstrations (Chobe): US\$ 300,000

? Component 2: (non-expendable) Equipment for Extension Services to support on-the-ground demonstrations (Tutume): US\$ 300,000

The GoB PMC co-financing will likely exceed the amount listed in the Project Document. The GOB will provide financial support for vehicles/drivers, PM staff and services, three offices (2 field offices and one Gaborone office), etc. The cofinancing overview in paragraph 184 has been adjusted accordingly.

Vehicles: US\$ 60,000/year x 5 years: US\$ 300,000

PM Staff Time: US\$ 40,000/year X 5 years: US\$ 200,000

Office: US\$ 30,000/year x 5 years: US\$ 150,000

Co-financing figures have been included in paragraph 184.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response N/A

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

01/22/2021: Not fully.

Several items in Table C do not correctly reflect the type and sources of co-financing that are indicated in the letters. Please consult the GEF co-financing guidelines and revise the table with regard to sources and type. Further, please describe how Investment Mobilized has been identified in the space provide under the table.

In addition, please address specifically:

- KAZA and FAO letters do not specify type of co-financing. Either revise or count as in-kind.

- ISFMI and MOA letters are in a different currency, please indicate which exchange rates have been used.

- DFRR letter states public investment but Table C indicates "grant".

In addition, please clarify the table provided in para 184 of the portal. the total co-financing amount is dedicated to co-financing of the project components. PMC must also be co-financed in a credible way. Please clarify which sources/entities will provide PMC co-financing.

03/16/2021: Not fully addressed.

For comments on PMC, see above. In this context, the reviewer would like to ask why there is not co-financing provided by FAO? While it is not required, it may help to increase the ratio of PMC co-financing as mentioned in above comments on Table B.

04/09/2021: Outstanding issues:

- Co-financing letter from Savanna Fire Management indicates that the funds are from the Australian Government (donor Agency). Please revise the information in table C.

- Co-financing from KfW should be labeled as "donor Agency" (even if the letter is issued by the government's implementing unit). Also, in-kind co-financing usually refers to "recurrent, operative costs" and not investment mobilized. Please provide a justification or revise.

- Co-financing letter from Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources, Conservation and Tourism: DFRR indicates co-financing of 18,604,569.00 BWP = US\$ 1,738,744 (using the exchange rate provided by the Agency). Please revise table C accordingly.

04/27/2021: Addressed and corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

04/22/2021

Co-financing figures are updated, Table C amended.

03/28/2021

FAO will contribute US\$ 518,050 of targeted co-financing to support PMC. The corresponding letter of co-financing has been uploaded.

The co-financing table C has been amended

The Project Document now states:

The Government of Botswana working with FAO/Botswana secured co-financing from the listed sources. Please see attached letters of co-financing inclusive of descriptions attached.

The exchange rate used for ISFMI and MOA was approximately US\$ 1 = Pula 10.7. This has been noted.

Co-financing table (para 184) has been updated.

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

01/22/2021: Not fully.

Table D is correct.

However, the budget proposal is not adequate and needs revisions. In the revision please take the following points (but not limited to these points) into account :

- The budget needs revision in line with FAO not providing execution support services (see also further below comments on coordination).

- The GEF amount going towards field implementation is considered too low. Please make every effort to increase the amounts going towards field implementation.

- Also note that all costs related to project management must be charged to PMC and co-financed as per GEF guidelines. For example, the administrative and financial manager should be fully charged to PMC and not to project components.

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

04/09/2021: Note that above comments on PMC co-financing will affect the budget table.

(i) Miscellaneous are generally operating expenses, so they should be charged to PMC but not to project components. Please utilize co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

(ii) Administrative and Finance Manager costs are spread among all three components and the PMC ? please use PMC to cover this (GEF portion and co-financing portion).

04/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

04/22/2021

Miscellaneous expenses have been removed from the budget. Admin and Finance Manger is now covered by the project's PMC. The government co-financing was increased (see last response) after consultation to support the PMU logistically and technically. The nature of the identified PMC co-financing does not allow a direct cost sharing arrangement for the PMU staff.

