

# Unlocking a sustainable and an inclusive Wildlife Economy potential in Tsholotsho District of the Hwange-Kazuma Landscape in Zimbabwe

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10966

**Countries**

Zimbabwe

**Project Name**

Unlocking a sustainable and an inclusive Wildlife Economy potential in Tsholotsho District of the Hwange-Kazuma Landscape in Zimbabwe

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

4/11/2022

**Review completed by PM**

6/21/2022

**Program Manager**

Jurgis Sapijanskas

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

MSP

## PIF

### Part I ? Project Information

#### 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

JS 6/21/2022 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 6/18/2022 - Thank you for the significant revisions to the PIF since the first submission.

A-The Executing Partner in Portal (Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry) is different than the Executing Partner in Letter of Endorsement (Ministry of Environment and Forestry of the Republic of South Sudan). Please provide a new LoE and make sure the execution arrangements shown in the portal are consistent with that of the new LoE.

JS 4/28/2022

Thank you for the submission of this PIF, which as the potential to be eligible for GEF-7 funding. However, the main issues to be addressed are:

1- The added-value and increment compared to the GEF-6 GWP project ID 9660 *Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart*

*Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe*, the GEF-7 project ID 10625 *Collaborative platform for African nature-based tourism enterprises, conservation areas and local communities ? a response to COVID-19*, and the Africa's Coexistence Landscapes are not sufficiently clear.

1a- In particular, while its field work is taking place in another landscape, the GEF-6 GWP project is set to update several national policies related to the wildlife economy (the Wildlife Policy, the Parks and Wildlife Act, the Communal Land Forest Produce Act, the National Anti-Poaching Strategy) and is already undertaking this in the context of COVID. The GEF 7 project ID 10625 is providing assessments and critical analyses of the direct and indirect impacts of COVID-19 on nature-based tourism, including for Zimbabwe. Please see the corresponding dashboard that shows that surveys were already carried-out in the landscape targeted by this PIF:

<https://naturebasedtourism.africa/data/>. Please also see the country summary report: <https://naturebasedtourism.africa/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/African-NBT-Platform-Zimbabwe-Summary-Report-1.pdf>

Please thus add these two projects to the baseline, revise table B, the alternative scenario and the incremental cost reasoning to clearly outline how this project builds on them and would be complementary, providing a cost-effective increment.

1b- Please elaborate more on the Africa's Coexistence Landscapes (ACL) in the baseline and clarify the increment this PIF provides. In particular, where does ACL stop in terms of assessments and policy package development and where does this project start? Reciprocally, how does this project up-scaling strategy, from pilot testing in the Hwange-Kazuma landscape, articulate with the ACL's intervention in the larger Hwange Kazuma Chobe Wildlife Dispersal Area?

2- The project support to actual implementation (beyond consultations, desk studies and policy drafting), and thus to the delivery of global environmental benefits (GEBs) is unclear. Please revise to clarify how the project is to deliver GEBs in concrete terms.

3- Please strengthen the up-scaling /replication strategy of the project and add corresponding output or activity(ies) to embed it in the PIF design. Currently, there seems to be only communication and awareness raising interventions planned. As the project is meant to pilot new policies in a very specific landscape, a stronger strategy up-scaling strategy should be embedded in the design.

Agency Response

**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

JS 6/18/2022 - Thank you for the significant revisions to the PIF since the first submission.

A-The Executing Partner in Portal (Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry) is different than the Executing Partner in Letter of Endorsement (Ministry of Environment and Forestry of the Republic of South Sudan). Please provide a new LoE and make sure the execution arrangements shown in the portal are consistent with that of the new LoE.

A new LoE has been developed and execution arrangements of the new LoE

**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

JS 4/28/2022

Thank you for the submission of this PIF, which has the potential to be eligible for GEF-7 funding. However, the main issues to be addressed are:

1- The added-value and increment compared to the GEF-6 GWP project ID 9660 *Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe*, the GEF-7 project ID 10625 *Collaborative platform for African nature-based tourism enterprises, conservation areas and local communities ? a response to COVID-19*, and the Africa's Coexistence Landscapes are not sufficiently clear.

