



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening the Capacity of the Protected Area System to Address New Management Challenges			
Country(ies):	Namibia	GEF Project ID: ¹	4729
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4623
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment and Tourism – Directorate of Regional Services and Parks Management	Submission Date:	28 August 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Agency Fee (\$):	400,000
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CD3 BD1	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 Indicator 1.2: Funding gap for management of protected area systems as recorded by protected area financing scorecards	1. Terrestrial ecosystem coverage in national protected area system 2. Protected area management effectiveness as measured by tracking tools	GEF TF	4,000,000	14,000,000
Total project costs				4,000,000	14,000,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: The Protected Area system of Namibia is strengthened and sustainably financed through improving current systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanisms; and cost effective enforcement through application of the Enforcement Economics Model						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Improved Current Systems for revenue		Increased PA financing	1.1 The MET's Directorate of Financial	GEF TF	810,000	4,000,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

generation and developing new and innovative mechanisms		<p>opportunities for new PAs covering 33, 530 00 ha and new conservancies covering an area of 30, 837 00 ha, by developing and implementing new and innovative revenue generation mechanisms</p> <p>Protected Area funding gap (currently at US\$ 14 million) reduced by 50 percent due to system wide automation and reconciliation of revenue collection, implementation of revised fee and licensing structure and exploring unexploited revenue opportunities (increase in revenue measured by the Protected Area financing score card)</p>	<p>Administration and Human Resources (DAFHR) is strengthened to effectively address sustainable PAS financing in Namibia.</p> <p>1.2 Automated revenue collection system introduced across the PA system (on a pilot basis) to track, monitor, and reconcile PA fees and PA entrances and exits</p> <p>1.3 Fee and licensing structure revised and diversified (game products) and licensing fee collection system strengthened</p> <p>1.4 Other opportunities explored including bio-prospecting, user fees, ear-marked taxes, corporate donations, voluntary contributions, cause related marketing</p>			
2. Cost Effective enforcement through application of sound Enforcement Economics principles	TA	<p>Effective enforcement in PAs and deterrence of biodiversity-related crimes over a PA estate area of 136,796 km² and an area of 123,347 km² comprising Communal Conservancies.</p>	<p>2.1 A state of the art detection and enforcement system is in place, with a harmonized enforcement chain and a platform for information sharing and intelligence gathering among customs, police, army, parks, communities and wildlife authorities, amongst other</p> <p>2.2 Overall wildlife crime related monitoring systems are improved, and especially, there is a registration system in place for wildlife owned by private persons in the PA system</p> <p>2.3 Game patrols, rangers, community members and other</p>	GEF TF	2,840,000	8,833,000

			<p>relevant staff are trained in sophisticated enforcement approaches and schemes; multifaceted arrangements are made with Interpol, NAMPOL and CITES Permitting and Enforcement Institutions, etc.; staff have the capacity to take effective enforcement actions</p> <p>2.4 Appropriate mechanisms and incentives are set in place to reduce complicity in wildlife crimes, encourage public to report wildlife crimes, and to be disincentives for poaching</p> <p>2.5 Improved legal system and effective prosecution and penalties of wildlife crimes, including those committed by nationals of other countries, is in place</p>			
3. Implementation of Integrated Fire Management	TA	Improved Fire Management Strategies leading to reduced degradation of wildlife habitats.	3.1 Standard Operating Procedures for all the National Parks and Game Reserves based on the Fire Management Strategy developed and implemented	GEF TF	150,000	500,000
Subtotal					3,800,000	13,333,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³					200,000	667,000
Total project costs					4,000,000	14,000,000

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	In kind & cash	14,000,000
Total Co-financing			14,000,000

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

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 TF	Biodiversity	Namibia	4,000,000	400,000	4,400,000
Total Grant Resources				4,000,000	400,000	4,400,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	--	--	--
National/Local Consultants	763,500	--	763,500

G. 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).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**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. NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.**

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. This project is aligned to the second Programme which is dedicated to unlocking the potential of protected areas, including indigenous and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing towards sustainable development

2. Furthermore, several additional new strategies and plans have been developed. The revised NBSAP II (2011-2020), currently under final review, aims to further consolidate the PA network through landscape level conservation and co-management with local communities and stakeholders. This project will directly address several strategic objectives and set targets of the NBSAP II. The project is specifically identified in the strategy as a means to address key areas of the action plan, and clearly contributes to a wide variety of the strategies set out. In particular the project will support the following four targets: *Target 1.3: By 2020, appropriate incentives for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use are in place and applied; Target 3.1: By 2020, protected areas are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems and for the socio-economic benefit of all Namibians; Target 3.2: By 2020, Extinctions of threatened species have been prevented and the conservation status of vulnerable species has been improved and Target 4.3: The knowledge, research and science base relating to biodiversity has been improved, and relevant technologies have been improved, shared and applied.*

3. The new National Development Plan (NDP4) recognises protected areas systems contribution to Namibia's overall economy, and thus this project will directly contribute to the NDP 4 Outcome: *By the year 2017, Namibia is the most competitive economy in the SADC region, according to the standards set by the World Economic*

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

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

4. The project is still aligned with the GEF's Strategic Objective (SO) 1 of the Biodiversity focal area, 'Improve Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems' BD-1. It will specifically contribute to the outcome under BD-1 "Improved Management Effectiveness of Existing and New Protected areas" and outcome 1.2 "Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management"