Noted. The budget has been revised accordingly.

Component 1 investments are directed towards on-the-ground activities required to generate parameters and guidance to make certain investment target and deliver intended LDN and other project results. As noted, this is a process defined by high levels of stakeholder engagement at the community level. Nearly 300,000 hectares of

the targeted areas are designated Tribal Lands. Resource use and access are largely defined by communities working with tribal and government systems. It will be critical that this work takes place at the 'field' level.

Component 2 is designed to support field implementation in terms of 'on-the-ground' action by private stakeholders. As noted, most of the project budget is allocated to support these efforts. This includes the purchase of equipment and goods required to implement improved practices. The remainder will be allocated for much needed field-based training and technical support, including financing for field-based staff to work directly with communities in both target areas to make certain demonstrations are designed to deliver intended results. This investment will work as 'venture capital' to provide the financing required for communities to bridge from unsustainable to sustainable practices.

Component 3 investments are directed towards on-the-ground activities required to capture and disseminate best practices and create a KM system designed to ensure enduring results. This includes KM systems that directly target field level actors to improve their access to knowledge required to advance and sustain improved practices.

Budget revisions were made according to directions.

Lower salary support from GEF reflects PMC co-financing to be picked up via GoB.

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

However, please copy and paste into Annex C of the portal.

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response PPG utilization report has been included within Annex C of the portal

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

01/22/2021: Not fully.

- The project does not indicate any BD related targets, which doesn't seem correct. For a project under the SFM Drylands IP, this is expected. Please clarify BD related benefits and list them under 4.1 and 4.4. as appropriate. The table provided in paragraph 185 lists 300,000 ha of area for BD benefits and 140,000 ha of HCVF. Please enter that into core indicator table as well.

- Please make sure that core indicator table and table in para 185 are consistent.

- Indicator 6 is listed in the wrong category (please enter in AFOLU sector).

03/16/2021: Not fully.

Indicator 6 lacks starting year and duration of accounting (20 years for AFOLU).

04/09/2021: Outstanding issue: consistency of figures:

- Please ensure that the targets in the GEF core indicator worksheet are aligned and consistent with the (i) section on GEBs and (ii) project results framework in Annex A. Double check the numbers for CI 4 and CI 11 (see discrepancies in para 185, for example).

04/27/2021: Addressed and corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

04/22/2021

Targets are aligned now

03/28/2021

Noted and corrected

Core Indicator 4 was amended as follows:

Core Indicator 4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)	545,000
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity	
	Chobe (Entire Chobe Forest Reserve)	258,000
	Tutume-Mosetse	
Indicator 4.2	Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations	
	Chobe	
	Tutume-Mosetse	
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems	
	Chobe	66,000
	Tutume-Mosetse	185,740
Indicator 4.4	Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided	
	Chobe (Forest on Tribal Lands)	21,000
	Tutume-Mosetse (Forest on Tribal Lands)	14,260

In addition, the following BD indicator has been included in the results framework to provide further guidance:

- ? Number of reported human-wildlife conflicts reported to the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) reduced by at least 25% in both project areas.

Reduced wildlife conflict is a strong and measurable indicator of improved sustainable management of productive landscapes in both areas.

As noted, the Results Framework includes the following indicators designed to contribute to BD impacts:

- ? Hectares of degraded lands with restored ecosystem functionality

- ? Hectares of landscapes under improved practices directed by legally adopted LUP, including BD, SLM, and HCV forest loss.

- ? Hectares of land achieving LDN as indicated by improved land cover, productivity, and carbon stocks

- ? Hectares covered by adopted land use plans measuring LDN with objective of SLM and SFM

** LDN targets include BD.

Core indicator 6 is now listed under AFOLU. The total is: 637,745 CO2e

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Not fully

In line with above comments made on the budget, please clarify and elaborate further on the project activities that are implemented in the field with local communities and how these will contribute to the intended outcomes. The project description focuses a lot of capacity building; while this is certainly a necessary element, there seems to be less focus on on the ground implementation with tangible outcomes.