1a- In particular, while its field work is taking place in another landscape, the GEF-6 GWP project is set to update several national policies related to the wildlife economy (the Wildlife Policy, the Parks and Wildlife Act, the Communal Land Forest Produce Act, the National Anti-Poaching Strategy) and is already undertaking this in the context of COVID. The GEF 7 project ID 10625 is providing assessments and critical analyses of the direct and indirect impacts of COVID-19 on nature-based tourism, including for Zimbabwe. Please see the corresponding dashboard that shows that surveys were already carried-out in the landscape targeted by this PIF: <https://naturebasedtourism.africa/data/>. Please also see the country summary report: <https://naturebasedtourism.africa/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/African-NBT-Platform-Zimbabwe-Summary-Report-1.pdf>

Please thus add these two projects to the baseline, revise table B, the alternative scenario and the incremental cost reasoning to clearly outline how this project builds on them and would be complementary, providing a cost-effective increment.

1b- Please elaborate more on the Africa's Coexistence Landscapes (ACL) in the baseline and clarify the increment this PIF provides. In particular, where does ACL stop in terms of assessments and policy package development and where does this project start?

Reciprocally, how does this project up-scaling strategy, from pilot testing in the Hwange-Kazuma landscape, articulate with the ACL's intervention in the larger Hwange Kazuma Chobe Wildlife Dispersal Area?

2- The project support to actual implementation (beyond consultations, desk studies and policy drafting), and thus to the delivery of global environmental benefits (GEBs) is unclear. Please revise to clarify how the project is to deliver GEBs in concrete terms.

3- Please strengthen the up-scaling /replication strategy of the project and add corresponding output or activity(ies) to embed it in the PIF design. Currently, there seems to be only communication and awareness raising interventions planned. As the project is meant to pilot new policies in a very specific landscape, a stronger strategy up-scaling strategy should be embedded in the design.

#### 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

JS 6/21/2020 - Cleared.

During PPG, please:

- Explore all possibilities to be more cost-efficient on component 2 to increase the budget allocation of component. Please notably consider removing the mid-term review, which would have limited impact on the implementation a very streamlined 36 month project. Please also strive to coordinate with related projects to use existing knowledge platforms (e.g. GWP, GEF-7 project ID 10625) rather than developing something ad-hoc for this small MSP.

- Develop the up-scaling/replication strategy for the project and imbed it in the project design. Up-scaling/replication should not be restricted to a document to be developed during project implementation. An overall strategy and concrete project activities to foster up-scaling / replication should also be identified in the CEO approval request.

JS 6/16/2022 -

1- None of the project outcomes explicit include benefits for biodiversity. Outcome 1 is related to increased benefits from wildlife economy, which we understand as material benefits to people only. Please correct so that outcome 1, or an additional outcome under

component 1, reflect the benefits for biodiversity of global relevance that will result from this project.

2- Please correct the typo on the name of component 2 in table B, which is currently the same as component 1

During PPG, please:

- Explore all possibilities to be more cost-efficient on component 2 to increase the budget allocation of component 2. Please notably consider removing the mid-term review, which would have limited impact on the implementation a very streamlined 36 month project. Please also strive to coordinate with related projects to use existing knowledge platforms (e.g. GWP, GEF-7 project ID 10625) rather than developing something ad-hoc for this small MSP.

- Develop the up-scaling/replication strategy for the project and imbed it in the project design. Up-scaling/replication should not be restricted to a document to be developed during project implementation. An overall strategy and concrete project activities to foster up-scaling / replication should also be identified in the CEO approval request.

JS 4/28/2022

1- Please revise the project objective ("*To work towards a resilient wildlife economy in the Hwange Kazuma landscape that benefits people and nature, using habitats and wildlife in ecologically, economically and socially sustainable way*") so that it is as SMART as possible, and in particular specific, measurable, and reflects what the project will do in practice.

2a- Please clarify the anticipated scale of each output (national or Hwange Kazuma landscape).