5. Project contributions to the established GEF Indicators are envisaged as follows

GEF Strategic Program	Expected Outcomes	GEF Indicators	Project Contribution to GEF Indicators
Objective 1: Improved Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	<p>1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.</p> <p>1.2 Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management.</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.2: Funding gap for the management of protected area systems as recorded by protected area financing scorecards.</i></p>	<p>1. Terrestrial ecosystem coverage in national protected area system</p> <p>2. Protected area management effectiveness as measured by tracking tools</p>	<p>1. Management Effectiveness Score for 13 PAs; increased over the baseline score by at least 10%.</p> <p>2. Total government budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management (MTEF Vote 18 MET; Code 1 and Code 2⁵) increased by 30%</p> <p>3. Capacity Development Scorecard increases from a baseline score of 64% by at least 15%</p>

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

In addition to what is already covered in the PIF, the draft United Nations Partnership Assistance Framework (UNPAF): 2014 -2017, the UNDP specific support for this project falls under Programme Component 1 (PC 1), in line with the NDP 4 Institutional Environment DO 1. PC1 focuses on creating enabling conditions, and individual capabilities, synergistically and complementary, with existing national initiatives, for safeguarding Namibia's renewable and non-renewable resources to ensure that Namibia remain and sustain international and regional competitiveness by capitalizing on a nature-based economy. UNDP has a Framework and the project is aligned with it.

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

6. As stated in the PIF, **two primary threats** to biodiversity will be addressed through this project within and around protected areas in Namibia: (1) *Poaching of wildlife for consumptive use and illegal trade*: especially in the North East parks for elephant ivory and rhino horns in the North Western areas; and (2) *Fire outbreaks*: Natural bush fires during the hot season.

⁵ <http://www.mof.na/Downloads/Budget%20Documents/Budget%202013/Medium%20Term%20Expenditure%20Framework%202013-14%20to%202015-16%20-With%20Covers-.pdf>

Baseline

7. As indicated in the PIF, over the last ten years the Government of Namibia has established an impressive system of state-managed protected areas, comprising game parks, nature reserve sites and tourism recreation areas. The Government has created a number of legal and institutional prerequisites for increasing the financial sustainability of the PA system, which serve a positive baseline for the project. These include the sustainable financing plan for the protected area system of February 2010 which contains a PA financing part (*Details are elaborated in the PIF*). The budget for the funding of the whole PA system is approved on an annual basis by the Government; and there are standards for PA fees collection and provision for PAs to retain income from concessions and tourism activities.

8. Various economic tools and approaches are currently being investigated in Namibia, including PES, looking into options to leverage innovative funding sources of Conservancies. Long-term and large-scale support to Namibia's Conservancies and the CBNRM programme e.g. by national and international NGOs and donors (e.g. WWF, GIZ, MCA) is underway and being systematically pursued.

9. Legislation on bio-prospecting has been put into place in Namibia, and an Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) mechanism is being set up. The negotiations of the legal contexts are mostly vested within the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA) – or – under the new structure the National Environmental Commission (NEC), whilst the practical permitting responsibilities will lie with other MET entities, i.e. DRSPM. Research and monitoring of resources, quota setting for extractive utilization, are all areas that need to be further developed with relevant partners, including the MAWF, UNAM and others. Overall, a role clarification amongst the various MET entities and the wider range of stakeholders will be facilitated under this output.

10. Biotrade is being developed as a new opportunity in Namibia, and several baseline projects will support the biotrade sector (projects implemented by CRIAA SA-DC with support from GIZ and others include marula, kalahari melon seeds, nara, xemenia and overall biotrade development in Namibia). If and where linkages to this project should be made, needs to be established through a consultative and coordinating platform, which may be linked to the think tank indicated under output 1.1 of component 1.

The desired scenario and barriers to achieving it

11. The current financing plan for the PA system, though impressive, is not adequate to address the aforementioned new management challenges. One of the main reasons for this is that the protected area estate has recently expanded by an additional 33,530 sq. km with the gazetting of the *Sperrgebiet*, *Mangetti* and *Dorob* National Parks covering 22,000 km², 420 km² and 8 118km² respectively in 2008 and 2010. There has not been, however, a corresponding increase in PA financing to manage these new areas. The network of Communal Conservancies on communal lands has also expanded by an additional 30,837 sq. km with more than 79 new conservancies registered to date. However, the conservancies are not realising their full financial potential. Most conservancies are generating income from extractive consumption such as trophy hunting and game meat, but they have not been able to access other available revenue opportunities. It is important to support them to diversify the revenue generating mechanisms by raising awareness of other revenue generating options and assisting them to access them. Further investment in the protected area system is therefore, critical to address these new challenges and ensure sustainability of the entire PA estate and conservation of the globally significant biodiversity within them.

Project design (Objective, Outcome, Outputs and Activities)

12. 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 budget total; however, allocation of budgets across outcomes has been modified extensively. Based on the outcomes of the PPG phase, it was clearly identified that components 1 and 2 of this proposal are of such immediate importance to Namibia's PAS sustainability, that component 3 will follow-up mainly on focused PPG phase activities, and other important elements will be developed as stand-alone project proposals to other donors. It was intended to leverage such co-financing for this specific component during the PPG phase. However, this did not materialise at this point.

13. **The project objective is to ensure that the Protected Area system of Namibia is strengthened and financed sustainably through improving current systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanisms; and cost effective enforcement through application of the Enforcement Economics Model.**

14. The project is expected to attain the following outcomes at objective level:

- **Outcome 1:** Increased PA financing opportunities for new PAs covering 33,530 ha and new conservancies covering an area of 30,837 ha, by developing and implementing new and innovative revenue generation mechanisms
- **Outcome 2:** Effective enforcement in PAs and deterrence of biodiversity-related crimes over a PA estate area of 136,796 km² and an area of 123,347 km² comprising Communal Conservancies.
- **Outcome 3:** Improved Fire Management Strategies leading to reduced degradation of wildlife habitats.