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Please see comments above regarding budget revisions and clarifications.

As noted, contextual parameters describing priority on-the-ground interventions and associated monitoring are critical to making certain investments align with and support achievement of intended ILUP objectives and impacts related to core degradation issues.

Output 2.2 provides a list of illustrative interventions identified during project design.

On-the-ground interventions will be refined and prioritized based upon findings and directions of the ILUP delivered under Component 1.

Output 1.2 details sectors that mirror on-the-ground implementation requirements.

This includes linkages to specific expectations and targets required for LDN and associated project results impacts.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

It is noted that indigenous groups (San people) are involved as stakeholder.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Yes. However, please take the following recommendations into account and address as appropriate:

- Tourism, nature based (hunting, safari, landscapes), features strongly as a private sector activity across all of the regions. However, actions that engage the Tourism sector, or seek to align with the tourism sector are not included in the project design. If so, these would of course be assessed and adapted in the context of the pandemic.
- Extractive industries (diamonds, copper and coal) are noted as important economic actors and in some cases, notably sand mining, are contributors to the environmental degradation of the project areas.
- Charcoal production, for domestic fuelwood, is also listed as an economic activity driving forest degradation with the increasingly difficult access to this resource. It is noted that there are no recent reports on the level of demand and supply for charcoal and that measures such as efficiency of production, certification, access to new markets and

sources of sustainable supply could relieve pressure from the forests. The project is encouraged to continue working on this issue / management challenge in the course of its implementation.

- Coal, copper and diamond mining companies may also be considered for financial co-contribution where their SDG targets align with the project goals, especially global corporate targets for biodiversity and carbon.

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

There is very little tourism in the Tutume area and/or opportunities for tourism. The closest touristic area is the Tuli Block.

Prior to Covid-19, the Chobe Enclave had a robust tourism industry. As noted, many of the households living in target communities benefit directly from the tourism industry.

Botswana's relatively successful CBNRM program was launched nearly thirty years ago in the Enclave. These communities continue to benefit from Joint Venture Partnerships and other agreements with tourism companies.

The project will of course seek out additional opportunities.

Over the past thirty years, numerous attempts have been made to establish community-based tourism operations. None have had a meaningful impact for a variety of reasons.

During the design process, discussions were held with several private enterprises associated with tourism, including lodge owners/managers. These parties are generally receptive to providing communities with as much benefit as possible recognizing the symbiotic relationship between communities, wildlife, and tourism.

Very few meaningful opportunities exist to further expand economic benefit relationships between communities and private tourism operations through this project.

Some lodges would be interested in "farm to table" production if the quality and quantity of produce could be guaranteed and the high tourism season aligned better with the growing season.

Nearly all lodges already sell handicrafts from local communities.

Regardless, as the Project Document notes, the tourism industry is a critical stakeholder in the Chobe region and the project will continue to explore opportunities.

There is no diamond, copper, or coal mining in the regions targeted.

The GoB reports that sand mining is very limited and reasonably well-regulated.

Charcoal production is very limited in Botswana.

There are two pilot projects (UNDP) in other areas focused upon bush encroachment by prosopis to make charcoal for bricks. However, in the project target areas invasive prosopis is not an issue. Prosopis was introduced to the Kalahari regions for dune stabilization. As the project progresses, this may be explored further.

Large mining sectors work closely with the GoB. These sectors substantially contribute to the GoB's core budget.

GoB funds, in part derived from the mining sector, will be used for GoB co-financing during implementation.

These core budget funds will also be applied by the GoB to provide sustainable financing to maintain project implemented improvements post-project.

There are no mining activities within the project's target areas.

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

01/22/2021: Not fully.

The risk table includes mostly "challenges". Please focus and prioritize the table on major risks such as climate, drought, and implications of the pandemic.