If the policy package is to be developed only for the Hwange Kazuma landscape, please clarify:

2b- how, institutionally, policies can be modified and implemented at such a local scale only. Aren't there national legal and policy frameworks that constrain what can be done at the landscape level and would limit any local policy change? Are there adequate institutional arrangements to allow for the implementation of novel policies at a local scale?

2c- how changing policies at such a local scale would be sufficient to have a noticeable effect.

3- Component 1: Please revise output formulations to make clear that they will not be limited to desk studies and consider breaking down into more granular outputs. In particular, from its underlying activities, output 1.2 does not seem restricted to policy development but also appear to involve setting-up institutional mechanism ("intersectoral coordination mechanism"), which would likely merit an output of its own.

4- Please revise the budget allocations across components. Currently there is more funding towards KM, M&E and PMC than to original work. Component 1 should receive the bulk of the funding.

5- There is no proportionality between the share of GEF project finance and co-funding allocated to PMC. 9.3% of GEF project finance is allocated to PMC while less than 8.2% of co-funding is to cover PMC. Please ensure proportionality.

### Agency Response

<p><b>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?</b>          Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion          JS 6/16/2022 -</p> <p>1- None of the project outcomes explicit include benefits for biodiversity. Outcome 1 is related to increased benefits from wildlife economy, which we understand as material benefits to people only. Please correct so that outcome 1, or an additional outcome under component 1, reflect the benefits for biodiversity of global relevance that will result from this project.</p>	<p>Outcome 1 has been wildlife economy a area management o improved law enfor</p> <p>And Output 1.3 has and anti-poaching a sustainable utilizati wildlife economy a National Park toget</p>
<p>2- Please correct the typo on the name of component 2 in table B, which is currently the same as component 1</p>	<p>The typo on the nar the portal</p>
<p>During PPG, please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explore all possibilities to be more cost-efficient on component 2 to increase the budget allocation of component. Please notably consider removing the mid-term review, which would have limited impact on the implementation a very streamlined 36 month project. Please also strive to coordinate with related projects to use existing knowledge platforms (e.g. GWP, GEF-7 project ID 10625) rather than developing something ad-hoc for this small MSP.</li> <li>- Develop the up-scaling/replication strategy for the project and imbed it in the project design. Up-scaling/replication should not be restricted to a document to be developed during project implementation. An overall strategy and concrete project activities to foster up-scaling / replication should also be identified in the CEO approval request.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, we promise th</p> <p>- we will Explore a component 2 to inc</p> <p>-We will also devel project and imbed i</p>

JS 4/28/2022

1- Please revise the project objective ("*To work towards a resilient wildlife economy in the Hwange Kazuma landscape that benefits people and nature, using habitats and wildlife in ecologically, economically and socially sustainable way*") so that it is as SMART as possible, and in particular specific, measurable, and reflects what the project will do in practice.

2a- Please clarify the anticipated scale of each output (national or Hwange Kazuma landscape).

If the policy package is to be developed only for the Hwange Kazuma landscape, please clarify:

2b- how, institutionally, policies can be modified and implemented at such a local scale only. Aren't there national legal and policy frameworks that constrain what can be done at the landscape level and would limit any local policy change? Are there adequate institutional arrangements to allow for the implementation of novel policies at a local scale?

2c- how changing policies at such a local scale would be sufficient to have a noticeable effect.

3- Component 1: Please revise output formulations to make clear that they will not be limited to desk studies and consider breaking down into more granular outputs. In particular, from its underlying activities, output 1.2 does not seem restricted to policy development but also appear to involve setting-up institutional mechanism ("intersectoral coordination mechanism"), which would likely merit an output of its own.

4- Please revise the budget allocations across components. Currently there is more funding towards KM, M&E and PMC than to original work. Component 1 should receive the bulk of the funding.

5- There is no proportionality between the share of GEF project finance and co-funding allocated to PMC. 9.3% of GEF project finance is allocated to PMC while less than 8.2% of co-funding is to cover PMC. Please ensure proportionality.