15. The Project Components as outlined in the PIF have been maintained, although the expected outputs of the components have been revised.

16. Component 1 is still in line with the PIF Component 1: **(Improved Current Systems for revenue generation and developing new and innovative mechanisms)** – although it has a new output 1.1 which focuses on supporting the set up and operationalisation of a dedicated *Protected Areas Finance Planning Unit*. The unit is a result of a recent comprehensive restructuring of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) that established a new Directorate of Administration, Finance and Human Resource (DAFHR), with a clear mandate of developing financing mechanisms for PAs and responsibility of strategic revenue generation mechanism in place.

17. Component 2 is still in line with the PIF Component 2: **(Cost Effective enforcement through application of sound Enforcement Economics principles)** and it is enriched by the findings from the detailed review and analysis of the enforcement chain in Namibia carried out during the PPG phase. The review identified six distinct and critical performance areas (*see table 13 in the project document*). The entire component is focussed on addressing these weaknesses.

18. Component 3 is still in line with the PIF Component 3: **(Implementation of an Integrated Fire Management Strategy)** and it is enriched by preliminary work already underway by the MET to develop a an Integrated Fire Management Strategy for select PAs. This component will support rolling out and implementation of the current of the strategy and replication in other PAs.

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:

Rationale and summary of GEF Alternative

19. The GEF co-financing will - at a critical time - contribute to help the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) to position itself to address three key areas of protected areas management. First, after the recent restructuring, the GEF support will operationalise the newly established Protected Areas Financing Unit in the MET. This unit will be supported in terms of capacity development and strategic guidance to implement the protected areas financing strategy. A variety of funding sources will be explored by the dedicated unit,. This will include the establishment of an automated revenue collection system in parks, using Etosha National park as a pilot, as well as the improvement of currently quite archaic collection systems in other parks.

20. Secondly, GEF resources will be injected to create an immediate response to the escalating poaching threat of key species in north-eastern and north-western Namibia. A preliminary analysis of the enforcement chain in Namibia, revolving around wildlife crime, identified specific weaknesses that this project aims to address. Investments into a better intelligence and surveillance system will be made, as well as the enforcement capacity of MET, NAMPOL and other strategic partners will be strengthened. Innovative incentive measures for the public to help curb wildlife crime will be implemented, including t a targeted “pride and shame” campaign elevating those who help prevent wildlife crimes and shaming those that become wildlife crime perpetrators. Special support interventions will focus on the

judiciary, which needs to be better informed about the seriousness of the crimes committed to ensure that effective prosecution of wildlife crimes will take place.

21. Last but not least, GEF resources will support the MET to develop and implement an Integrated Fire Management Strategy and actions plans for each protected area in Namibia.

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:

22. The identification of risks was initiated at a very early stage of project development. The main risks, risk rankings and mitigation measures are presented below as outlined in the PIF.

RISK	RATING	RISK MITIGATION MEASURE
High competition for revenue from other sectors and even within environment sector	Medium	Stakeholder and policy level lobbying are an integral part of this project design.
Rhino poaching may spiral out of control, spilling over faster than anticipated, as well as the elephant poaching in the Northeast BMM Complex resulting in a reduction of budget allocations to PA management and a refocussing of all resources to anti-poaching activities	High	The project will prevent this by allocating resources specifically to improving the capacity of law enforcement agencies in dealing with wildlife crime. Furthermore, the relationship between law enforcement agencies will be enhanced. Other sustainable financing mechanisms for PA and conservancies will be identified and strengthened.
Enforcement continues to be ineffective	High	Criminals involved in wildlife crime are constantly changing methods to outwit law enforcement agents. However, the more effective the law enforcement becomes, the more sophisticated criminals are likely to become.
The Parks and Wildlife Management Bill not being enacted.	Low	MET Senior Management has endorsed the Bill and it is currently with the State Attorneys for review and comments. Regulations for the bill are under development.
Decline in tourism	Low	Namibia is seeking to increase regional and national tourism and diversifying the market by focusing on new opportunities in East Asia and Latin America. The country is preparing to host the 2013 Adventure World Travel Summit, which could bring in as much as US\$18.3 million for the hosts and ensure positive impacts on tourism in the long run. ⁶

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

23. In addition to what was described in the PIF, on-going projects that have bearing on this initiative include; Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (NAMPLACE) which is aimed at establishing protected landscape conservation areas and ensuring that land uses in areas adjacent to existing protected areas are compatible with biodiversity objectives, and corridors are established to sustain the viability of wildlife populations.

24. The project will link to the NAFOLA project (currently under development) which will be implemented in adjacent areas in North-eastern Namibia. Whilst NAFOLA has a strong focus on community-forestry, it is envisaged that co-benefits in terms of incentive measures for local communities to engage in activities relating to the enforcement chain will be leveraged. Similarly the GEF financed NACOMA follow-up project implemented via the World Bank will create such co-benefits in the North-western area of this project, i.e. in Kunene and Erongo regions.

25. The project will build on the just ended US-led Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) and the EU-supported Rural Poverty Reduction Programme (RPRP). The MCA programme focused on increasing tourism growth and dividends, while the RPRP provided decentralised demand-driven support for rural livelihoods. Furthermore there is ongoing support to protected areas from the German Development Bank (KfW), specifically aimed at infrastructure development.