On the pandemic specifically, the description of the situation provided under the risk table is very informative. Please elaborate on two issues:

- What adaptive management is/will be in place e.g. on the fact that there are no international flights to Botswana right now? Will this affect the planned international expertise?

- Are there any opportunities that arise from planned COVID-19 recovery efforts by the government?

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The risk table was updated based upon recommendations.

The project document within the Environmental and Social Risks section includes a detailed analysis of potential environmental risks ? including climate change - and specific component-based responses.

The Covid-19 situation in Botswana is rapidly evolving. For instance, international borders are now open with flights bringing limited numbers of tourists.

Botswana has already made an upfront payment through COVAX for nearly 1 million doses under a two-dose regime. This is a substantial figure given Botswana's population of 2.3 million people. The country is rapidly making arrangements for additional doses to cover the entire population.

Although there is no certainty, the GoB is confident that pandemic impacts to project implementation will be most prevalent in the near-term and will diminish over time. For instance, the project will likely commence implementation by mid-2021 with primarily inception focused activities, e.g. recruitment, refinement of implementation strategies, etc. These activities can easily be moved forward remotely.

During the project design phase, remote working conditions proved to be adequate for most technical support activities. This included conducting national level vetting workshops with active international participation.

The project's field based activities are scheduled to commence in December 2021 when pandemic based implementation risks are likely decreased.

Regardless, FAO at both the national and international levels has designed and adopted several Covid-19 coping strategies that will be utilized during implementation on a case by case level. This includes a recently adopted manual covering how to implement FFS remotely to accommodate potential pandemic concerns and restrictions.

In addition, the project is designed to rely primarily upon Botswana national staff and government staff for field based activities. Technical and advisory support can very effectively be provided remotely. This will limit requirements and constraints associated with international travel.

With regards to alignment with post-pandemic economic recovery, the GoB has established a Covid-19 relief fund with more than 2 billion Pula seed funding (US\$ 182 million). This includes providing loans, credit supports, tax concessions, expedited government purchase orders, etc.

As the project inception period progresses and as national Covid-19 relief advances and/or modifies over time, opportunities for alignment with this fund and other post-pandemic relief initiatives will be explored.

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

01/22/2021: Not fully.

It is noted that the OFP has made an exception request for FAO to provide execution support.

- The justification provided in this case is to ensure a more effective collaboration between the Miombo/Mopane cluster countries under the programmatic approach, and also to provide an opportunity for a harmonized, well-coordinated and cost-efficient deployment of tailored technical assistance to support child project countries in addressing common land degradation challenges. This is not considered a justification for a GEF policy exception, which explicitly precludes the merging or crossing over of the implementing functions of the GEF Agencies and the execution functions undertaken by EAs.

- The proposed arrangement on the procurement of all international expertise for the child project through FAO is not in line with this policy. GEF policy strongly prefers national execution of projects and the utilization of national expertise to provide technical assistance locally. The intended harmonized, well-coordinated and cost-efficient deployment of tailored technical assistance to support child project execution can be achieved by other means than by providing execution support by the Implementing agency.

- FAO as the Lead Agency for the DSL program also implements and executes the associated Global Coordination Project (GCP) for this program. This function is crucial for ensuring coherence among all child projects under the program, and also has a specific budget for providing technical assistance through the GCP. In addition, child

projects are expected to allocate funds for engagement in global (and specifically for this IP regional cluster) activities for learning and knowledge sharing.

- Even if situations of low capacity in the country would require specific execution support, we request the GEF Agency to procure a "third-party" to execute as a preferred way forward.

- Finally, written requests by OFPs are only a condition for consideration of the request, and do not automatically lead to GEF's concurrence with the request. In the specific case, the conclusion of the PM is to not approve the request.

- Please re-design the coordination arrangements accordingly.

03/16/2021: Addressed.

The arrangement has been approved by the Program Manager.

Cleared

Agency Response

The project budget has been amended accordingly. International consultants were removed, and funds reallocated to increase investments into field-based operations per GEF-SEC recommendations.