### 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 JS 4/28/2022 -Cleared.



Agency Response [cleared on 28 April 2022](#)  
**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 JS 4/28/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 28 April 2022](#)

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/28/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 28 April 2022](#)

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/28/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 28 April 2022](#)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response [N/A](#)

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response [N/A](#)

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response [N/A](#)

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response N/A

**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 JS 4/28/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 28 April 2022](#)

**Core indicators**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**JS 6/21/2022 - Cleared.**

**During PPG, please explore the possibility to have more systemic interventions on PA management and assess to what extent the PA's METT score would be enhanced by project interventions and, if there is a measurable benefit, please report the full PA on core indicator 1.**

**JS 6/16/2022 -**

**1- Core indicator 1 is binary, either the full PA is reported or nothing is reported. The indicator is indeed designed to capture benefits on the whole management unit, as measured by the METT. Given the very localized interventions planned at this PIF stage, please remove the target on core indicator 1 in the PIF.**

**During PPG, please explore the possibility to have more systemic interventions on PA management and assess to what extent the PA's METT score would be enhanced by project interventions and, if there is a measurable benefit, please report the full PA on core indicator 1.**

JS 4/28/2022

1-The targets are unrealistic given the project's interventions and funding. Please note that core indicators are meant to capture only the direct impacts of the project, be it from GEF funding or co-finance. While the project is to "test" some new policies under output 1.2, it is unclear to what extent the project is to support implementation on the ground. Please revise substantially downward and consider adding a narrative under table F explaining the anticipated indirect impacts of the project, while capturing only direct GEBs in the core indicators.

1a- For the surface area reported under core indicator 1, please clarify how (which activity/output) the project is to improve management effectiveness, as measured by the METT, of the targeted PAs in practice.

1b- Likewise, for core indicator 4, please clarify how the project is to improve practices over more than 440,779 ha of land (or the revised surface area) outside of PAs.

2-Please add an explanation under table F of how the number of beneficiaries was derived.

### Agency Response

<p><b>6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)</b>          Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion          JS 6/16/2022 -</p> <p>1- Core indicator 1 is binary, either the full PA is reported or nothing is reported. The indicator is indeed designed to capture benefits on the whole management unit, as measured by the METT. Given the very localized interventions planned at this PIF stage, please remove the target on core indicator 1 in the PIF.</p> <p>During PPG, please explore the possibility to have more systemic interventions on PA management and assess to what extent the PA's METT score would be enhanced by project interventions and, if there is a measurable benefit, please report the full PA on core indicator 1.</p>	<p>the target on core in and the PIF</p> <p>We promise that du more systemic inte extent the PA's ME interventions and, i full PA on core ind</p>
<p>JS 4/28/2022</p> <p>1-The targets are unrealistic given the project's interventions and funding. Please note that core indicators are meant to capture only the direct impacts of the project, be it from GEF funding or co-finance. While the project is to "test" some new policies under output 1.2, it is unclear to what extent the project is to support implementation on the ground. Please revise substantially downward and consider adding a narrative under table F explaining the anticipated indirect impacts of the project, while capturing only direct GEBs in the core indicators.</p>	<p>Targets revised o</p>

1a- For the surface area reported under core indicator 1, please clarify how (which activity/output) the project is to improve management effectiveness, as measured by the METT, of the targeted PAs in practice.	Although ha, the p Tsholots work in commun 454,779
1b- Likewise, for core indicator 4, please clarify how the project is to improve practices over more than 440,779 ha of land (or the revised surface area) outside of PAs.	The proj 440,779 District,
2-Please add an explanation under table F of how the number of beneficiaries was derived.	These ar Hwange

**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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared

Please refine tagging during PPG.