⁶<http://www.newera.com.na/article.php?articleid=41198&title=Namibia%20bids%20to%20host%20Adventure%20World%20Travel%20Summit>

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

26. The newly established Directorate of Regional Services and Parks Management (DRSPM) within the Ministry of Environment and Tourism will be responsible for different aspects of the project development process. The Ministry will work in close cooperation with other institutions, including the Ministry of Safety and Security, Ministry of Finance, Namibia Tourism Board as well as several NGOs and private sector investors. The Table below describes the major categories of stakeholders and their level of involvement in the project.

Key stakeholders and roles and responsibilities in the project

Key stakeholders	Roles and responsibilities in project implementation.
National Governmental	
<i>Ministry of Environment and Tourism</i>	<p>MET (through the Directorate of Regional Services and Park Management) will have overall responsibility for the implementation of the project. MET will ensure that the policy, institutional, legislative and budget reforms are in place to support the implementation of project activities. It will facilitate the operational functioning of DAFHR (Directorate of Financial Administration and Human Resources) as a Protected Area Finance Planning Unit. Supported by its departments such as the DoT, DEA, DAFHR, the MET will ensure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff restructuring and devolved authority to do the job • Increase revenue from Parks which return to, and benefit the PA system, piloted in ENP • Recruit and train Accountants / Clerks under DAFHR • Create linkage between park gate, station office and headquarters. • Training on law enforcement • Permits for park entrances
<i>Ministry of Finance</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the system to the targeted and pilot sites • Improve projections of revenue • Integrated automated revenue system collection established ENP • Piloted automated revenue system collection at all project sites • Involvement in the 4 targeted Regional Service offices
<i>Ministry of Trade and Industry</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and reporting illegal wildlife trade
<i>Ministry of Safety and Social Security</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prosecution of wildlife crimes • Improve coordination with other law enforcement agencies on biodiversity-related crimes • Training of staff members on legal frameworks & procedures in collaboration with MET
<i>Ministry of Defence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoD will support the project in the selection of prospective ex-combatants who have previously received park ranger training, and who could be appointed as patrols/rangers etc. in protected areas.
<i>Ministry of Lands and Resettlement</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use endorsement • Incentives to secure land for indigenous biodiversity
<i>Ministry of Justice</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the regulatory framework for fines and licensing fees (PA and Wildlife Management Act, enacted)
International	
<i>CITES</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tighten regulations on wildlife movement (rhino species)
<i>TRAFFIC</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network to strengthen wildlife trade monitoring system
Parastatals /Tourism bodies	
<i>Namibia Tourism Board</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting good standards of tourism facilities and services in PAs • Using the PAs as key promotional material for marketing Namibia

<i>Namibia Wildlife Resorts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having efficient and well managed parks for guests to enjoy • Having good working relations and effective systems for collaboration and partnership with park management e.g. automated revenue system in place
Regional and local level, Tertiary and investors	
<i>Regional Councils</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilise local people to engage in this project
<i>Traditional Authorities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate communication between the project and the communities at a village level, and will act as a mediator for conflicts that may arise. • Have levels of influence, and thus are important partners to keep informed, discuss new developments, etc. – particularly park-neighbour arrangements
<i>Local communities</i>	<p>The project will liaise, involve and/or consult with natural resource user groups in project implementation through e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement in capacity building programs on fire management • Promotion of cultural tourism initiatives e.g. CBNRM • Expect particular attention to be paid to eliminating or mitigating conflict areas between PAs and farmers, including conflicts caused by wildlife (predators, elephants, strengthening law enforcement, etc.
<i>Academic and research institutions</i>	<p>The project will collaborate with local and academic research institutions in the implementation of project activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closer partnership, to help focus researchers to address park priority needs – as well as capacity building through staff undertaking studies
<i>Private investors /farms with wildlife custodian</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project will liaise, involve and/or consult with adjacent park neighbours/farms. • Investors will also be engaged in PA financing opportunities • Opportunity for business ventures, which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism accommodation facilities - Tourism services - Related services - Trophy and sport hunting - Private nature reserves
Funders and NGOs	
<i>Donor agencies and private companies</i>	<p>The donor agencies and private companies financing protected area activities in Namibia (e.g. WWF) are important project partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They will share, coordinate and collaborate with the project and make linkages with their activities where possible e.g. WWF on Law enforcement
<i>NGOs and CBOs</i>	<p>NGOs and CBOs, most notably the NACSO, IRDNC, SRT are important project partners. They will share, coordinate and collaborate with the project as and where relevant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deal with the monitoring of wildlife in their respective areas of work • Parks create incentives and optimal opportunities for neighbouring conservancies (tourism, wildlife, trophy-hunting, marketing of craft, spin-off small enterprises, etc.) • That conservancies contribute significantly to wildlife and biodiversity conservation, particularly where parks are under-represented • That conservancies provide linkages and genetic corridors, and thus enhance environmental resilience, particularly in the face of climate change • That parks provide strong partnerships for local development, empowerment of communities, capacity-building and joint initiatives such as law-enforcement, monitoring and so forth,
<i>Environmental Investment Fund (EIF)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate donations and voluntary contributions
Media	
<i>Newspapers, NBC</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public awareness on fines, licensing, and conservation legal frameworks • Publicise success stories

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):

27. The main direct use values associated with the protected area system are derived from tourism activities. Tourists visiting protected areas spend money both within and outside them. This generates value added in the tourism industry, and further value added for the Namibian economy as a whole through linkage and multiplier effects. Some 20% of this income accrues to low-income segments of the population through wages, through returns to enterprises, and through rentals and royalties. With further investment in the PA system, the benefits to communities will increase. Important infrastructure developments benefiting locals and visitors alike will be developed. For instance, through backward linkages, wholesale and retail businesses will be established near protected areas to offer various goods to the tourist industry. Tarred roads and other communication facilities will be developed in partly to facilitate tourism development. Last but not least, communities/conservancies will be further rewarded for stewardship of wildlife resources.

