



Reimagining National Parks for People and Nature - Mega Living Landscapes Project

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11347

Countries

South Africa

Project Name

Reimagining National Parks for People and Nature - Mega Living Landscapes Project

Agencies

WWF-US

Date received by PM

10/16/2023

Review completed by PM

10/31/2023

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

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 10.27.23: Project is eligible for GEF financing under BD FA strategy.

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 10.27.23: Problem, objectives and expected results are well described.

Agency's Comments

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 10.27.23: Project objective is clear and components, outcomes and outputs are 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

10.27.23: M&E budget is higher than the recommended threshold for projects of similar size (3%) as per Project Cycle Guidelines, please consider adjusting it for CEO endorsement stage:

M&E	443,716.00	3,000,000.00
Sub Total (\$)	8,451,726.00	52,001,100.00
M&E share	5.3%	5.8%
Project Management Cost (PMC)		
GET	422,586.00	3,078,900.00
Sub Total(\$)	422,586.00	3,078,900.00
Total Project Cost(\$)	8,874,312.00	55,080,000.00
PMC share	5.0%	5.9%

Agency's Comments

11/13/23

After careful consideration of this comment, it was decided to retain the M&E budget amount at this time, but noting that it will be reviewed during the PPG phase. The reason for the slightly higher M&E budget is because this project involves 3 Mega Living Landscapes, each of which are large, and are far from each other. This makes the M&E more expensive than normal.

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 10.27.23: Proposed project financing is adequate.

Agency's Comments

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 10.27.23: Baseline situation is adequately described, barriers and enabler are identified.

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 10.27.23: 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 10.27.23: Proposed theory of change is satisfactory.

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 10.30.23: Incremental cost follows 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

10.30.23: In section 'Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project?', the Agency mentions that they expect to play an execution role in this project.

Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

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

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

The GEF8 investment will build from the following opportunities and linkages:

- DFFE and other conservation agencies initiatives and lessons, for example:
 - National Integrated Strategy to Combat Wildlife Trafficking.
 - National Biodiversity Economy Strategy.
 - DFFE/UNDP's BioFin initiative.
 - Implementation lessons from stewardship implementation.
 - The Sustainable Finance Coalition, a partnership between Wilderness Foundation Africa and WWF South Africa.
- The SANParks' Vision 2040 process and strategic processes for example:
 - The SANParks Rhino Range Expansion Programme and Rhino Conservation Strategy.
 - The SANParks Land Inclusion Plan and Park Management Plans.
- The strong network of civil society partnerships across SA landscape, for example:
 - The establishment of the National Grasslands Park via a partnership with WWF – this will be a contract park which protects both critically endangered grasslands ecosystems and a key water source area while maintaining compatible rangeland management practices.
 - The WWF Black Rhino Range Expansion Programme (BRREP) – has catalysed extensive conservation area expansion and facilitated the doubling of black rhino population since 1990s. The SANParks/Care for Wild partnership in Barberton has a high

However, the LoE does not indicate WWF as executing partner, neither there is a letter of support from OFPs for this option. Please, remove any mention of WWF to execute the project.

Dr. Renae Stenhouse
WWF GEF Agency
1250 24th St. NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037
USA

ENDORSEMENT FOR "REIMAGINING NATIONAL PARKS FOR PEOPLE AND NATURE - MEGA LIVING LANDSCAPES" PROJECT

In my capacity as GEF Operational Focal Point for South Africa, I confirm that the above project proposal (a) is in accordance with my government's national priorities including the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, National Protected Area Expansion Strategy and the White Paper on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, and our commitment to the relevant global environmental conventions; and (b) was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points.

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Implementing Agency(ies) listed below. If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by and the project executed by SANParks. I request the GEF Implementing Agency(ies) to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement / Approval.

Agency's Comments

11/13/23

Please accept our apologies for this error, which has been corrected in the PIF. At this time, there is no plan to have WWF play any executing role in this project. This has been removed from the portal.

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 10.30.23: CI1 value only reflects values from 1.1 but not from 1.2. Please, revise.

Also, the value for 1.2 stands at 0, whereas information is provided in the list of WDPA IDs. The table has a value (ha) under name of protected area under C.1.2. Please, revise tables accordingly.

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
210000	0	0	0

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
210000	0	0	0

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
			210,000.00			

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0	0	0	0

Name of the Protected Area	WDP A ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
1,162,100 ha									

Agency's Comments

11/13/23

Revisions have been made to the indicators Table to correct the error. We confirm that the indicators on the PIF are correct as follows:

Project Core Indicators		Expected at PIF
1	Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management (hectare)	1,372,100 ha
1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created	210,000 ha
1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness	1,162,100 ha

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 10.30.23: Project risks 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 10.30.23: Proposed project is innovative and well aligned with national policies.

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 10.30.23: 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

10.30.23: Proposed project is well aligned with CBD targets and priorities.

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 10.30.23: Proposed project will deliver results under target 3 of the GBF.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments 10.30.23: Policy requirements are satisfactory.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments 10.30.23: Please, provide dates for stakeholder consultations. In addition, considering the scope and objective of this project, it is noted that there has not been any consultation with a broader relevant CSOs and local community organizations. Please, elaborate further on plans to engage and consult these entities during project development.

Agency's Comments

11/13/23

A Table with names and dates of engagements with stakeholders has been added to the PIF under the Stakeholder Engagement section. An initial stakeholder engagement plan for the project development phase, that includes name of stakeholder, mandate/role, relevance to project, type of engagement and frequency of engagement has been developed and uploaded as a stand-alone document.

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 10.30.23:Proposed financing is within the Country's STAR Allocation

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments 10.30.23:Proposed financing is aligned with BD 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 Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/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 Comments

10.31.23: Proposed PPG request is adequate.

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 Comments

10.31.23: Please replace 'recurrent expenditures' to 'investment mobilized for DFFE.

Recipient Country Government	DFFE	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	24,440,000.00
---------------------------------	------	-------	---------------------------	---------------

Agency's Comments

11/13/23

Done. These are funds from DFFE as part of the Extended Public Works Program (EPWP) mainly used for restoration.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(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 has informed all agencies, via an e-mail sent in March 2023 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, send a new LoE including the required footnote, or alternatively, ask the OFP to send a message to the GEF Sec officially indicating its concurrence/acceptance of the footnote to be part of the existing LoE (the message needs to include specific reference to the footnote and the LoE).

Agency's Comments

11/13/23

The LOE has been revised to include the footnote, and has been sign and uploaded.

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

Secretariat's Comments 10.31.23: OFP letter of endorsement is uploaded to 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 10.31.23: Maps are adequate.

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: The project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and WWF-US attached the Environmental and Social Safeguards Pre- Screen. However, it is not clear a plan to address potential impacts of the project during the PPG. Please provide a plan for further environmental and social assessment and/or environmental and social management plan during the PPG stage.

Agency's Comments

11/13/23

Annex D has been amended to include the comment as follows: During project preparation potential safeguards impacts will be addressed in two ways: 1) Training of the project development team (both the Executing Agency and partners; and the consulting team) on how to incorporate safeguards into their way of working during project preparation so that they include safeguards thinking in their conceptualisation and detailed planning processes; and 2) The appointment of a Safeguards consultant as part of the consulting team from the beginning of detailed project planning who will both be the safeguards check for the working, as well as responsible to deliver the Environmental and Social Assessment Report, Documentation of Consultations and Consultation Summary and Environmental and Social Management Framework.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments 10.31.23: Rio Markers are correctly selected.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments 10.31.23: 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!

Agency's Comments

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

First Review
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)