JS 4/28/2022

Please consider tagging for:

-species /Illegal Wildlife Trade, Threatened Species, Wildlife for Sustainable Development

-Protected Areas and Landscapes /Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Management

-Mainstreaming/ Tourism

Agency Response

<p><b>7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?</b> Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared</p> <p>Please refine tagging during PPG.</p>	<p>Actually, the tagging requested areas have</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Project/Program taxonomy</b></p> <p><b>7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?</b> Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/28/2022</p> <p>Please consider tagging for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-species /Illegal Wildlife Trade, Threatened Species, Wildlife for Sustainable Development</li><li>-Protected Areas and Landscapes /Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Management</li><li>-Mainstreaming/ Tourism</li></ul>	<p>We have section i it at PPC</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------

**Part 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  
JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please refine the barrier analysis, in particular unpack barrier 1, which currently mixes many aspects, from equity to lack of planning, capacity or funding.

JS 4/28/2022

1- Please elaborate more on the prevalence of and threats related to poaching and illegal wildlife trade in the targeted landscape. Please also clarify to what extent the project intends to tackle poaching and IWT.

2- Barrier 2 points to lack of capacity, when the projects does not plan any capacity building, just assessment and policy. Please explain.

3- Please clarify in the PIF what is meant by "policy" in the context of this project (national or local, laws? regulations? strategies / plans? Which sectors ?)

4- As working on institutional arrangements seem to be part of the project, and would indeed be relevant if coordination is an issue, please clarify why they are not identified as a barrier.

Agency Response

<p><b>Part II ? Project Justification</b>  <b>1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?</b>          Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion          JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared.          During PPG, please refine the barrier analysis, in particular unpack barrier 1, which currently mixes many aspects, from equity to lack of planning, capacity or funding.</p>	<p>Thank you. We pro analysis, in particu</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

<p><b>1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?</b>          Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion          JS 4/28/2022</p> <p>1- Please elaborate more on the prevalence of and threats related to poaching and illegal wildlife trade in the targeted landscape. Please also clarify to what extent the project intends to tackle poaching and IWT.</p>	<p>The barr compon</p>
<p>2- Barrier 2 points to lack of capacity, when the projects does not plan any capacity building, just assessment and policy. Please explain.</p>	<p>The barr compon</p>

3- Please clarify in the PIF what is meant by "policy" in the context of this project (national or local, laws? regulations? strategies / plans? Which sectors ?)	The PIF at the di covered
4- As working on institutional arrangements seem to be part of the project, and would indeed be relevant if coordination is an issue, please clarify why they are not identified as a barrier.	The barr

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/21/2022- Cleared.

JS 6/16/2022 -

1- Please include the GEF-7 project ID 10625 "*Collaborative platform for African nature-based tourism enterprises, conservation areas and local communities ? a response to COVID-19*" in the baseline. While it is well noted that this MSP proposal is no longer conducting assessments of COVID impacts on the wildlife economy, GEF ID 10625 is delivering precious baseline information , including for the project target location, and tools to support nature-based tourism that should be fully reflected in the CEO approval request and used in the project development.

JS 4/28/2022

1- Please add in the baseline:

1a- the GEF-6 GWP project ID 9660 *Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe (UNDP)*

1b- the GEF-7 project ID 10257 *A cross-sector approach supporting the mainstreaming of sustainable forest and land management to enhance ecosystem resilience for improved livelihoods in the Save and Runde Catchments of Zimbabwe* (FAO). While the landscapes are different, 10257 is to also work on human wildlife conflict.

1c- the GEF-7 project ID 10625 *Collaborative platform for African nature-based tourism enterprises, conservation areas and local communities ? a response to COVID-19* (WWF), which also works on Zimbabwe.

2- Please expand the description of Africa's Coexistence Landscapes. What is the time frame and what is it deliver in practice, in particular in the targeted landscapes?

