



**(REQUEST FOR: CEO ENDORSEMENT
PROJECT TYPE: FULL SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND**

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Improved Management Effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of Protected Areas			
Country(ies):	Botswana	GEF Project ID: ¹	4544
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4624
Other Executing Partner(s):	Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Department of Environmental Affairs; University of Botswana	Submission Date:	June 21, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	n/a	Agency Fee (\$):	181,818

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD 1: Improve sustainability of protected area systems	1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas 1.2 Increased revenue for protected areas to meet total expenditures required for management	1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management	GEF TF	1,668,182	6,417,214
Project management costs			GEF TF	150,000	577,025
Total project costs				1,818,182	6,994,239

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To strengthen management effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of PAs to respond to existing and emerging threats

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Collaborative Governance framework in place in PAs and Buffer Zones resulting	TA	1.1 Co-management framework involving PAs, private sector, communities, NGO and GoZ established and capacitated 1.2 Integrated land use plans reducing threats and expanding economy 1.3 Tourism revenue exploited and diversified	1) Vision document (5-10p) developed with strategic zoning plan and Integrated land use plan for Chobe Complex	GEF TF	853,182	3,152,500

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

<p>in reduced threats to Biodiversity and Economic Growth</p>		<p>in priority areas including FRs and CBNRM/CHA areas 1.4 Tourism expansion used to leverage community benefits (through PPPs and HH revenue sharing) and wildlife management Indicators: PA Buffer and Wildlife Dispersal Areas zoned Wildlife populations maintained at landscape level Wildlife corridors identified and secured and preserving wildlife movements and access to water HWC killings at 50% of current levels 250-300 new tourism beds and 500 jobs Tourism activities diversified Park fees increase by P2.5m 8 Villages receiving at least P400,000 annually with 80% benefiting HH 15% increase HH income in CBNRM areas Governance tracking shows 65%+ performance</p>	<p>2) PA Buffer and Wildlife Dispersal Areas zoned with clear boundaries, specific regulations, standards and code of practices developed 3) Value of the Chobe bio-economy developed and incorporated into land use plans through an integrated research, training and planning process 4) Simple, concise tourism plan developed that increases tourism activities and diversity of activities in priority areas 5) Shared management information system developed for Chobe PA Complex 6) CBNRM support Unit established and capacitated CBNRM and capable of monitoring conformance, finances, livelihoods, gender and governance</p>																																
<p>2. Management Effectiveness and Financial Sustainability in Core Protected Areas strengthened to address existing and emerging threats to Biodiversity</p>	<p>TA</p>	<p>2.1 Increase management effectiveness and financial efficiency of PA Complex 2.2: Effective resource protection and monitoring in place</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="370 1346 862 1633"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"><i>Metrics</i></th> <th colspan="2"><i>Baseline 2013</i></th> <th colspan="2"><i>Target 2018</i></th> </tr> <tr> <th>CNP</th> <th>FR</th> <th>CNP</th> <th>FR</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Financial Sustainability</i></td> <td>25%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>60%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>METT</i></td> <td>54%</td> <td>45%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Income Pm</i></td> <td>19</td> <td>0</td> <td>24</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Budget Pm</i></td> <td>5</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>10</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicators: Measurable resource protection in 14,776km² PA and 11,149km² buffer zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 25,000 patrol days annually Less than 1 poaching incident / 100 patrol days Less than 10 elephant poached annually PA revenues increased by 25% from new	<i>Metrics</i>	<i>Baseline 2013</i>		<i>Target 2018</i>		CNP	FR	CNP	FR	<i>Financial Sustainability</i>	25%	21%	60%	50%	<i>METT</i>	54%	45%	75%	60%	<i>Income Pm</i>	19	0	24	4	<i>Budget Pm</i>	5	3.5	10	5	<p>1) Economic studies undertaken and case developed to ensure revenue retention to manage CNP/FRs and sustain tourism business that depends on them 2) Business / management and sustainable financing plans developed and implemented for matrix of PAs 3) Integrated law enforcement/patrolling system in place in partnership with BDF with effective monitoring and information systems 4) Integrated habitat and wildlife</p>	<p>GEF TF</p>	<p>815,000</p>	<p>3,113,739</p>
<i>Metrics</i>	<i>Baseline 2013</i>			<i>Target 2018</i>																															
	CNP	FR	CNP	FR																															
<i>Financial Sustainability</i>	25%	21%	60%	50%																															
<i>METT</i>	54%	45%	75%	60%																															
<i>Income Pm</i>	19	0	24	4																															
<i>Budget Pm</i>	5	3.5	10	5																															

	sites Activity based budgets and performance indicators in place by Y2 Visualized data presented to stakeholders to support evidence-based decision making 80% of tourists satisfied with game viewing along Chobe River frontage Relevant staff trained through professional short courses Habitats stable or improving Burned area reduced to 4,000km2 Integrated Fire Management Strategy in place Stable or increasing populations of indicator Baseline survey and threat assessment of aquatic environment conducted	monitoring system in place 5) Integrated fire management system in place 6) Baseline survey and risk assessment for aquatic environment completed			
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				150,000	728,000
Total project costs				1,818,182	6,994,239

