

Conservation Areas for Biodiversity Conservation and Development II-Additional Financing

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10583

Countries

Mozambique

Project Name

Conservation Areas for Biodiversity Conservation and Development II-Additional Financing

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

4/1/2020

Review completed by PM

6/10/2020

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I – Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

1) Alignment to the DSL IP is described mainly in Annex 3 of the PAD and in the GEF data sheet. However, there is a disconnect between the PAD components and the Annex 3/GEF datasheet. The PAD components do not fully reflect the alignment with the DSL-IP and do not provide entry points for the regional/transboundary activities as well as the work on common management challenges in drylands within the context of the IP.

2) The team should consider amending the PDO and/or the components so that they provide clear entry points for the regional/transboundary activities as well as the work on common management challenges in drylands within the context of the DSL-IP.

6-12-20

- 1- Table A – Indicative Focal – Non-Focal Area Elements: the child Project info doesn't match the PFD info (see below).

PFD:

Programming Directions	Expected Outcomes	Trust Fund
IP SFM Drylands	Dryland Landscapes Sustainably managed	GET

Child Project:

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund
BD-1-1	Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors	GET
BD-2-7	Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate	GET
CCM-2-7	Demonstrate mitigation options with systemic impacts for sustainable forest management impact program	GET
LD-2-5	Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN	GET
IP SFM Drylands	Promoting effective coordination for sustainable forest management	GET

2. Figures for GEF Financing and Agency Fee in Tables A, B and D in in Portal for the child project (\$23,119,226 - \$2,080,734) are higher than the original allocation for Mozambique in the PFD (\$23,115,776 - \$2,080,420) – please ask the Agency to adjust (including the correspondent Agency fee):

Table D in PFD:

D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	4,100,917	369,083	4,470,000
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	9,941,464	894,732	10,836,196
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	1,908,257	171,743	2,080,000
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Multi Focal Area	IP SFM Drylands Set-Aside	7,165,138	644,862	7,810,000
					23,115,776	2,080,420	25,196,196

Table D in child project:

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	9,944,954	895,046
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	1,908,257	171,743
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	4,100,917	369,083
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Multi Focal Area	IP SFM Drylands Set-Aside	7,165,138	644,862
Total Grant Resources(\$)					23,119,266	2,080,734

6-15-20

Cleared

Agency Response

June 12, 2020:

The two issues highlighted have been resolved. The Focal areas are now only shown as a single entry IP SFM drylands in Table A.

On the BD allocation and fees, while figures were aligned with LoE, adjustments have now been made based on recommendations by GEF Secretariat to align with PFD approved. We kindly request for timely clearance to allow for the Council recirculation. Thank you

May 15, 2020:

The team thanks GEFSEC for participating in the review meeting, where some of the issues were clarified including those raised by GEFSEC. Please note that as an additional financing to an ongoing project the structure of the original project is maintained to capture the baseline cofinancing and synergies.

1. The issue of linkage is cleared later in the review sheet citing the available responses. Nevertheless to clarify : the Project Paper has been revised to make the alignment to the DSL IP clearer, by adding some info from Annex 3 (ToC and Incremental reasoning) into the PP components. And clear linkages of component level indicators to DSLIP have been provided (Tables 1 &2 Annex A of GEF Data sheet in the portal and, Tables 1 and 2 in the Project Paper. The regional/transboundary activities to address common management challenges are embedded in Component 1 and Component 2, which have been more clearly spelled out to capture the context of the IP. As discussed with GEFSEC, the overall budget plan (also shared separately) for the project includes provision of funds for these activities.

2. Following the internal review meeting and as detailed above, the components have been adjusted and refined to better reflect the alignment with DSLIP. And it should be noted that as designed, the proposed project is building upon a strong baseline project to which it aligns its PDO to capture that the cofinancing effectively. Therefore, the team in discussion with the counterparts did not consider amending the PDO.