Agency Response

<p><b>2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?</b>                  Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion                  JS 6/16/2022 -</p> <p>1- Please include the GEF-7 project ID 10625 "<i>Collaborative platform for African nature-based tourism enterprises, conservation areas and local communities ? a response to COVID-19</i>" in the baseline. While it is well noted that this MSP proposal is no longer conducting assessments of COVID impacts on the wildlife economy, GEF ID 10625 is delivering precious baseline information , including for the project target location, and tools to support nature-based tourism that should be fully reflected in the CEO approval request and used in the project development.</p>	<p>The GEF-7 project</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------

<p>JS 4/28/2022</p> <p>1- Please add in the baseline:</p> <p>1a- the GEF-6 GWP project ID 9660 <i>Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe (UNDP)</i></p>	<p>This GE baseline</p>
<p>1b- the GEF-7 project ID 10257 <i>A cross-sector approach supporting the mainstreaming of sustainable forest and land management to enhance ecosystem resilience for improved livelihoods in the Save and Runde Catchments of Zimbabwe (FAO)</i>. While the landscapes are different, 10257 is to also work on human wildlife conflict.</p>	<p>This has cross-se</p>
<p>1c- the GEF-7 project ID 10625 <i>Collaborative platform for African nature-based tourism enterprises, conservation areas and local communities ? a response to COVID-19 (WWF)</i>, which also works on Zimbabwe.</p>	<p>Compon PIF</p>
<p>2- Please expand the description of Africa's Coexistence Landscapes. What is the time frame and what is it deliver in practice, in particular in the targeted landscapes?</p>	<p>The desc expanded</p>

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/21/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please refine the Theory of change and notably develop a narrative. While there remain diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly.



through a diagram and a narrative, the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance: <https://www.stagef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

JS 6/16/2022 -

1. Please remove the narrative of the Theory change as is it either in part entirely generic and could apply to any project, and the part that are specific to this project simply lists outputs and outcomes without explaining causal pathways.

During PPG, please refine the Theory of change and notably develop a narrative. While there remain diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance: <https://www.stagef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

JS 4/28/2022

1-Output 1.1: Please clarify in the PIF the anticipated methods for the assessment. In particular, is Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting planned for?

2- Output 1.2:

2a -Please clarify in the PIF to what extent the project will support policy implementation. The output says the policies will be tested but the last underlying activity is just a finalization of the a framework.

2b- Please clarify the range of policies the project plans to work on (national or local, laws? regulations? strategies / plans? Which sectors ?). A cross-sectoral coordination is highlighted as an important element, please notably clarify which sectoral policies will reviewed and potentially modified.

3- Consider adding an output related to the set-up of adequate institutional arrangements.

4- Please remove all the generic language that could apply to any project in the Theory of change's narrative (e.g. "*The intervention logic for the project is premised on the understanding that resources will be deployed to implement the interventions (activities) to deliver outputs which in turn will lead to certain institutional and behavioral changes (outcomes) at the intermediate level provided that the assumptions and certain pre-conditions governing project implementation hold true.*"). Please revise so that the narrative outlines in a simple way the specific project's causal pathways by which

interventions are expected to have the desired effect. Please refer to STAP's guidance: <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

Agency Response

<p><b>3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?</b>          Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion          JS 6/16/2022 -</p> <p>1. Please remove the narrative of the Theory change as is it either in part entirely generic and could apply to any project, and the part that are specific to this project simply lists outputs and outcomes without explaining causal pathways.</p> <p>During PPG, please refine the Theory of change and notably develop a narrative. While there remain diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance: <a href="https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer">https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer</a></p>	<p>The narrative of the</p> <p>We agree. We pro  of change and not</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>JS 4/28/2022</p> <p>1-Output 1.1: Please clarify in the PIF the anticipated methods for the assessment. In particular, is Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting planned for?</p>	<p>Outputs</p>
<p>2- Output 1.2:</p>	
<p>2a -Please clarify in the PIF to what extent the project will support policy implementation. The output says the policies will be tested but the last underlying activity is just a finalization of the framework.</p>	<p>Outputs</p>
<p>2b- Please clarify the range of policies the project plans to work on (national or local, laws? regulations? strategies / plans? Which sectors?). A cross-sectoral coordination is highlighted as an important element, please notably clarify which sectoral policies will reviewed and potentially modified.</p>	<p>See abo</p>
<p>3- Consider adding an output related to the set-up of adequate institutional arrangements.</p>	<p>Outputs</p>