28. Investing into the improvements of the enforcement chain will generate and secure already established socio-economic benefits that nearly 30% of Namibia's rural population gain from conservancies and conservation. Poaching has a very strong negative impact on local incomes and a negative image, but also the loss of hunting species and tourism attractions will most certainly be felt by these people – as well as the economy per se.

29. The project will mainstream gender into all its components, especially when designing the “pride and shame” campaign gender specific value systems and emotional responses will be capitalized on to establish a strong value based incentive systems towards a pro-conservation society with wildlife crime reporting becoming a honourable thing to do, for example. In terms of capacity support at Ministerial and generally institutional level, gender components should be considered.

30. Especially when dealing with field staff based in remote areas, MET will also specifically consider existing in-house HIV/AIDS policies and strategies, and may update these based on the specific staffing arrangements that will be pursued.

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

31. The project will build on a suite of previous efforts of the MET to strengthen its management capacity of PAS and investing into partnerships with conservancies in scaling up the national conservation efforts. This project will specifically build on previously implemented UNDP-GEF work such as the Strengthening of the Protected Areas Network (SPAN) project, and the currently ongoing NAM-PLACE portfolio. It additionally capitalises on World Bank-GEF supported *Namibia Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management (ICEMA) Project*, which has just ended, started the process of helping conservancies to be financially sustainable by building capacities of management teams, and developing business plans. However, the project did not support all conservancies, and new ones have been established since. This project will support the new conservancies to develop business plans and access opportunities for financing available through deal flow facilitation. Overall a strong baseline from Government programmes and donor supported projects is in place.

32. The Government of Namibia has a track record of piloting approaches, which subsequently are integrated into ongoing strategies of government and private sector, including NGOs. The strategic and catalytic approach to programming this specific project is thus seen to be highly cost effective and sustainable in the long run.

33. The design of this intervention is focusing on strengthening key institutions such as MET, Nampol, Customs and the Judiciary, amongst others, to increase their capacity to address key conservation threats in Namibia. Targeted investments that help set up sustainable technical systems are supported by specific investments into sustainable PAS finance planning. This is seen to be a particularly strong cost effectiveness aspect.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

34. This project is being developed in line with the GEF and UNDP guidance on M&E. The GEF standard Tracking tools (METT, capacity and financial score cards) have been applied and form the basis for the overall Strategic Results Framework (SRF), which lays the foundation for the project M&E. The SRF is included in Annex A of this CEO Endorsement.

35. A detailed budgeted M&E workplan is presented below, with critical milestones being the inception workshop and

report, annual project reports (ARP and PIRs), tripartite assessments as well as the mid-term and terminal evaluations.

M& E work plan and budget

Type of M & E activity	Responsible parties	Budget USD Excluding Project team staff time	Time frame
Inception workshop	Project Manager UNDP CO UNDP GEF	10 000	Within first two months of project start-up
Inception report	Project Team UNDP CO	None	Immediately after the inception workshop
Measurement of Means of verification for Project Purpose Indicators	Project manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members	To be finalized in inception phase	Start, mid and end of Project
Measurement of Means of verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	Oversight by Project manager Monitoring and Evaluation Officer Project Team	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan preparation	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR and PIR	Project Team UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF	None	Annually
Quarterly progress reports	Project Team	None	Quarterly
CDRs	Project Manager	None	Quarterly
Issues Log	Project Manager UNDP CO-Programme staff	None	Quarterly
Risks Log	Project Manager UNDP CO-Programme staff	None	Quarterly
Lessons Learnt Log	Project Manager UNDP CO-Programme staff	None	Quarterly
Mid-term evaluation	Project Team UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit External consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	40 000	At the mid-point Project implementation
Final Evaluation	Project Team UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit External consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	50 000	At the end of the Project implementation
Terminal Report	Project Team UNDP-Co Local consultant	Funds are budgeted for local consultants to assist where needed	At least a month before end of Project
Lessons Learnt	Project Team UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit	0	Yearly

	External consultants (i.e. evaluation team)		
Audit	UNDP-CO Project Team	4000 per annum	Yearly
Visits to field sites	UNDP Country office UNDP-GEF regional Coordinating Unit (as appropriate) Government representatives	Paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST		US\$ 104,000	
<i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>			

***Note:** Costs included in this table are part and parcel of the UNDP Total Budget and Work Plan and not additional to it.


