



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4544		
Country/Region:	Botswana		
Project Title:	Improved Management Effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of Protected Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,818,182
Co-financing:	\$5,695,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,513,182
PIF Approval:	July 20, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Alice Ruhweza

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	6-09-11 Yes. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	6-09-11 Yes. Yes there is a LoE from the OFP for \$2.1 million dated April 20, 2011 Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	6-09-11 Yes. Information in item C1 and C2 of PIF (p.10) Cleared	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	6-09-11 Yes. As stated in the PIF "Interventions proposed under this project are in line with the UNDAF for Botswana for the period 2010-2016".	

Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	6-09-11 This project is using 100% of the BD allocation. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	6-09-11 This project is using 100% of the BD allocation. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	6-09-11 Yes. With Objective 1 of the BD Strategy. Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	6-09-11 Yes. With Objective 1 of the BD Strategy. Cleared	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	6-09-11 Yes. Top priority at the national prioritization workshop for GEF 5 (held in Dec 2010 in Gaborone), in line with the 2007 Department of Wildlife and National Parks Strategic Plan, directly contributes to the Chobe District Development Plan 7, support the Chobe District Development Plan and the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) strategic plan. Cleared	

	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>6-09-11</p> <p>The issue of sustainability is central to this project. Although this is mentioned in a few places across the document, the PIF would greatly benefit from a separate paragraph on "Institutional and Financial Sustainability" under item B.3 (p.8). In this paragraph, all relevant elements on sustainability (including the "Business Plan") should come together to better understand how this project is contributing to the institutional and financial sustainability of the project. In</p> <p>Please clarify the link between the Business Plan and the outcome of reducing the funding gap for protected areas. What other elements need to be put in place to ensure that this "Business Plan" results in reducing the financial gap. As currently stated, there is a disconnect.</p> <p>7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	<p>11. Is the description of the baseline project/ scenario – what is happening in the project area without GEF project – reliable?</p>	<p>The Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti matrix of PAs has a baseline investment of \$2 million/year for anti-poaching, Problem Animal Control, Chobe National Park facilities and limited research on wildlife ecology and behavior. This baseline does not address the threats inside- (i. tourism above carrying capacity, inaccessible parts to set up infrastructure for surveillance, fire control and monitoring), and outside-PA buffer zones (i.e. encroachment, overutilization of veldt products. and</p>	

		7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	12. If GEF does not provide funding, is the rest of the project funded by other partners viable?	7-19-11 No. GEF funding is critical to cover the incremental costs to address threats inside and outside the PAs. Cleared	
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	6-09-11  No. As stated under 13, because the baseline is not clear, the incremental activities are difficult to understand. While there are plenty of activities listed in the PIF, the correspondence with threats and barriers is hard to make.  7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	6-09-11  Please address the following issues:  1. Please clearly state the proposed activities, outputs and outcomes for both components. While it is clear that the project aims at strengthening the core PA functions and threat removal (in and outside of the project area), the current results framework does not allow visualizing how these two components will be tackled. Perhaps a shorter and more to the point results framework could help understand at a glance what this project wants to do and how. The rest of the information can go to the	

		<p>2. Threats are mentioned and discussed through the PIF. This makes difficult to understand the threats that this project is concentrating on, and the proposed activities to deal with them. For instance, there is no good correspondence among the set of threats in the Baseline project (p.5-7) and Incremental and associated GEB (p.8).</p> <p>3. Tourism is mention both as an opportunity and as a threat. It is not clear what side tourism is, and if the actions proposed for the project are to increase, reduce or regulate tourism in the region.</p> <p>7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>6-15-11 There is no reference to the GEBs. Under item B.2 (p.7) there is a description of the Components, but no mention of the actual GEBs to be derived from the project.</p> <p>7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>6-15-11 The section on socio-economic benefits does not tackle the issues mentioned under the Baseline Project (Box p.7). Please clearly state (enumerate) the benefits and link them to the proposed set of activities.</p>	

		7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	6-16-11 Local communities are mentioned in regard to co- management frameworks, participatory PA planning, training. Cleared	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	6-16-11  The following risks was not addressed:  1. Zoning, integrated land use planning and participatory PA planning are not implemented and enforced. These tools for threat removal and collaborative governance appear to be based on voluntary measures and "self-policing". What are the risks associated with using these measures and how can the project mitigate these risks?  7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	6-16-11 While there is reference to ongoing GEF projects in the region, it is difficult to see if there complementarily and/or duplication of efforts. Please clarify.  7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	6-15-11 Yes. Described under B5. (p.9).	

	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	6-15-11 Management cost is 8.25%. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	6-15-11 The funding for the components appears to be very low. Does the project need to cover the entire Matrix of PAs? Are there areas where investments can be concentrated to increase the impact?  7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	6-15-11 The co-financing is \$5.445 million from the Government of Botswana (baseline), the GEF Agency (\$250,000) and the private sector (\$500,000). Please clarify the role of the investments of the private sector.  7-19-11 Addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	6-09-11 UNDP is providing \$250K towards component 2. Details provided on p.10.	

Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>6-16-11 No. Please address issues under items 11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,20,21,23,28,29 and 30.</p> <p>Overall: i) The project appears to be overambitious considering area, time and funding, ii) The threats and barriers are not clearly stated and are not always consistent across the text. This makes difficult to see how the proposed activities, outputs and outcomes would render the overall objective of the project and components.</p> <p>7-19-11 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG		



	commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 16, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 19, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	6-16-11 Please review list of activities based on review of PIF.  8-19-11 Issues addressed in the revised PPG dated July 18, 2011 Cleared
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	6-16-11 Please review budget allocation based on review of proposed activities in revised PIF and item 1 of PPG review.  8-19-11 Issues addressed in the revised PPG dated July 18, 2011 Cleared
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	6-16-11 No. Please address items above.  8-19-11 Issues addressed in the revised PPG dated July 18, 2011 Cleared
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 16, 2011

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.