2. Project description summary. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

The proposed outcomes and outputs of the project in the Portal don't fully correlate with those in the PAD. Please align the two documents as the GEF portal version will be the basis for other reviewers, including the circulation of the project to the GEF Council and stakeholders.

COMPONENT 1: Strengthening Capacity and Financial Sustainability of National Conservation Institutions (Original amount: US\$15.0 million equivalent from IDA, Additional Financing: US\$13,825,000 million equivalent from GEF).

Comments on the proposed activities to be funded by the GEF funds as described in the PAD

Strengthening of ANAC (US\$1,1 million). Nagoya Protocol. Not clear what is this part of this sub-component. The project needs to provide additional information on the “*review the regulation on Access and Benefit Sharing from Genetic and Biological Resources and associated traditional knowledge* as that is in the domain of the Nagoya Protocol. Mozambique participated in the Global Project ID 2820 “*Supporting the Development and Implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing Policies in Africa*”. It is necessary to explain what was achieved and what will be done as part of this component. It is not clear if the financial resources for Strengthening of ANAC (\$1.1 million) will be enough to carry out all the activities, including those related to the Nagoya Protocol. Countries usually allocate \$1-2 million for projects to implement the provisions of the Protocol.

Strengthening of Biofund (US\$12,4 million). Please elaborate on the use of the funds allocated to *Endowment Fund; Window 2: Basket fund to increase efficiency of ANAC and the CA system* (\$2million). Is this the same as to *create a basket fund that aims to increase retainment and attraction of new skills needed for the efficiency of ANAC and the CA system*. What does this mean exactly? Is this for Administration? Please also elaborate on *Endowment Fund; Window 3: Private sector collaboration program for dryland management* (\$3million). Assume the same as *iii) implement a new private sector collaboration program in support of sustainable and equitable dryland management and that provide continued funding to Mozbio 2 targeted interventions for a period of 10 years*. Why is the engagement with the Private Sector requires so much funding? What are the potential private sector companies working in Mozambique on game farming, sustainable wildlife use (meaning in the context of the project?), non-timber forest products (NTFPs) and how is the private sector going to benefit from this window? Through grants, loans?

Strengthening of FNDS (US\$0.3 million). Please provide the list of activities that this sub-component covers This is a list of activities that need to be elaborated on at CEO Endorsement stage.

COMPONENT 2: Improving Conservation Areas Management in Target Landscapes Original amount: US\$17 million equivalent from IDA, Additional Financing US\$2,575,000 million equivalent from GEF.

Comments on the proposed activities to be funded by the GEF funds as described in the PAD

The budget allocation for this component is very small. This \$2.575 million component is supposed to cover the related activities in three PAs and for three years. The review of the Budget shows that each PA will be received less than \$1.0 million total, or \$300,000/year on average. Furthermore, each of the items under each of the PAs is \$200,00 total.

Please describe what are the proposed interventions that will lead to an improvement of the Management Effectiveness in these areas as a result of the investments of GEF funds?

Enhancing CA's human resources and fixed assets (GEF \$1.2 million) How many EarthRanger systems will be deployed and in what areas? What is the estimated cost of the software, setting up the system (hardware) and covering the recurrent costs of the operation?

If funding from Mozambique is going to be used for *support to cross boundary collaboration with neighboring countries, specifically South Africa, Zimbabwe and eSwatini through the Lubombo and Chimanimani Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs), including joint aerial surveys, monitoring and law enforcement programs*, will neighboring countries know of this initiative and on board to co-sponsor the activities?

Supporting CA's operations (\$1.3 million). The budget allocated to this important component should be increased as this represent critical funding for the operations of the 3 Cas. There are several activities under the previous part of this component that can be downsized significantly without affecting the conservation and sustainable use objectives of the project and will release funds for this part of the project. Some of those activities that need to be reconsidered are: *awareness campaigns, participation in TFCA coordination meetings and sharing and streamlining of research and management practices in regard to dryland and other endemic biodiversity.*

Comments on the proposed activities to be funded by the GEF funds as described in the PAD

Component 3: Promoting Conservation-compatible Rural Development and Integrated Landscape Management in Target Landscapes (*Original Project: US\$13 million equivalent from IDA, Additional Financing US\$ 6,719,266 from GEF*).