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)
Teofilus Nghitila	Environmental Commissioner	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM	

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
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		August 28, 2013	Alice Ruhweza, RTA, EBD	+251 934 967015	alice.ruhweza@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

PART I: Strategic Results Framework, SRF (formerly GEF Logical Framework) Analysis

Indicator framework as part of the SRF

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:</p> <p>UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: National and local governments and communities have the capacities to adapt to climate change and make inclusive and sustainable environment & energy decisions addressing brown & green environmental issues, thereby increasing competitiveness and providing greater certainty to private sector</p> <p>UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: National and local governments and communities have the capacities to adapt to climate change and make inclusive and sustainable environment & energy decisions benefitting in particular under-served populations.</p>
<p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</p> <p>N/a – still draft</p>
<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): Catalyzing environmental finance</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: BD-1, SO1 ‘Improve Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems’</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</p> <p>Outcome 1.1. “Improved Management Effectiveness of Existing and New Protected areas”</p> <p>Outcome 1.2 “Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management”</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</p> <p>1. Terrestrial ecosystem coverage in national protected area system</p> <p>2. Protected area management effectiveness as measured by tracking tools</p>

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target at mid-term	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Objective – To Strengthen and sustainably finance the PAS through improved current systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanisms; and cost effective enforcement through application of the Enforcement	1.Total government budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management (MTEF Vote 18 MET; Code 1 and Code 2 ⁷)	NAD 129,625 Mio(US\$ ⁸ 13,645 Mio) CODE 2: Natural Resources Management: NAD 53,370 Mio (US\$ 5,618 Mio) (as at 2013 MTEF)	18% increase	30% increase	Financial reports of MET	Assumptions: – MET successfully implemented the draft PAS sustainable financing strategy – MOF agrees that revenues from protected areas are reinvested in the protected area system Risks: – The government assigns less priority and limited financial support for
	2. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 72% Institutional: 59%	Systemic: 77% Institutional:	Systemic: 80% Institutional:	Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	

⁷ <http://www.mof.na/Downloads/Budget%20Documents/Budget%202013/Medium%20Term%20Expenditure%20Framework%202013-14%20to%202015-16%20-With%20Covers-.pdf>

⁸ 1 US\$ = NDA 9.5

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target at mid-term	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Economics Model		Individual: 56%	69%	74%		sustainable PAS financing and management development
			Individual: 71%	Individual: 71%		
	4. Improvement of METT score at intervention PAS	Waterberg Plateau Park - 73 Bwabwata East - 71 Bwabwata West - 71 Bwabwata National Park - 71 (aggregate score for the two management areas) Khaudum National Park – 59 Nkasa Rupara (Formerly Mamili NP) - 62 Mangetti National Park – 51 Mudumu National Park - 75 Etosha West - 50 Etosha Central - 55 Etosha East - 52 Etosha National Park - 52.3 (aggregate score for the three management areas based on the new structure)	2%	10%	Regular METT assessments	
Component 1 –	Output 1.1.: The MET's Directorate of Financial Administration and Human Resources (DAFHR) is strengthened to effectively address sustainable PAS financing in Namibia Output 1.2: Implementation of automated revenue collection system across the entire PA system and reconciliation of fees and PA entrances and exits. Output 1.3: Fee and licensing structure revised and diversified and licensing fee collection strengthened Output 1.4: Other opportunities explored including bio-prospecting, user fees, ear marked taxes, corporate donations, voluntary contributions, cause related marketing					
Improving Systems for Revenue Generation and Implementing New and Innovative Revenue Generation Mechanisms	Annual allocations for MET/DRSPM from national budget: (1) operational budget (OP) (salaries, maintenance, fuel etc) (2) infrastructure investment budget (IIB) (roads, visitor centres etc) 36.	In 2013: - OP NAD 145,691,000 - IIB NAD 50,000,000	Increase by 5 %	Increase by 20%	MTE, annual financial reports MET	Risk: High inflation rates may need to be factored into the targets set Assumption: -At mid-term it will be difficult to measure the budget increase, as the new MTE will not be in place

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target at mid-term	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	Increase of revenue from park entry fees collections ⁹	Revenue collected at in 2013 ¹⁰ : (1) Northwest - Etosha National Park, Skeleton Coast and Dorob National Park = TBD (2) Greater Waterberg Complex = TBD (3) Northeast (BMM Complex) – Bwabwata, Mudumu, Mamili & Khaudum = TBD	Increase by 5 %	Increase by 15%	annual financial reports MET	- effective reporting systems are being implemented by MET - Political willingness to invest into the implementation of the sustainable financing plan is guaranteed
	Level of additional revenue from diversified sources incl. -Voluntary Payments/Corporate Contributions -Automated revenue collection systems -Restructuring the licensing system to capture hitherto unexploited sources -Cost Effective Enforcement Savings -New concessions/Royalties -Opportunities for New Conservancies	Not currently systematically incorporated into official PAS financing	Increase of 10% of “old” sources	Doubling of resources (100% increase)	annual financial reports MET	
Component 2 – Cost Effective Enforcement through Testing and Implementing Principles of Enforcement Economics	Output 2.1: A state of the art detection and enforcement system is in place, with a harmonized enforcement chain and a platform for information sharing and intelligence gathering among customs, police, army, parks, communities and wildlife authorities, amongst other Output 2.2: Overall wildlife crime related monitoring systems are improved, and especially, there is a registration system in place for wildlife owned by private persons in the PA system Output 2.3: Game patrols, rangers, community members and other relevant staff are trained in sophisticated enforcement approaches and schemes; multifaceted arrangements are made with Interpol, NAMPOL and CITES Permitting and Enforcement Institutions, etc.; staff have the capacity to take effective enforcement actions Ouput 2.4: Appropriate mechanisms and incentives are set in place to reduce complicity in wildlife crimes, encourage public to report wildlife crimes, and to be disincentives for poaching Output 2.5: Improved legal system and effective prosecution and penalties of wildlife crimes, including those committed by nationals of other countries, is in place					
	(4) 4. Improvement of METT score at intervention PAS	Waterberg Plateau Park - 73 Bwabwata East - 71	2%	10%	Through annual MET reports; Regular METT	Assumptions: - MET is investing in

⁹ This indicator may measure different aspects such as an improved recording system, improved governance, and an increase number of visitors, which must be triangulated with visitor recordings e.g. from NWR