FAO is now only providing minor and very targeted support functions to the lead executing agency (Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources Conservation and Tourism, MENT) and the co-leading agency (Department of Crop Production (DCP) in the Ministry of Agricultural Development and Food Security, MoA) at country level. The services are regarded as essential for a smooth and consistent delivery of the program and will be delivered by a national expert (Execution Capacity Development Support and ESS monitoring specialist) as requested by the Government of Botswana. This will be budgeted for from the PMC and M&E budget. The expert will ensure efficient coordination and support, building the EAs' capacity in fiduciary, as well as environmental and social risk mitigation and monitoring efforts as follows:

? Closely support the implementing of the Executing Agency's (EA) fiduciary risk mitigation plan. While MENT and MoA guarantee most of the required expertise, convening power and compliance with UN and GEF fiduciary standards to execute, the fiduciary assessment of the EAs' execution capacity (conducted by the external audit firm BDO) has identified a number of significant weaknesses that will need active support and capacity building to enable MENT and MOA to perform their role as Executing Agencies. This tailored support will be required, especially during the first 2 years of implementation. As part of this process, the EAs have requested a training for

harmonizing their procurement standards and process with UN and GEF standards, specifically on OPIM requirements. The fiduciary assessment also highlighted significant risks posed by MOA's limited sub-contracting and procurement capacities.

? Ensuring coherence and timely engagement with regional and global learning, monitoring, and reporting efforts as well as the provision of the GCP's technical support services. FAO is well-positioned to ensure that the project optimizes its interactions both regionally and globally. Through this targeted support the project management unit will be in a better position to interface directly with the Regional Exchange Mechanism, ensuring a consistent and reliable bi-directional flow of data and knowledge.

? Coordinating the project's complex institutional arrangements (2 main Executing Entities under Operational Partner Agreements and several sub- partners, including NGOs and regional implementing partners) which require a high level of coordination, M&E and learning efforts. The FAO expert will ensure that all AWP&B, procurement plans and reporting products are prepared in a consistent manner for a smooth review and approval from the Project Steering Committee, a key PMC support task that Executing Agencies, alone, will not be able to ensure for a program of this complexity.

? Managing risks related to environmental and social safeguards (ESS) that were triggered, and the implementation and monitoring of corresponding risk mitigation plan. The ESS that require additional support are related to conflict resolution and tenure (as part of the integrated land use planning), crop genetic resources (related to the establishment of seeds banks) and the inclusion of indigenous people (San communities locally known as Basarwa). See relevant section in the ProDoc.

In view of the tasks (see TORs below) the inputs provided by the implementing agency fee and own co-financing alone are not expected to be sufficient to ensure the desired level of coordination, application of environmental and social safeguards, coherent flow of knowledge and monitoring of agencies performances and contributions.

TORS: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/102cN-5hDwS6-jh72Q6RZpTNIA2e1u6iX/view?usp=sharing>

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Not fully.

While all elements are in place and well-described throughout the documentation, please provide a concise overview on the timeline and set of the deliverables and how this is reflected in the budget.

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Strategic Implementation Work Plan:

The Indicative Workplan (Annex H) provides a timeline designed to guide delivery. This will be further refined during project implementation. During the inception period, the project will generate a strategic implementation work plan covering the entire project period. The budget has allocated a small amount of financing to make certain the project design team is engaged to support the PMU with this action. This approach will help make certain the project benefits from a more seamless transition from design to implementation during the inception phase.

KM and Communications Strategy:

The project has allocated resources to hire expertise to generate a timeline and set of deliverables related to KM based upon best international and national experiences. As noted in the Project Document, this team's first task will be to generate a KM strategy to elaborate deliverables and timing. The detailed strategy will be based upon and capture the KM and communications tools and approaches detailed within the Project Document.

International and National KM Expert:

The budget allocates approximately US\$ 275,000 to hire a national KM expert (200 weeks) and international KM expert (25 weeks). The international KM expert will be expected to provide technical support and backstopping to the national KM expert throughout the project. These experts will be tasked with making certain KM is being delivered efficiently and effectively.