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co financing	Co financing Amount (\$)
Government of Botswana	Department of Wildlife and National Parks	Grant	4,695,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	250,000
Private Sector	Kwando Wildlife Experience	Grant	615,450
Academia	Botswana College of Agriculture	Grant	411,725
Academia	Okavango Research Institute	Grant	1,022,064
Total Co-financing			6,994,239

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF	Biodiversity	Botswana	1,818,182	181,818	2,000,000
Total Grant Resources				1,818,182	181,818	2,000,000

CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	142,500	0	142,500
National/Local Consultants	23,500	0	23,500

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

N/A

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

1. In addition to what was described in the PIF, UNDP has finalized its Biodiversity and Ecosystem Framework for 2012 and 2020, which will be integrated in the UNDP Business plan and country programmes. Under the Framework, the second Programme is dedicated to unlocking the potential of protected areas, including indigenous and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing towards sustainable development.environment and natural ecosystems, which is one of the main outcomes of the UNDAF 2010-2016.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

2. The project is designed by closely complying with the objectives, outcomes, components, GEF budget and co-financing specified in the PIF . There has been no change in the GEF budget totals nor in the allocation of budgets across outcomes., although co-finance has increased by \$1,433,789 – with University of Botswana and Botswana College of Agriculture coming on board. These are important new partners and will play a key role in research and training.

3. **As in the PIF the Project Objective is :** To strengthen management effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of PAs to respond to existing and emerging threats

4. The Project Components as outlined in the PIF have been maintained, although the order of the components has been reversed, with the first component now focusing on collaborative governance of the whole, and the second focusing on improved management effectiveness of core PA functions. The project components are now as follows:

1. *Collaborative Governance in PA and Buffer Zones Increasing Economic Growth and Removing Threats*
2. *Core protected areas strengthened (financial sustainability and management effectiveness) to address existing and emerging threats to biodiversity*

5. Component 1 is further elaborated to emphasise collaborative governance in addressing PA buffer zone threats, but also the importance of economic growth as both the means of incentivising and securing improved buffer zone management, and as an incremental socio-economic benefits of the project. As noted in the PIF, the buffer zone is comprised of multiple land use areas, ranging from livestock grazing, commercial and subsistence arable farming, consumptive and non-consumptive tourism (WMAs), veldt products harvesting, settlements and critical wildlife dispersal areas/corridors. This poses various management challenges, which are exacerbated by the fact that there is little or no appreciation by people living in the PA buffer zones of the economic value of the PAs in terms of biodiversity outcomes, and in purely tangible terms such as jobs and contribution to GDP. Component one is therefore designed to address these gaps through providing opportunities to expand and diversify tourism to reduce pressure on biodiversity in key zones, provide jobs and pro-poor benefits, convince stakeholders that “wildlife is the number one economic driver” in CKL Complex; and strengthen capacity for collaborative governance and integrated planning.

6. Component 2 has been enriched by findings from the baseline studies carried out during the PPG. A key new finding is that there is scope for the CNP to increase its current tourism revenue base by at least 25% and become financially sustainable. The Chobe Complex of PAs, though underutilized with limited investment in and planning for tourism expansion, can already fund itself if it is able to retain its revenues. However, the irony is that underfunding by about \$2m annually is putting at risk a tourism economy already worth \$24-48m that can easily be expanded to provide tax revenues, economic growth and employment. Secondly, financial shortfalls are exacerbated by centralised budget and human resource management process that are neither matched to nor prioritise the core needs and functions of PA management. Thus, management systems emphasise financial control, but not financial effectiveness, accountability for biodiversity outcomes, or indeed how biodiversity outcomes are to be monitored and controlled. In order to achieve its biodiversity objectives, the Chobe PA Complex should be able to consistently cover its “core operational costs”. To do this it needs (a) adequate and well-planned budgets and (b) systems that ensure that these budgets are

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

used effectively to respond to existing and emerging threats and to achieve PA objectives in an integrated manner in partnership with private operators, community-based organizations (CBOs) and sister government agencies. It also needs to strengthen monitoring of law enforcement, habitats, wildlife, tourism, buffer zones, HWC and so on to inform evidence-based adaptive management. Component 2 is, therefore, is designed to address these short comings.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

7. N/A

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Project risks have been updated and are summarized in Table 1 below

TABLE 1: PROJECT RISKS ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Identified Risks	Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Elaboration of Risks	Mitigation Measures
Different sectors involved in the establishment and management of PAs work in isolation	Strategic	Medium	Moderately likely	Low	Sectors are highly centralized	<p>The project will institute collaborative management structure for decision making.</p> <p>All relevant Government structures will be involved from the start to create ownership and commitment to the proposed reforms and increase the chance of implementation.</p> <p>The Project will build a community of practice with a common Vision by providing funding and facilitation of stakeholder workshops, by emphasizing measurable goals, by developing evidence-based management, and by providing training to partners on key issues, especially economics and land use, in order to build a common understanding and approach.</p>
PA funding gaps	Financial / Regulatory	High	Medium	Medium	<p>PAs can potential fund themselves. However, income (P19m) is centralized and PAs are provided with a budget of P5m for CNP and P3.5m for FRs.</p> <p>This is an underlying cause of low management effectiveness. It puts at risk a \$24-48m tourism economy.</p>	<p>The project address this is several ways: by developing economic and financial justification for sufficient budget, by introducing new management systems that build confidence in financial controls and effectiveness, new revenues by expanding and diversifying tourism.</p> <p>Note that these issues have been prioritized by the Minister and PS</p>
High staff turnover affects capacity-retention, institutional memory and	Financial / Regulatory	High	Medium	Medium	High staff turnover affects capacity-retention, institutional memory and relationship building	<p>Institutionalization of management systems</p> <p>Capacity building of PA agencies and stakeholders</p>