¹⁰ Baseline to be determined from 2013 incomes at project onset

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target at mid-term	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
		Bwabwata West - 71 Bwabwata National Park - 71 (aggregate score for the two management areas) Khaudum National Park – 59 Nkasa Rupara (Formerly Mamili NP) - 62 Mangetti National Park – 51 Mudumu National Park - 75 Etosha West - 50 Etosha Central - 55 Etosha East - 52 Etosha National Park - 52.3 (aggregate score for the three management areas based on the new structure)			assessments	<p>adopting the METT as a performance indicator included in its annual plans – if not specific assessments must be undertaken prior to MTE and TE</p> <p>- The interpretation of the indicators will be weighted up against a decline of the poaching threat due to effective improvements of the enforcement chain versus an increased detection and reporting of cases due to improved capacities of enforcement</p>
	5. Numbers of key species poached	In 2012 xxx reported cases of key species poaching ¹¹ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elephants: 78 • Black rhino: 1 • Black faced impala: not known • White rhino: not known • Other: not known 	Reduction of annual rate by 20%	Reduction of annual rate by 50%	MET reports	
	6. Amount of wildlife products confiscated ¹²	In 2012 xxx tonnes of xxx confiscated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ivory: 106 • Cheetah skins: not known 	Reduction by 20%	Reduction by 40%	MET reports, with inputs from Nampol & customs	
	7. Illegal border crossings of protected species recorded ¹³	In 2012 xxx cases of xxx illegal border crossings of protected species recorded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • White Rhino: not known • Black impala: not known • Other: not known: • 	Reduction of 20%	Reduction by 40%	MET reports, with inputs from Nampol & customs	

¹¹ During the inception phase of the project clear baselines will have to be established for indicators 5 to 7, where possible.

¹² This indicator may need to be further examined. Whilst the aim is to reduce poaching as reflected in wildlife products confiscated, investments into the enforcement chain may lead to a better detection rate which would increase the figures.

¹³ Ibid – a similar problem detecting a decrease in cases versus an increase of enforcement effectiveness must be disentangled

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target at mid-term	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Component 3 –	Output 3.1: Standard Operating Procedures for all the National Parks and Game Reserves based on the Fire Management Strategy developed					
Implementation of the Integrated Fire Management Strategy	8. Number of hectares under improved integrated fire management	SOPs are currently not in place	30% of Namibia's PAs (40,771 ha)	100% of Namibia's PAs (135,906 ha)	MET reports	Assumption: - MET has additional resources for SOP implementation

List of Outputs per Outcome as part of the SRF

Project's Development Goal:		
Project Objective: – To Strengthen and sustainably finance the PAS through improved current systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanisms; and cost effective enforcement through application of the Enforcement Economics Model		
Component1: Improving Systems for Revenue Generation and Implementing New and Innovative Revenue Generation Mechanisms	Outcomes	Outputs
	1. Increased PA financing opportunities for new PAs covering 33,530 km ² and new Communal conservancies covering an area of 30,837 km ² , by developing and implementing new and innovative revenue generation mechanisms. 2. Protected Area funding gap reduced by 50 percent due to systemwide automation and reconciliation of revenue collection, implementation of revised fee and licensing structure and exploring unexploited revenue opportunities	<i>1.1 The MET's Directorate of Financial Administration and Human Resources (DAFHR) is strengthened to effectively address sustainable PAS financing in Namibia</i>
		<i>1.2 Automated revenue collection system introduced across the PA system (on a pilot basis) to track, monitor, and reconcile PA fees and PA entrances and exits</i>
		<i>1.3 Fee and licensing structure revised and diversified (game products) and licensing fee collection system strengthened</i>
		<i>1.4 Other opportunities explored including bio-prospecting, user fees, ear-marked taxes, corporate donations, voluntary contributions, cause related marketing</i>
Component 2 – Cost Effective Enforcement through Testing and Implementing Principles of Enforcement	2. Effective enforcement in PAs and deterrence of biodiversity-related crimes over a PA estate area of 136,796 km ² and an area of 123,347 km ² comprising Communal Conservancies.	<i>2.1 A state of the art detection and enforcement system is in place, with a harmonized enforcement chain and a platform for information sharing and intelligence gathering among customs, police, army, parks, communities and wildlife authorities, amongst other</i>
		<i>2.2 Overall wildlife crime related monitoring systems are improved, and especially, there is a registration system in place for wildlife owned by private persons in the PA systems</i>

Economics		<i>2.3 Game patrols, rangers, community members and other relevant staff are trained in sophisticated enforcement approaches and schemes; multifaceted arrangements are made with Interpol, NAMPOL and CITES Permitting and Enforcement Institutions, etc.; staff have the capacity to take effective enforcement actions</i>
		<i>2.4 Appropriate mechanisms and incentives are set in place to reduce complicity in wildlife crimes, encourage public to report wildlife crimes, and to be disincentives for poaching</i>
		<i>2.5 Improved legal system and effective prosecution and penalties of wildlife crimes, including those committed by nationals of other countries, is in place</i>
Component 3 – Implementation of the Integrated Fire Management Strategy	3. Improved Fire Management Strategies leading to reduced degradation of wildlife habitats.	<i>3.1 Standard Operating Procedures for all the National Parks and Game Reserves based on the Fire Management Strategy developed</i>