4- Please remove all the generic language that could apply to any project in the Theory of change's narrative (e.g. "*The intervention logic for the project is premised on the understanding that resources will be deployed to implement the interventions (activities) to deliver outputs which in turn will lead to certain institutional and behavioral changes (outcomes) at the intermediate level provided that the assumptions and certain pre-conditions governing project implementation hold true.*"). Please revise so that the narrative outlines in a simple way the specific project's causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect. Please refer to STAP's guidance: <https://www.stagef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

Revisio  
new Ou

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 4/28/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 28 April 2022](#)

**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

**JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared**

JS 4/28/2022 - No, please see first comment box and revise entirely this section. The scenario without the GEF support should describe what would happen thanks to the baseline projects, and the increment should make clear what would happen in addition as a direct result of the project.

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

JS 4/28/2022 - No, please see first comment box and revise entirely this section. The scenario without the GEF support should describe what would happen thanks to the baseline projects, and the increment should make clear what would happen in addition as a direct result of the project.

Descripti  
been re-v

**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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared

JS 4/28/2022 -Please see other comment box on core indicators.

Agency Response

<b>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?</b> Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/28/2022 -Please see other comment box on core indicators.	The glo
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared

JS 4/28/2022 - Please see comment in the first comment box on up-scaling.

Agency Response

<b>7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?</b> Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/28/2022 - Please see comment in the first comment box on up-scaling.	Descript scaling u
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

**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

JS 4/28/2022 -Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 28 April 2022](#)

**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

**JS 6/21/2022 - Cleared.**

JS 6/18/2022 - The PIF indicates that IPLCs, CSOs and Private Sector entities were consulted during project identification stage. However, there is no information on any of these consultations. In addition, it is unclear from the submission on what the plans are to meaningfully consult with local communities and beneficiaries, during PPG, including their role in component 1 of the project.

1- Please elaborate further on IPLC and CSO consultations made to develop this PIF project identification as well as the approach to involve them during PPG.

JS 4/28/2022

- Please add information (short enumeration/ synthesis) on the consultation made to date to inform the design of the PIF.

- The stakeholder list remains very generic, at the level of broad categories for NGOs and Academia, and the private sector is missing. Please refine and in particular include relevant public and private actors of the economic sectors that will be involved, at a minimum Tourism, but also infrastructure (roads, rail) and agriculture which were also mentioned. Relevant actors related to poaching and IWT management should also be included.

Agency Response

<p><b>Stakeholders</b>  <b>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?</b>          Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion          JS 6/18/2022 - The PIF indicates that IPLCs, CSOs and Private Sector entities were consulted during project identification stage. However, there is no information on any of these consultations. In addition, it is unclear from the submission on what the plans are to meaningfully consult with local communities and beneficiaries, during PPG, including their role in component 1 of the project.</p> <p>1- Please elaborate further on IPLC and CSO consultations made to develop this PIF project identification as well as the approach to involve them during PPG.</p>	<p>Various consultation stakeholders. These with representatives and Hospitality Ind project. Thereafter, selected stakeholder representatives of s</p> <p>Some meetings incl Wildlife Foundation (IFAW), Painted do representatives of c people are consider Therefore, only rep However, we confir consultations will b</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>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?</b>          Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion          JS 4/28/2022</p> <p>- Please add information (short enumeration/ synthesis) on the consultation made to date to inform the design of the PIF.</p> <p>- The stakeholder list remains very generic, at the level of broad categories for NGOs and Academia, and the private sector is missing. Please refine and in particular include relevant public and private actors of the economic sectors that will be involved, at a minimum Tourism, but also infrastructure (roads, rail) and agriculture which were also mentioned. Relevant actors related to poaching and IWT management should also be included.</p>	<p>The stake Private s</p> <p>NGOs w African valuation KAZA. Internati illegal w Painted d wild dog Bhejane poaching</p> <p>Private s explored</p> <p>the actual include: Gwanda will prov Oxford U</p> <p>In additi be condu</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**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

JS 6/18/2020 - Cleared.

It is well noted that the project includes indicative information on gender dimensions related to the project objective and context. It highlights considerations of gender in component 2 but does not elaborate further on its approach to address gender issues in component 1.