relationship building						
Local communities may still follow incompatible land use and resource use practices, jeopardizing biodiversity	Political	Medium	Likely	Medium	<p>The hunting ban will greatly reduce revenues to CBNRM communities.</p> <p>CBNRM in Chobe has not been successful at providing HH incentives from wildlife, or in developing community-based wildlife management systems</p>	<p>The Project emphasizes tourism development to directly counter this risk. This will be conditional that benefits get to individual villages and HHs including women.</p> <p>With the right incentives and support, CBNRM villages are very willing to invest in wildlife management, especially once they get benefits and training. Appropriate training will be initiated. However, this is a longer-term process, but of low risk to the project in the short term.</p>
Conservation efforts may be limited by ecological responses to climate change	Environmental	Medium	Likely	Medium	<p>Much of northern Botswana has experienced lower and more variable rainfall since the global climate shift in the 1980s; Chobe has experienced the opposite. While Chobe's climate future is uncertain future droughts are highly likely. The high stocking rates of the PA, especially of elephants, increases the risk of major die-offs. This is a controversial issue</p>	<p>The Project addresses this by ensuring that habitat and species monitoring is intensified, and by setting Limits of Acceptable Change</p>
Management of PAs remains ineffective, leading to a decline of biodiversity	Operational	Medium	Moderately Likely	Low		<p>The Project will support this in a number of ways: (1) increased budgets, (2) efficient management systems (3) training(4) monitoring of resources, resource protection, tourism impact, etc.</p>

<p>Downturn in tourism industry owing to factors external to the Project</p> <p>Insufficient tourism investors available to take up sites</p>	Economic	High	Low	Low	<p>Chobe is a popular destination, with a high demand for new sites.</p> <p>Botswana provides a politically and socially stable and safe environment for tourism development. Historically, the demand for tourism in Botswana has proven over time to be relatively inelastic (including during the current global economic crisis).</p>	<p>There is a moderate risk that the anticipated rate of investment may be slightly too fast for the market, but streamlined procedures, clear plans and simple contract arrangement will encourage investment.</p> <p>The private sector has shown willingness to invest if given the right incentives (e.g. extending lease periods from 5 to 15 years). The Government has put in place a Privatization policy to encourage more involvement of the private sector and other non-state actors in the entire economy.</p> <p>The diversification of the tourism product will serve to mitigate this risk.</p>
<p>Assumption - suitable research/training institutions are available in the region. New skills are required to manage PAs and buffer zones</p>	Education / research	Medium	Moderately Likely	Medium	<p>Concerns have been expressed at inadequate quality of internal training, and also low quality cut-and-paste consultancy documents.</p> <p>The absence of appropriate training for modern parks is being assessed and partially addressed at a regional level⁵.</p>	<p>Bundle consultancy and capacity-building requirements so that supplying new sets of modules (e.g. economics, LE monitoring) becomes worthwhile (given upfront training preparation and/or curriculum development costs)</p>

⁵ A GIZ SADC project is being developed to address capacity-building needs for TFCAs. Through SADC, SAWC is attempting to address significant gaps in PA training, especially for higher level managers, and especially on subjects relevant to this project – PA economic and financial management, performance management, stakeholder processes, CBNRM institution-building, governance, and livelihoods. SAWC has approach Norway to fund similar work in partnership with NorAgric, Copperbelt University and Stellenbosch University. Therefore, with a 4-year commitment it is highly likely that SAWC and other institutions (including WWF) can provide/coordinate the training and capacity-building required

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

In addition to what was described in the PIF, A GIZ SADC project is being developed to address capacity gaps in PA finance and economics for higher level managers, - subjects that are highly relevant to this project. The South Africa Wildlife College has approached Norway to fund similar work in partnership with NorAgric, Copperbelt University and Stellenbosch University. Therefore, with a 4-year commitment it is highly likely that the project will be able to partner with other institutions to provide/coordinate the training and capacity building required

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

A detailed stakeholder analysis is provided in the ProDoc. However, the essence of this is that:

- Overall management and strategic direction of the project is the responsibility of the Project Steering Committee in Gabarone. This is chaired by MWET, and incorporates key government agencies and representatives of NGOs and the private sector. DEA, as the GEF focal point, provides the secretariat for the PSC.
- The District Land Use Planning Unit of the Chobe District Council, chaired by the Chobe Land Board, will be the locus of collaborative governance, with responsibility for integrated planning (i.e. outcome 1). Members of most government agencies are represented on this committee, plus representatives of community based organization, NGOs and the private sector. Though the “Technical Reference Group” DLUPU partners were involved in the planning of this project.
- PA management effectiveness will be coordinated through the newly formed Park Management Committee because it is through this forum that the authorities responsible for PAs and WMS (i.e. DWNP), Forest Reserves (i.e. DFRR) and tourism (BTO) are mandated to jointly manage core PAs. The PMC is chaired by the private sector, and other members are DWNP (responsible for National Parks), DNRR (responsible for Forest Reserves) and BTO (responsible for tourism development). The need to broaden membership of the Park Management Committee has been flagged by the committee.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The ProDoc emphasizes a people-centered approach to conservation with a focus on economic growth and equitable benefit sharing as a means to achieving bio-diversity outcomes. Tourism in Chobe already has an economic impact of \$24-48m annually, and provides at least 2,000 jobs. Indeed, every single person who attended the stakeholder meetings agreed that they owed his/her employment to wildlife and the PA. In addition to its primary biodiversity conservation objectives, the Project aims, first, to secure the foundation of this economy (which is the PA, its buffer zones and wildlife), second, to develop a much deeper understanding of this economy, and third to expand tourism into new areas to create more economic growth (and not least to protect the resource both directly through ground coverage and indirectly by strengthening the economic case for bio-diversity). It is anticipated that tourism development initiated through this Project will yield \$9m in turnover once these lodges/activities reach full capacity and will provide some 500 new jobs.

At a more local scale, the Project will support communities in the buffer zones to develop tourism opportunities that will result in to income and employment. The project is ensuring 80% of tourism concession fees in multi-use buffer zones are shared equitably among households including women, removing a long-term threat to the biodiversity in buffer zones, and alleviating poverty. The Project will also conduct regular household surveys to assess the impacts of its activities on livelihoods.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design

The project will spend \$1.8 m to address integrated planning and PA management effectiveness in an area of 24,177km² with over 50,000 elephants and 23,000 people. The project aims to reduce land use conflicts and transaction costs by improving collaborative governance. It will also introduce performance-based management with annual workplans, budgets and review processes. These will result in improved performance and financial efficiency.

The Project strategy is framed around unlocking the financial and economic potential of CNP, which is worth some US\$24-48m annually and provides over 2,000 jobs, and can be increased by 25% in the short to medium term. By unlocking hitherto untapped sources of revenue, PA budgets will increase, will be able to cover core operational costs, improve financial efficiency and contribute to management effectiveness.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below. At **Project start**: A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and with appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan. The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles; support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- b) Based on the project results framework and the relevant SOF (e.g. GEF) Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks. This should be done within a long term plan for financial sustainability.
- c) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- d) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- e) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and SOF (e.g. GEF) reporting requirements. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits: UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term of project cycle: The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (insert date). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-EEG. The management response and the

evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). The relevant SOF (GEF) Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project: An independent [Final Evaluation](#) will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and SOF (e.g. GEF) guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-EEG. The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response, which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). The relevant SOF (e.g. GEF) Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the [Project Terminal Report](#). This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and knowledge sharing: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: 10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by Project Manager ▪ Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 20,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team, ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 20,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Project manager and team 	Indicative cost per year: 3,000	Yearly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
TOTAL indicative COST		US\$ 62,000	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT (S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Ingrid Otukile	GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM	20TH APRIL, 2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adrian Dinu, UNDP-GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		June 21, 2013	Alice Ruhweza, RTA, EBD	+27 12 354 8120	alice.ruhweza@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Objective: To strengthen management effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of PAs to respond to existing and emerging threats	PA budgets secure	P8m	PA budgets of P20m cover operational costs for 14,000km ² and used effectively according to activity-based budgets and stakeholder review	Annual reports and accounts	Supportive Government policies in place emphasizing decentralized responsibilities and revenue retention by PAs
	PA management indicators including status of LE, habitats and wildlife populations	Nil	14,776km ² PS (CNP10,600 km, FRs 4,176 km ²) and 11,149km ² buffer zones (8,998km ² CHAs, 2,151 km ² occupied State Lands) have measurable resource protection, habitat and wildlife monitoring and PA management indicators (detailed below) are monitored and improving (i.e. habitats and wildlife, poaching, fire, problem animals, tourism, stakeholder and tourist satisfaction)	Annual performance review	
	Community benefits and participation HH income, especially in poor areas	P6m to committee P750,000 to villages 0 HH benefit	15% increase in HH income in CBNRM areas	Surveys of HH livelihoods	Stakeholders are able to work together and agree roles, targets and land use zonation, streamline tourism site allocation agree, and follow strategic Vision and zoning plan
	Reduced land use and wildlife conflicts	5-10 lions HWC 10 elephants HWC	Wildlife corridors (to Hwange, Nxai Pan/Maghadghadi, Okavango, Caprivi) and key wildlife habitats (e.g. Seloko) formally identified and secured and land use conflicts reduced to 25% of current level	Aerial surveys and expert opinion	
	Wildlife corridors			HWC records	GoB supports strengthen of CBNRM approaches with participation and 80% benefit sharing
	Tourism expansion and diversification in FR, CBNRM areas and CNP	1,200 beds	PAC in CBNRM areas reduced to 30% of current levels (through benefit sharing and management plans)	Tourism contracts	
			Tourism activities diversified with 250-300 beds in new areas		
	Increase in Financial Sustainability Scorecard scores	CNP = 25% FR = 21%	CNP = 60% FR = 50%		