The GEF budget should be significantly reduced (or eliminate) in this component and cover the costs of the associated activities for Rural Development with the IDA funds. Conservation funds are harder to come by than Development Funds. GEF funds should be re-allocate to Component 2.

NOTE: The GEF expects changes in the Project Document and a response to the comments and suggestion by the GEF.

6-10-20

Cleared

Agency Response

May 15, 2020: The GEF data sheet template has been completed as per normal standards of outcomes and outputs and not in a descriptive manner. In addition, the data sheet focuses on highlighting the DSLIP linkages aligned with the concept stage deliverables, as is usually done. While it is difficult to add the entire content, the text has nevertheless been slightly refined to address the comment.

Detailed responses below:

Component 1

1. Strengthening of ANAC (US\$1,1 million)

Nagoya Protocol. Not clear what is this part of this sub-component. The project needs to provide additional information on the “review the regulation on Access and Benefit Sharing from Genetic and Biological Resources and associated traditional knowledge as that is in the domain of the Nagoya Protocol. Mozambique participated in the Global Project ID 2820 “Supporting

the Development and Implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing Policies in Africa”. It is necessary to explain what was achieved and what will be done as part of this component. It is not clear if the financial resources for Strengthening of ANAC (\$1.1 million) will be enough to carry out all the activities, including those related to the Nagoya Protocol. Countries usually allocate \$1-2 million for projects to implement the provisions of the Protocol.

Strengthening of Biofund (US\$12,4 million)

Please elaborate on the use of the funds allocated to Endowment Fund; Window 2: Basket fund to increase efficiency of ANAC and the CA system (\$2million). Is this the same as to create a basket fund that aims to increase retainment and attraction of new skills needed for the efficiency of ANAC and the CA system. What does this mean exactly? Is this for Administration? Please also elaborate on Endowment Fund; Window 3: Private sector collaboration program for dryland management (\$3million). Assume the same as iii) implement a new private sector collaboration program in support of sustainable and equitable dryland management and that provide continued funding to Mozbio 2 targeted interventions for a period of 10 years. Why is the engagement with the Private Sector

requires so much funding? What are the potential private sector companies working in Mozambique on game farming, sustainable wildlife use (meaning in the context of the project?), non-timber forest products (NTFPs) and how is the private sector going to benefit from this window? Through grants, loans?

1. Further info is provided in the Project Paper on the rationale and content of the activity. Mozambique had developed and approved in 2007 a Regulation on Access and Benefit Sharing resulting from Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge (Decree 19/2007 of 9 August). With the global adoption of Nagoya Protocol in 2010, and its ratification by Mozambique in 2014, there is the need to adapt the instrument to respond fully to the Nagoya Protocol, and improve its desired impact. The revision of the regulation intends to include the development of a mechanism for access and benefit sharing, taking into account the targets 14 and 15 on the payment for environmental services, and should help to promote and empower local communities and the private sector to participate in compensation mechanisms from biodiversity. It should also be noted that the activity contributes to Mozbio PDO 2 by enabling proper use of traditional knowledge along with biological resources to improve livelihoods. (Based on the Nagoya Protocol Document) and contributes to objective 3 of the DSL Impact Program Creation of an enabling environment to support the two other objectives. The team expects the resources to be enough.