During PPG, Please make sure to also mainstream gender considerations in component 1 as well.

Agency Response

cleared on 28 April 2022

<p><b>Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?</b> Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 6/18/2020 - Cleared.</p> <p>It is well noted that the project includes indicative information on gender dimensions related to the project objective and context. It highlights considerations of gender in component 2 but does not elaborate further on its approach to address gender issues in component 1.</p> <p>During PPG, Please make sure to also mainstream gender considerations in component 1 as well.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>We promise that du approach to address</p> <p>We will also make component 1 as we</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared

JS 4/28/2022 - Please see comment on stakeholder engagement and address accordingly here.

Agency Response

<p><b>Private Sector Engagement</b></p> <p><b>Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?</b> Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/28/2022 - Please see comment on stakeholder engagement and address accordingly here.</p>	<p>The proj Conserv gathering provide partnersh sector en</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### 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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared

During PPG, please address the risk related to "leakage" of environmental offenses and poaching, and embed mitigation measures in project design. Working on enforcement and anti-poaching activities only in a small part of a large wildlife area, may indeed merely displace offenses and poaching to other areas not receiving project support. How will the project (i) mitigate and (ii) monitor such leakage.

JS 4/28/2022

1- Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:



- a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).
- b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.
- c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).
- d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

(<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>)

2- Please address the risk related to economic and political instability (e.g. inflation, general election in 2023).

3- As the project seems to focus on piloting new policies at a local level, please address the risk that the results of these policies may be negatively or positively overridden by external factors outside of their control. The mitigation measures should clarify how the projects intends to deal with attribution to the new policy package of the impacts that will be measured through M&E.

#### Agency Response

<p><b>Risks to Achieving Project Objectives</b>  <b>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?</b>          Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion          JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared</p> <p>During PPG, please address the risk related to "leakage" of environmental offenses and poaching, and embed mitigation measures in project design. Working on enforcement and anti-poaching activities only in a small part of a large wildlife area, may indeed merely displace offenses and poaching to other areas not receiving project support. How will the project (i) mitigate and (ii) monitor such leakage.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>We promise that du "leakage" of enviro mitigation measure</p> <p>We agree that Wor only in a small part displace offenses an support. Therefore, design how the pro</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The project has been focused on fewer activities. Risks and their mitigation measures have been revised accordingly in section 5 of the PIF. We confirm that a detailed climate risk screening will be conducted during PPG

**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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared

JS 4/28/2022

Please add the two GEF-7 projects highlighted in the comment box related to baseline to the list of projects to coordinate with.

Please coordinate also with the GEF-7 GWP platform.

**Agency Response**

<p>JS 4/28/2022</p> <p>Please add the two GEF-7 projects highlighted in the comment box related to baseline to the list of projects to coordinate with.</p> <p>Please coordinate also with the GEF-7 GWP platform.</p>	<p>the two G coordinat</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------

**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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared

JS 4/28/2022 - Please elaborate on the alignment with the NBSAP.

Agency Response

JS 4/28/2022 - Please elaborate on the alignment with the NBSAP.

alignmen

### 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

JS 4/28/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 28 April 2022](#)

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6 /21/2022 - It is well noted that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low, and UNEP attached Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). The Project Description (Component 1 and 2) and Project title in SRIF are, however, different from what have been described in the PIF.

By CEO Approval, please provide updated screening forms based on the updated Component 1 and 2.

JS 4/28/2022 - Cleared. We note the project is rated as low risk.

Agency Response [cleared on 28 April 2022](#)

**Part 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

JS 4/28/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response **cleared on 28 April 2022**

**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

NA

Agency Response

N/A

**GEFSEC 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

**JS 6/22/2022 - The PIF is recommended for clearance.**

**JS 6/18/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.**

JS 4/28/2022 -Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit. For any clarification, please contact [jsapijanskas@thegef.org](mailto:jsapijanskas@thegef.org)

**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**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/28/2022</b>	<b>4/28/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/18/2022</b>	<b>6/18/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/22/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**