	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool	CNP = 54% ⁶ FR = 45	CNP=75% FR = 60%		
Component 1: Collaborative Governance in PA and Buffer Zones Increasing Economic Growth and Removing Threats					
1.1 Co-management framework involving PAs, private sector, communities, NGO and GoZ established and capacitated	Stakeholder committee Role clarification Procedures	Plans for CNP, CECT, CH5 and draft plans for “Kasane as the Tourism Capital of the North”	Stakeholder forum meeting regularly, tracking progress against project indicators and ensuring timely decision-making and corrective action Roles of stakeholders agreed in strategic plan Procedures streamlined and decision made within 90 days (e.g. approval of LUP, tourism sites, adherence to ILUP, etc.) At least 3 staff trained with degrees, 15 with certificates and diplomas, and 170 through professional short course training.	Annual workplans and budget Report of strategic planning workshop/s Reports on LUPs, tourism plans Training reports	Conflicts between arms of Government and different stakeholder groups do not undermine project implementation activities Suitable research/ training institutions are available in the region
1.2 Integrated land use plans reducing threats and expanding economy	Integrated plans /processes and sub-plans Wildlife populations at landscape level Wildlife corridors Compatibility of land uses Containment of threats from infrastructure placement and tourism impact	0	PA Buffer and Wildlife Dispersal Areas zoned with clear boundaries, specific regulations, standards and code of practices and ensures compatibility of land uses with overall biodiversity management goals Wildlife populations maintained at landscape level Wildlife corridors identified and secured and preserving wildlife movements and access to water		Government agencies able to work together to integrate plans
1.3 Tourism revenue exploited and diversified in priority areas including FRs and CBNRM/CHA areas	Tourism investment sites and procedures Tourism beds, income, economic impact, employment Number of new activities introduced Park fees	0	Integrated tourism development plan agreed by stakeholders to increase investment in FRs (6 camp / 120+beds), CBNRM-linked areas (8 camps/200+ beds) by Y4 Tourism turnover increases by P65-100m with new 250-300 beds and 500 new jobs Tourism activities diversified to include walking, night drives, horse trails, bush dinners, remote camp sites, etc introduced Park fees increase by P2.5m At least 80% of tourists recommend Chobe to	Monitoring of site contracts Gate statistics Lodge/hotel statistics Tourist satisfaction surveys	BTO, Land Board, DWNP, FD, Communities able to agree on and implement new tourism sites Sufficient tourism investors available to take up sites

⁶ Note that this scorecard was completed by the ProDoc consultant. The METT values provided in the preparatory documents exaggerates the management effectiveness of CNP and FRs, mainly because they have no budgets and/or trained staff to implement. Alternative scores were 72% and 54% for CNP and FRs respectively

	Tourism satisfaction		friends		
1.4 Tourism expansion used to leverage community benefits (through PPPs and HH revenue sharing) and wildlife management	Amount and % of tourism fees reaching community Employment Uptake of wildlife management and land use zoning by communities	CECT P4m (P150,000 to each village) KALEPA P1,5m (nil to each village) 8 lions, 10 elephant / year	8 Villages receiving at least P400,000 annually with 80% benefiting and providing at least 250 jobs Communities employing game guards and providing MOMS and HWC reports HWC reduced to 2 lions, 4 elephants LU zoning, protection and business plans implemented and monitored Livelihoods improve 15% especially for marginal people and women (surveys) Governance tracking shows 65%+ performance and at least 30% women representation	Bi-annual surveys of livelihoods, gender effects, governance in communities	Ban on hunting can be replaced by tourism revenues Policy /practices agreeing to Village benefits and 80% HH revenue sharing agreed Villagers empowered to manage wildlife and wildlife businesses Private sector is not capable and willing to invest in biodiversity conservation
Component 2. Core protected areas strengthened (financial sustainability and management effectiveness) to address existing and emerging threats to biodiversity					
2.1 Increase management effectiveness and financial efficiency of PA Complex	Sustainable financing plan	P8m (requirement is P20m)	CNP/FR legally established as business centers by Y3 and retaining P20m to manage CNP and FRs effectively		Policy makers in Gaborone agree to modernize PA financial and management structures, and agree to revenue retention
	PA revenues		PA revenues increased by 25% from new sites in FRs and streamlined PA gate and concession fees		
	Reduction in funding gap of the targeted PAs	CNP income: P19,200,000 CNP Budget: P5,000,000 FR income: P0 FR Budget: P3,700,000	CNP Income: P25m CNP Budget: P15m FR Income: P4m FR budget: P 10m Strategic surplus: P4m.		High staff turnover affects capacity retention, institutional memory and relationship building
	Effective management		Activity based budgets and performance indicators in place by Y2	Annual reports, financial accounts	
	Management information system	Much unused data	Visualized data presented to stakeholders to support evidence-based decision making, e.g. fires, LE, habitats, wildlife, CBNRM, tourism, etc.	Annual and half annual stakeholder review	
	Tourism crowding and satisfaction	No data	80% of tourists satisfied with game viewing along Chobe River frontage		
	Human resource capacity (relative to KPAs)	0	In Y1, review staff numbers and capacity relative to KPAs, including job descriptions and performance criteria, and initiate a staff development plan		