2. **BIOFUND.** MozBIO is a long running project and the BIOFUND is an operational fund which was established to sustain and finance investments for the restoration of the vulnerable dryland landscapes. The funds to the Endowment fund will be allocated as follows:

- US\$7 million: Finance investments for the protection and restoration of dryland forests in selected CAs that are either already degraded, or at high risk of becoming so.
- US\$ 2 million: Create a basket fund for ANAC and yes there is only one basket fund, explained below.
- US\$3 million: Implement a new private sector collaboration program in support of sustainable and equitable dryland management and that provides continued funding to Mozbio 2 targeted interventions for a period of 10 years:

Basket Fund: The aim of the Basket fund is to pool resources from ANAC’s various development partners (DPs) to create a stable source of resources that can hire and retain qualified staff for ANAC at both central level and the level of CAs. This contribution of \$2 million will hence be complemented by other DPs (exact contribution still under discussion with a few DPs). It should be noted that to develop such a basket fund came out as a key recommendation from the Mozbio 1 completion, as a way to address the need of maintaining qualified technical management capacity of the CA system, since there is still limited state budget for ANAC, who is also dependent on very fluctuated support from DPs. The funds generated by this US\$ 2 million mechanism will be approximately US\$ 60,000/year for an indefinite long-term period, in accordance with BIOFUND's

Component 2

1. The budget allocation for this component is very small. This \$2.575 million component is supposed to cover the related activities in three PAs and for three years. The review of the Budget shows that each PA will be received less than \$1.0 million total, or \$300,000/year on average. Furthermore, each of the items under each of the PAs is \$200,00 total.

2. Please describe what are the proposed interventions that will lead to an improvement of the Management Effectiveness in these areas as a result of the investments of GEF funds?

Enhancing CA's human resources and fixed assets (\$1.2 million)

3. How many EarthRanger systems will be deployed and in what areas? What is the estimated cost of the software, setting up the system (hardware) and covering the recurrent costs of the operation?

4. If funding from Mozambique is going to be used for support to cross boundary collaboration with neighboring countries, specifically South Africa, Zimbabwe and eSwatini through the Lubombo and Chimanimani Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs), including joint aerial surveys, monitoring and law enforcement programs, will

1. The project component costs have been discussed extensively with the counterparts to reflect realistic complementarity with the IDA resources for that component (US\$17 million) under the parent project. This is in fact the largest component under the parent project and the attempt has been to avoid duplication in activities. This was again discussed with the project team following the decision meeting and the team considers the budget sufficient to complement IDA resources.

2. Interventions have been defined and are provided in the table elaborating the GEF activities. Perhaps the reviewer missed the details. Kindly refer to Table 1 annex A of GEF Data sheet in the portal and Table 2 in the Project Paper.

3. The funds will support the expansion of the Earth ranger system in Mozambique (currently used in Gorongosa and Bazaruto National Parks), and thus support the installation and use of the EarthRanger system to be used centrally at ANAC, as well as in two CAs – Chimanimani and Maputo Special Reserve. The Earth ranger system integrates a variety of cross-boundary information that can improve management, such as for example movements of wildlife across borders and will as such enhance cross-boundary cooperation. South Africa and Zimbabwe are already using Earth ranger systems so there is capacity to use them. The costs of setting up the system in these areas is approximately \$600,000. The Government of Mozambique has also ensured co-financing for this activity by Conservation International of US1\$ million to ensure that maintaining the system is covered. Specific area targets and numbers will be confirmed during implementation, and detailed in the implementation plan.

4. The cross-boundary collaboration with neighboring countries has been discussed with respective countries and they are well aware and supportive of the proposed activities. Some of the activities are in fact already under implementation so these funds will help scale them up and also allow further discussion.

Component 3

6. The GEF budget should be significantly reduced (or eliminate) in this component and cover the costs of the associated activities for Rural Development with the IDA funds. Conservation funds are harder to come by than Development Funds. GEF funds should be re-allocate to Component 2.