M&E Expert:

The efforts of the national M&E expert will be linked to the KM and communications strategic approach. The budget allocates approximately US\$ 180,000 to retain this national expert for 60 months.

Impact Monitoring:

The project budget allocates approximately US\$ 130,000 to hire national expertise required to oversee impact monitoring. This will include capturing of lessons learned and feeding this information into the KM and communications strategy.

KM Training:

To facilitate training and uptake, the project allocates an additional US\$ 125,000 for KM and M&E workshops at national and field-based levels. Again, this will be linked to and informed by the KM strategy and associated M&E and market analysis as described in the project document.

KM Deliverables:

The project budget allocates approximately US\$ 200,000 for technical support for the completion of communications programming support including website design, KM portal, production of KM materials, etc.

The ear-marks an additional US\$ 170,000 for the procurement of equipment and services required to support the implementation of the finalized KM strategy.

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

Agency Response Noted.

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

01/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/22/2021: Annexes are attached to the Project Document. However, please also copy and paste the 6 relevant annexes to the portal section, Annex A-F.

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

04/09/2021: Note for consideration: It would be good to have a reference to the DSL IP in the summary page of the prodoc.

Agency Response

04/22/2021

The reference has been included.

The relevant annexes are now included within the portal.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/22/2021: Provided in the prodoc, please copy into portal Annex as well.

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response The results framework is now included within the portal.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Upstream GEF comments have been taken into account.

Agency Response Noted.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Will be addressed after the council circulation period, if any.

Agency Response Noted.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Upstream STAP comments have been taken into account.

Agency Response Noted

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Upstream UNCCD SEC comments have been taken into account.

Agency Response Noted.

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Upstream CSO comments made during partnership meetings have been taken into account.

Agency Response Noted.

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/22/2021: Provided in the prodoc, please also copy into portal Annex C.

03/16/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response The Status of PPG utilization is now included within the portal.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request provided

Agency Response Noted.

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

n/a

Agency Response

N/A

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 n/a

Agency Response N/A

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/22/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

03/16/2021: No. There are a few comments that were not fully addressed, please refer to outstanding issues in the review sheet.

04/09/2021: No. Please address outstanding issues.

04/27/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/16/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/9/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The child project in Botswana is part of Drylands Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (DSL IP). The program is designed to help maintain the ecological cross-boundary integrity of the Miombo and Mopane woodlands ecoregion and the project is fully in line with the programmatic approach to contribute to a shared programmatic goal to support a transformational shift towards a sustainable and integrated management of multi-use dryland landscapes of the Miombo and Mopane ecoregions. The project objective is to promote the integrated management of Miombo and Mopane landscapes in Chobe and Tutume-Mosetse sub-basins through the implementation of SLM and SFM interventions to achieve LDN targets. Through the Regional Exchange Mechanism (REM) in Southern Africa, the project will coordinate its interventions with 5 other Miombo countries participating in the DSL IP to address common and transboundary management challenges.

Specifically, the project will restore 20,000 hectares of degraded lands (primarily cultivated agricultural lands); 565,000 hectares of landscapes will come under improved practices; and 140,660 hectare of lands will achieve Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN). Carbon benefits of the project will amount to 637,745 tCO₂eq sequestered or avoided over 20-years due to direct project interventions and 15,200 direct beneficiaries (Female: 9,800 Male: 8,100) will participate in the project.

Implementation risks were duly assessed and mitigation measures proposed, including environmental risks such as climate change as well as risk of the COVID-19 pandemic. At the same time, the project has considered opportunities for green recovery including opportunities to lower environmental impacts and associated health risk exposures to limit the potential impacts of COVID-19. This is particularly pertinent to this project since it is designed to focus on improving sustainable agriculture across productive landscapes with a direct linkage to improving environmental and human health. The project will also consider and integrate methodologies to monitor and evaluate COVID-19 related impacts to project design and implementation. In this way, the program will contribute to overall GEF capacity to innovate pro-active and effective responses to COVID-19 issues within existing and future programming