			At least 3 staff trained with degrees, 15 with certificates and diplomas, and 170 through professional short course training.		
	Housing and equipment	Housing condition poor 5 vehicles	At least 50 staff houses rehabilitated with water, electricity 10 vehicles		
2.2: Effective resource protection and monitoring in place	Wildlife protection Patrol days Area coverage Poaching catch/effort data	19 elephants poached in 2009 and 18 in 2010	LE Management information system in place by Y2 At least 25,000 patrol days annually Less than 1 poaching incident / 100 patrol days Less than 10 elephant poached annually	MOMS anti-poaching monitoring (Control room)	BDF works with DWNP to introduce LE management information systems KAZA provides outlet for excess elephants
	Status of key habitats	0	Habitats stable or improving	300 permanent vegetation transects established by Y5 (Walker 1976 method) Fixed point photos Tree recovery initiated in xx experimental exclosures	Chobe has had a series of above average rainfall years. This is unlikely to continue
	Reduced area burned annually	Average burnt area of 7 714 ± 1 574 km ²	Burned area reduced to 4,000km ² Integrated Fire Management Strategy in place	Remote sensing	
	Wildlife populations	CNP=100% of carrying capacity (as per aerial survey 2010) Elephants = 91% large mammal biomass Mammal counts (1960s; 2012)	Stable or increasing populations of indicator / at risk species e.g. puku, red lechwe, tsessebe, sable, roan, bushbuck, slaty egret, wattled crane	Bi-annual Aerial survey Monthly road counts on floodplain	
	Aquatic environment	0	Baseline survey and threat assessment conducted by Y3		

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Council from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

COMMENTS FROM STAP	RESPONSE
<p>While supportive of this project, STAP wishes to suggest a number of areas project developers may wish to consider in the final design. The project concept note indicates that significant threats to biodiversity (among others) include uncontrolled wildfires and unsustainable use of natural resources such as thatch grasses, firewood, and a variety of other products. Wherever possible STAP urges that the project consider and address the root causes of these threats, rather than focus the majority of efforts on control measures such as fire suppression.</p>	<p>The ProDoc is in complete agreement with STAP that unsustainable use of natural resources and wildfires are symptoms of deeper problems. The two outcomes directly address these concerns, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborative Governance in PA and Buffer Increasing Economic Growth and Removing 2. Core protected areas strengthened (financial sustainability and management effectiveness) address existing and emerging threats to bio <p>Multiple methods are used to address the challenge of collaborative governance including well facilitated stakeholder processes, guiding stakeholders to research these problems themselves and in so doing to develop experiential capacity supported by training, and the more usual and more formal process of developing an integrated economic and land use plan for the district.</p> <p>Here the inclusion of 'economic' is critical because job creation, economic growth engender political action, and through the bio-tourism sector it is possible and necessary to use integrated planning to grow the economy while simultaneously providing incentives for PA and wildlife conservation. Integrated planning service both economies and ecological scale</p> <p>Importantly, the project eschews straight technical support consultancy. It makes a strong effort to ensure that technical support is provided in the format of mentoring, and that results are developed in partnership with stakeholders. This also integrated with experiential and formal training. This requires that the Project Manager is recruited with the capacity and to manage adaptive management / transdisciplinary processes.</p>
<p>The document underscores the important role this complex plays in the Kavango-Zambezi transfrontier zone. The current GEF Work Program contains similar initiatives under consideration in Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Angola the latter two of these proposed by UNDP. STAP believes that there is a unique opportunity, currently not addressed in any of these submissions, for lessons and knowledge sharing with these and among similar initiatives that could significantly improve the delivery of global benefits across the sub-region. The Panel urges UNDP to consider the use and/or development of knowledge systems as a component in project delivery.</p>	<p>The KAZA Secretariat is based in Kasane and participated in several meetings during PPG. It has also been proposed that KAZA is used to manage project finances, both because it has capacity in this and to engender linkages.</p> <p>Learning visits have been budgeted to learn from evidence on law enforcement and from PA's managed as decentralised business centers in Zambia.</p> <p>The project has a strong focus on monitoring, visualization and stakeholder processes.</p> <p>Finally, even within Botswana concern was expressed that and landscape managers are exposed more widely to fire in the region.</p>
<p>The perception, possibly correct, of tourist 'congestion' in Chobe is of interest. Is this the perception of the PA managers or of the</p>	<p>Tourism operators accept that overcrowding is a problem. They point to under-management rather than numbers</p>