6. As has been mentioned above, the project component scope and allocations have been made based on strategic complementarities with IDA resources with a focus on investments. It should be emphasized that the activities under this component are critical for contributing to the DSL IP Global Program's objectives, including facilitating engagement with the private sector, managing production landscapes development, developing viable green and gender-responsive value chains, ensure a comprehensive spatial planning that incorporates full range of variables and interactions, increased access to credit and technology and savings support for women to unlock their potential in drylands value chains, including underutilized crops and promote sustainable NMTPF wild harvesting, cultivation and trading of indigenous natural plant products that have the potential to contribute significantly to the alleviation of rural poverty while increasing households' resilience and conserving natural resources. The component also channels significant funds to restoration on the ground, as prioritized in the zoning plans to be developed as a first step. These restoration efforts will be done jointly between government, private and community stakeholders. Supporting these types of investments will be crucial activities to respond to the DSL IP objective to promoted science-based regional prioritization of dryland rehabilitation and restoration investments in order to optimize benefits and address trans-boundary factors, especially in Chimanimani and the Elephant Coast which are part of TFCAs. Also note that it will support the elaboration of the key integrated Development and Business Plan for the Maputo Environmental Projection Area (the second of its kind in Mozambique, and which will lay the example for how this model to support both conservation and sustainable production land-use in a same geographical area, can be scaled up in other parts of the country or regionally). This Plan will also help identify and prioritize investments that will be key for ensuring biological and productive processes in the transboundary ecosystem of the TFCA.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed 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, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

The co-financing is in the amount of \$113 million

Only the LoC from Peace Parks was included. Please provide proof of the other sources of co-financing.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Evidence
GEF Agency	World Bank (Mozbio II)	Grant	Investment mobilized	45,000,000	
GEF Agency	World Bank (MozFIP, Susenta, MozLand)	Grant	Investment mobilized	44,000,000	
Private Sector	Peace Parks Foundation and other CA co-managers	Unknown at this stage	Investment mobilized	16,000,000	
Beneficiaries	Local entrepreneurs, households and SMEs that are beneficiaries of the Matching Grant Scheme	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,000,000	
Government	FNDS and ANAC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	3,000,000	
Total Co-Financing(\$)				113,000,000	

6-10-20

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Letters of cofinancing support for all sources are available and provided with the revised package. Thank you.

5. GEF resource availability. 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

4-28-20

Comment on the use of GEF resources were made in Window 2.

Agency Response N/A

STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Mozambique is using its entire GEF-7 STAR allocation

Mozambique	2.08	10.84	4.47	17.39	no	2.26
-------------------	------	-------	------	-------	----	------

World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	9,944,954	895,046	10,840,000
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	1,908,257	171,743	2,080,000
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	4,100,917	369,083	4,470,000
World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Multi Focal Area	IP SFM Drylands Set-Aside	7,165,138	644,862	17,390,000

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Mozambique received \$7,810,000 from the Dryland IP.

GEF/Set Aside: 2.22

World Bank	GET	Mozambique	Multi Focal Area	IP SFM Drylands Set-Aside	7,165,138	644,862	7,810,000
------------	-----	------------	------------------	---------------------------	-----------	---------	-----------

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

No PPG

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

The project is contributing 387,300.00 ha of terrestrial Protected Areas Under Improved Management (3 Protected Areas), 6700 ha of land restored (3,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands and 3,700 ha of Forest and Forest Lands), 520,000 ha under improved management, 10,845,249 metric tons of CO2 Avoided Outside Agriculture, Forestry and other land uses.

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

There is a short description of the environmental and social issues in paragraphs 4&5 of the PAD. The main threats and drivers of dryland degradation and deforestation include; unsustainable agriculture and grazing; wood extraction and trade in timber; encroachment due to poverty and land tenure uncertainty and uncontrolled fires. The project will address these environmental and social challenges by improving the management of the target conservation area landscapes and enhance the living conditions of communities in and around these conservation areas. The project includes three components: 1) Strengthening Capacity and Financial Sustainability of National Conservation Institutions. (2) Improving Conservation Areas Management in Target Landscape, and 3) Promoting Conservation-compatible Rural Development and Integrated Landscape Management in Target Landscapes (US\$13 million equivalent from IDA).