<p>safari operators? Consultation with the PA managers, of both national parks and private lodges in neighbouring countries, regarding visitor management might be useful.</p>	<p>cause.</p> <p>The project addresses this through integrated planning by stakeholders, and by specifically developing new tourism sites and a diversity of activities in priority areas, i.e. to spread tourism and its benefits more widely</p>
<p>STAP wishes to caution against what appears to be a simplistic approach to fire management. Recent research reviewing over 100 years of fire management experience in Kruger National Park, where a massive investment was made from 1950 to 2000 in trying to 'manage' fire regimes has resulted in significant management revisions in recent years. Costs and risks have been assessed and the policy now is simply to protect infrastructure from risk, leaving fires to follow their course. It might be useful to consult with other regional PA authorities (such as KNP) in fire-prone savanna systems before finalising fire management policies and practices. A further point, recent work in South Africa and Australia indicates that large-scale wildfires are becoming more prevalent, as conditions for the 'three 30s' (air temperatures above 30 degrees; humidity below 30%, and air speed above 30 km per hour) become more frequent. Whether this is due to climate change is not yet known, but it has significant implications for the management of large PAs in these types of ecosystems.</p>	<p>The stance taken by the ProDoc is similar given the controversial nature of fire in these savannas – Namibia burns the Caprivi deliberately each year, while in Botswana it is actually illegal to start bushfires.</p> <p>There are also far better resources and qualified agencies to manage fire than CNP, with the Australians working with DFRR to develop fire policies and a major German investment in fire.</p> <p>Therefore the Project assists with fire monitoring, and with assessing long term change to Baikea forests and monitoring of habitats, and provides a small discretionary budget to DFRR to assist with their fire management programme.</p>
<p>Finally, the PIF notes "the increase in socio-economic benefits to the people of the region will help to ensure that biodiversity conservation efforts are sustainable in the long term . . . ". It would be extremely useful if the final project design could include a methodology for the collection of empirical data, which could be used to test the validity of this assumption, which would appear central to assessing the overall success of the project. This project appears to be well suited to test this assumption and STAP would be willing to assist in this regard.</p>	<p>The Project does indeed provide TA and research/training funds to 'research' and monitor the economic impact of the tourism sector, as well as the economics of alternative land uses in the area. Chobe, being relatively discrete, is an ideal place to make the economic case for PAs. Note that the ProDoc charts the direction for this with some indicative economic data and principles, but that this 'hypothesis' needs to be validated with quantitative data.</p>
<p>Note concerning resilience to climate change: STAP is currently testing a project screening tool to assess the potential risks associated with climate change to project design. The Panel notes that climate risks have not been listed among the potential risks to project success in section B.4. While these threats may not be immediate, as compared to those described, significant changes to annual rainfall regimes and cyclical patterns of drought (expected in the coming decades over much of the Southern Africa region) could significantly impact and perhaps even overwhelm the gains in global environmental benefits this project is expected to deliver. STAP urges the project proponents to actively consider these potential impacts and to consider adaptation measures where possible in project design.</p>	<p>The ProDoc is aware of the climate risk. Indeed, it is intriguing that Kasane has had above-average rainfall for the last decade, whereas rainfall in Shakawe and Maun was lower and more variable after the global climatic shift of the 1980s than it was before.</p> <p>This poses a significant risk to the ecosystem. Perhaps the least risky strategy is to remove impala from the Chobe riverfront, and also to manage elephants. However, politically, this is not feasible. The ProDoc approaches the issue by encouraging habitat and wildlife monitoring, and in Y3 the setting of "limits of acceptable change". Without data such a meeting is likely to be clouded by emotion, rather than analysis.</p>
<p>Comments from GERMANY</p>	
<p>The Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of protected areas plays an important role in the KAZA transfrontier conservation area. Therefore it is recommended that:</p>	<p>The KAZA Secretariat, which is based in Kasane, participated in all stakeholder workshops and all key staff were consulted during the PPG. One of the member's of the Park Management</p>

<p>The KAZA Secretariat should also be seen as key stakeholder (B.5.), and the final project proposal should elaborate on mechanisms for cooperation at the regional and transboundary level.</p> <p>Coordination with other related initiatives: German Financial Co-operation (KfW) is a key donor at KAZA level with support including infrastructure development in the Chobe National Park. Within the efforts of donor coordination the implementing agency should actively seek contact in order to ensure synergies and complementarities. Such coordination will also be important with regard to socio-economic development measures linked to nature-based tourism and sustainable utilization of natural resources.</p>	<p>Committee has the office next door to KAZA. See other comments above.</p>
<p>At the SADC level, German Technical Cooperation (GIZ) provides support to the implementation of regional programmes, including the SADC Regional Fire Management Programme and SADC Programme on Transfrontier Conservation Areas. It is recommended that in the final project design reference is made to these regional programmes and that regional authorities are consulted for improved coordination and cooperation.</p>	<p>This is noted in the ProDoc – para 122</p>
<p>The risk assessment should consider the risk of climate change on project objectives.</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p>NGO Comments</p>	
<p>Almost all the projects submitted from Southern Africa are government driven and has no participation of other stakeholders e.g. CSOs. When the term multiple benefits is mentioned, it opens up an age old term where the community members are used as recipients or benefactors when the reality on the ground is often opposite. For instance, is it true that at this age and time, a government has never acted to expand and strengthen protected areas? What is meant by improvement of management effectiveness? Or Shire<shared?> natural management systems? Does it mean there have been no management systems before? Generating natural benefits within and protected areas?</p>	<p>Note that in the ProDoc the goals of biodiversity conservation and economic development are closely linked.</p> <p>While this is not a community development programme, outputs 1.3 and 1.4 are specifically aimed at generating revenues for the eight villages, and at ensuring that HHs, including women and the poor, benefit directly.</p> <p>Ultimately the PA and wildlife will not survive if it does not generate benefits to local people. Indeed, the project area currently suffers from a market failure where people are economically and managerially disempowered relative to high-value wildlife and tourism, so that they have little livelihood option but lower-value subsistence agriculture in these drylands. The interventions planned by the project will not solve these problems, but they may open the door to solving them. Project oversight should emphasis the indicators included regarding HH benefit.</p>
<p>Comments from FRANCE</p>	
<p>The project tries to develop an integrated landscape approach to strengthen protected area management within the globally important 14,282 km² Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti matrix of PAs, comprising Chobe National Park and 6 Forest Reserves, and in surrounding buffer areas covering 2000 km².</p> <p>The project operates through two main components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Component 1: Strengthening Core PA functions to 	<p>During the PPG stage, an analysis of the fire problem was carried out. We attach excerpts from that report below</p> <p>““<i>Unmanaged Bush Fires</i> – Fire is an inherent feature of most African savanna systems including the CKL area. Based on annual maps (MODIS Satellite Images) fires in the CKL area occur every year and also commonly tend to be transboundary, Zimbabwe and Namibia. According to the Chobe National Park</p>

Address Existing and Emerging Threats to Biodiversity

- Component 2: Establishing Collaborative Governance to Address Threats in the PA and Buffer Zones

The project is well designed and there is no question with the justification and importance of the intervention in this globally significant area. The project strongly emphasizes its objective to tackle through a holistic manner the emerging threats to the biodiversity of the landscape.

We are particularly concerned with the wild fire management threats. If the project seems based on a sound approach to try to control the pressure of wildfire, it remains very weak in assessing the cause of wildfire. Particularly, the PIF should present a thorough technical, social and economical assessment of the social groups at the origin of wildfire, the reason of their practice of wildfire, and what could be the alternatives activities or practices that could be proposed to them. Trying to manage the pressure is good, but managing the cause of the pressure is better.

In this regard, the component 2 dedicated to collaborative governance is even not designed at trying to engage a dialog and improvement process with the groups at the cause of this threat (this component is mainly designed at involving communities in establishing regulation and enforcement in within PA and buffer zone, but not in trying to develop alternatives to the causes of the threats).

The same question will apply to poaching; increase encroachment into wildlife dispersal areas and unsustainable utilization of natural resources within and in adjacent lands of the PA. For the unsustainable use of natural resources, no technical and economical assessment proves that “joint natural resource management system” will not increase cost of verification and lower profitability for local stakeholders. Such an assessment is considered necessary to support this part of the project.

Without necessarily advocating to go back to Integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs), the project would be strengthened if additional funding was invested by the national agency in charge of rural development to assist this project in supporting adapted alternatives to the causes of the main threats identified by this project. If the Government of Botswana is ready to invest 4,695 M \$ for conservation in co-financing of this project, it could be explored whether GoB could try to mainstream and coordinate rural development actions in this area to develop a more comprehensive strategy of biodiversity conservation.

Mainstreaming biodiversity in all sectors is repeatedly called for in international arenas, but to date mostly remains a concept. This project is an opportunity to translate the concept into action.

Management Plan of 2008, at least 20% of CNP is burnt annual and the fires tend to be most prevalent in the north eastern part of the park. Records from DFRR indicate an average burnt area of $7\,714 \pm 1\,574 \text{ km}^2$ with the extent of fires depicting an increase trend between years 2007 and 2011. Close to 98% of fires in the CNP originate outside the park, specifically from FRs, around human settlements and along the international boundary in the Kwando-Linyanti area (Chobe National Park Management Plan 2008). Traditionally, fires can be lit after harvesting to ‘improve or encourage’ grass growth for the next season. According to DFRR (Kasane Office), anecdotal evidence indicates a strong relationship between the outbreak and origin of fires with times of grass harvesting, specifically in the Sibuyu Forest Reserve area (south of Pandamatenga village). However, as there has been no systematic assessment of the causes/origin of fire, it is not clear whether these fires are a deliberate action by the grass harvesters or accidental escape from their campfires. Therefore, the root cause and source of fires in the CKL area can only be speculative. Consistent with Chobe National Park Management Plan of 2008 and based on the fact that majority of fires (>95%) occur during the dry cool season when lighting ignited fires are highly improbable, these fires are mainly attributed to anthropogenic sources. Because of the dry and rapidly growing fuel load due to higher amounts of rainfall, commonly these fires are difficult to manage and/or control leading to extensive burning of the CKL every year.

This is an accurate comment. In developing the ProDoc we are aware of how much time, money and effort has been devoted to integrating planning, and how ineffective this has often been. This is why we have proposed an innovative approach that relies as much on process as on product, an links experiential capacity-building and training of stakeholders to analyze problems (e.g. the nature of the Chobe economy, ecological change and limits of acceptable change), with technical support and integrated management systems that – importantly – use clearly defined indicators as control points.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁷

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

N/A

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 90,910			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Project Preparation*	90,910	81,310.82	9,599.18
Total	90,910	81,310.82	9,599.18

*Project preparation here refers to activities as defined in the PID document.

⁷ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.