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Baseline investments leveraged are from the ongoing World Bank IDA Mozbio 2 project (US\$45 million) as well as \$40 million from the WB financed Integrated Landscape Management (ILM) Program Investment Mobilized by the World Bank (\$89 million), Peace Parks Foundation (\$16 million) and Local entrepreneurs, households and SMEs that are beneficiaries of the Matching Grant Scheme (\$3 million). There is also a contribution of the Government of Mozambique (Recurrent Expenditure \$3 million).

Please correct the numbers under Describe How any "Investment Mobilized" was Identified since the numbers do not correspond to the co-financing in Table C.

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted. Explanation has been revised,

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more 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

4-28-20

There is a description of the Components on pages 15 to 19 in PAD. Comments on the components in Part I. Project Description Summary.

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Tables 1 and 2 below summarize the child project alignment with the DSLIP framework and the specific indicator that directly contribute to the overall goals.

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-12-20

This is an add-on project so no need to address innovation. Sustainability issues are at the core of Component 1.

Cleared

4-12-29

Cleared for Next Question (Window not saving entry)

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

As stated in the Portal: Tables 1 and 2 below summarize the child project alignment with the DSLIP framework and the specific indicator that directly contribute to the overall goals.

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

10. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Yes. There is detailed description of the stakeholder (Summary of the key Stakeholders and their roles)

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

11. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

As stated in the CEO Endorsement: *A detailed Gender Gap Analysis and Action Plan for the ILM Portfolio, of which the Project will be part, was conducted by FNDS and the World Bank in 2019 (see separate Annex H)*

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

12. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Yes. Detailed description of the Private Sector Engagement.

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

13. Risk. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Page 20 of PAD

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

14. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Yes. There is a detailed description of the Implementation Arrangements in Annex 1 of the PAD (page 51). There is also description of the coordination with other GEF projects and of other institutions.

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

This is an add-on project. Consistency with National Priorities in First Project.

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

There is reference to Knowledge Management in one of the Outcomes (Knowledge on dryland management experiences is systematized, managed and capitalized on by key institutions in Mozambique, such as ANAC, FNDS and BIOFUN) and in an Outputs (Institutions in Mozambique have participated in knowledge sharing

events between Dryland countries, including through bilateral south-south knowledge exchanges and Participation in global and regional knowledge and learning activities) but this was not developed (It is supposed to be embedded in PMC but not explained).

Agency Response May 15, 2020: As designed the KM activities are embedded in Component 1 and 2, where PMC is mapped (and also budgeted for in the budget plan).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

Mentioned a number of times in PAD (N=12) and in the Portal (N=1) but the concept never developed. Please indicate where this is or point us in its direction.

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Comment is not clear. Detailed results framework with indicator and targets are included in the PP (Annex 1, Section VII). These are monitored regularly as part of project monitoring by the PMU and monitoring is budgeted under PMC. Additionally, in fact, both the GEF data sheet (Annex 1) and the PP include a table which further elaborates the indicator linkages with the DSLIP.

18. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

No information provided in the Portal

Agency Response May 15, 2020: As per GEF data sheet template all portal entries have been completed. In addition the Project paper also includes an economic and benefit analysis (Annex 5) and a clear theory of change (annex 3) which describes the incremental benefits as well. Comment is unclear.

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

As stated in the Portal: Please refer to Section VIII of the Project paper for full results framework

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted . Please note that the RF was uploaded earlier into the GEF data sheet appropriately.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-12-20

No comments yet.

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-12-20

Cleared

Agency Response May 15, 2020: Noted Thank you.

Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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

4-28-20

Please upload the LoE.

Agency Response May 15, 2020: The letter was provided in the portal at the PFD stage as well. As requested it has been uploaded again with the package.

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

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-28-20

No. Please address outstanding questions in the windows above.

6-12-20

No. Please address issues under window 1 (for convenience)

6-15-20

Yes This CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

1SMSP CEO Approval

Response to Secretariat comments

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

1SMSP CEO Approval**Response to Secretariat comments**

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

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

CONTEXT: Poor management of Natural Resources in- and around-Conservation Areas, not only undermines efforts for biodiversity conservation, rural development, social equity, food security and the sustainability of economic development, it also contributes to significant negative environmental impacts both at local and global level. At the local level it undermines ecological functions of ecosystems that communities depend on, such as soil fertility and water availability. As for the global level, it is one of the main contributing factors to Mozambique’s overall greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The main threats and drivers of dryland degradation and deforestation include; unsustainable agriculture and grazing; wood extraction and trade in timber; encroachment due to poverty and land tenure uncertainty and uncontrolled fires. The MozBio Program aims to support the conservation of Mozambique’s wildlife, biodiversity, and ecosystems and contribute to the livelihood of local communities living in Conservation Areas landscapes. It has four pillars: (a) policies, legislation, and institutions; (b) financial sustainability; (c) biodiversity conservation management; and (d) community development. The Program is also part of the Government of Mozambique’s (GoM) larger ‘Integrated Landscape Management Portfolio’, which is an integrated approach to address the challenges related to improving Conservation Areas and natural resources management.

PROJECT: The project has three components: Component 1: Strengthening Capacity and Financial Sustainability of National Conservation Institutions (Outcomes: a) Strengthened financial sustainability for dryland degradation and deforestation; b) Improved coordination and capacity of conservation institutions to ensure integrated and harmonized dryland management interventions; c) Improved regional collaboration on the joint management and connectivity of transboundary dryland ecosystems; d) Knowledge on dryland management experiences is systematized, managed and capitalized on by key institutions in Mozambique, such as ANAC, National Sustainable Development Fund, and BIOFUND. Component 2: Improving Conservation Areas Management in Target Landscapes (Outcomes: a) Increased community participation in sustainable dryland management, in particular of women-headed households; b) Improved awareness and engagement on biodiversity and drylands, at the level of all stakeholders, including youth; c) Improved coordination among Conservation Areas that are part of TFCA regarding dryland and wildlife

monitoring and research; d) Improved capacity of Conservation reas to actively track threats to wildlife and fauna and act upon it) Component 3: Promoting Conservation-compatible Rural Development and Integrated Landscape Management in Target Landscapes (Outcomes: a) Strengthened sustainable dryland value-chains and financing mechanisms to support sustainable production, management and restoration of drylands, with the inclusion of women led businesses; b) Financial institutions and other investors (public and private) offer finance to support sustainable production, management and restoration of drylands, tailored to the needs and conditions of resource managers and users; c) Reduced loss of habitat and a reduction in GHG emissions; d) Increased area under improved protection or management to benefit biodiversity and avoid loss of high-conservation value forest; e) Management decisions in target landscapes are guided by land use planning mainstreamed by SFM and LDN and climate resilience goals; f) Governance, tenure and access conditions are improved sufficiently to meet the requirements for effective and sustainable dryland management, in the target landscapes).

RESULTS: The project will deliver the following GEBs: 1) 387,300 ha of terrestrial Protected Areas Under Improved Management effectiveness; 2) 6,700 ha of Land restored (3,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands and 3,700 of forests and forests lands restored); 3) 520,000 ha of landscapes under improved practices, of which 3,000 ha are under international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations; 4) 10,845, 249 metric tons of CO_{2e} mitigated; 5) There will be 35,000 beneficiaries.

INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY, SCALE-UP: BIOFUND's work on establishing new innovative finance mechanisms for conservation in Mozambique is also progressing well, including the set-up of a Biodiversity Offset Program to engage the private sector in conservation. The parent Project incorporates activities that strengthen CA management at the national and local level, as well as conceptually innovative elements to promote development in the landscapes surrounding the CAs, as efforts to address threats to conservation. indigenous knowledge, in the form of herding and kraaling, are brought together with new technology to enable regenerative livestock production and enhance social equity in the form of innovative training and enterprise development. The project has a component to strengthen the capacity and financial sustainability of National Conservation Institutions,

CO-FINANCING: In the amount of \$113 million, will be provided by the World Bank, the Government of Mozambique, including FNDS and ANAC, and NGOs.