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

Comments	Response	Refer to project
Comments from the GEF Council		
<p>CANADA All of the biodiversity projects being proposed should provide information on how they relate to the country's obligations to the CBD, particularly the Aichi Targets. As presented, the PIFs is not clear on how it will help the country meet the Aichi targets. The project proponents should provide this information in the final project proposals.</p>	<p>The project is designed to contribute to several Aichi Targets, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target 1 on awareness is addressed through implementing awareness campaigns on wildlife crime for communities living near PAS. Secondly, there are other capacity building activities designed to lead to broader awareness amongst key stakeholders such as customs officials, the police and the judiciary, amongst others (Component 2). • Target 3 on Incentive measures is addressed under both component 1 and component 2 of the project. Whilst component 1 is focusing at a higher tier level to set incentives for increased PAS financing, component 2 specifically addresses strengthening enforcement– which is linked to improving incentive measures for protecting biodiversity. • Target 11 on effectively and equitably managed PAS is the basis for the entire project which is geared towards improving management effectiveness of Namibia's PAS system –. • Target 12 on threatened species is addressed through the approach taken by the project to focus on key species. This is clear in both the site selection and enforcement priorities. targeting especially black and white rhino and elephants 	See project document, Paragraph 153
<p>FRANCE We globally support the proposal, but it seems to mainly concentrate the effort on the national parks system but its contribution to the development and maintenance of communal conservancies (which is a very promising and successful community based natural resources management -CBNRM system) remain unclear.</p> <p>Transaction costs to establish and foster operation and maintenance of communal conservancies are not clearly reflected on the “Sustainable Financing Plan for Namibia's Protected Area System.”(February 2010). Conservancies are supposed</p>	<p>The Government of Namibia recognizes the role played by conservancies as partners in conservation, and thus the project is designed to improve systems for revenue generation and implementing new and innovative revenue generation mechanisms both at a PA level and at a conservancy level. - including on providing long-term financing strategies for communal conservancies..</p> <p>The draft financing plan developed by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) in 2010 already includes activities to increase revenue generated within existing communal conservancies, as well as support to emerging conservancies, e.g. looking at increasing local level revenue generated from trophy hunting and through innovative concession models. All outputs under component 2 address community conservancy concerns, but specifically outputs 2.3 and 2.4 focus on strengthening local capacities in law enforcement, incentive measures and create broader engagement in conservation.</p> <p>Secondly, all activities geared towards improving enforcement – training assistance etc. will be for both the national parks system, and conservancies.</p> <p>Moreover, addressing the serious poaching threat in Namibia benefit conservancies. The economic impact of poaching on</p>	<p>See component 2, page 30</p> <p>Also see component 2, specific outputs, Page 40</p> <p>The Implementation Management Strategy document outlines the integrated management approach to be implemented, including community conservancies (component 2, page 50)</p>

<p>to be self financing areas, but they need enforcement and training assistance over the long term, which don't seem to be integrated in the sustainable financing plan.</p> <p>Precision on the contribution of this project to conservancies' long term financing would be appreciated in parallel to its contribution to the national parks system.</p> <p>Opinion: favourable, with the above clarification.</p>	<p>communal conservancies especially in north-eastern Namibia is already felt – with foregone income from trophy hunting, and reduction of hunting quotas. Addressing poaching, therefore, goes a long way to guaranteeing financial sustainability of conservancies.</p> <p>Furthermore, the project will develop incentive measures that provide conservancies with meaningful benefits from protecting the resources. Conservancies will be actively involved in identifying and developing relevant incentive measures that will support the enforcement economic chain.</p> <p>Last but not least, the Integrated Fire Management Strategy for PAS that will be implemented through this project promotes a partnership model between formal protected areas and conservancies. Joint responses, training and so forth are part of the strategy and will be implemented as such under the SOPs to be prepared under component 3.</p>	
<p>GERMANY</p> <p>. Germany requests that the following requirement is taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:</p> <p>Providing sustainable livelihoods to communities is central to the success of conservation. Under Component 1 the project aims to support the development of financing opportunities for new communal conservancies. The strategy for these areas should be elaborated more clearly vis-à-vis the strategy for increased revenue collection across Protected Areas.</p> <p>. Institutional sustainability: The project builds on substantial policy and institutional reforms supported by previous projects, and reference is made to MET's new structure that will provide for decentralization to improve on decision-making and management effectiveness in parks and wildlife management. However, a more thorough institutional</p>	<p><u>Strategy for Engaging Conservancies</u>: Please refer to response to similar question from France above.</p> <p><u>Institutional sustainability</u>:- A detailed institutional analysis across the entire enforcement chain analysis was undertaken during the project preparation phase. Areas for improvement were identified and they are the focus of component 2. A more detailed capacity assessment and capacity development plan for the enforcement capacity is included in the specific PPG report on Law Enforcement.</p> <p><u>Coordination with other related initiatives</u> :GIZ and KFW were consulted at various points and represented at relevant consultative workshops. Their on-going activities were taken into consideration as baseline investments.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Involvement Plan shows SADC as a partner in all activities</p> <p>The Integrated Fire Management Strategy for PAS includes linkages to SADC Regional Fire Management Program as well as the SADC Protocol on Forestry</p>	<p>Table 13 Page 43 (in prodoc) provides the institutional analysis of the Enforcement chain</p> <p>See separate report on Integrated Fire Management strategy</p> <p>Page 138 for Stakeholder Involvement plan</p>

<p>analysis and capacity assessment (MET, conservancies, other key stakeholders) is required to assess how the proposed sophisticated enforcement schemes can be effectively implemented and sustained.</p> <p>Coordination with other related initiatives: Within the efforts of donor coordination the implementing agency should consider ongoing and emerging projects of German Development Cooperation. In 2011 the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has committed new funds to the Government of the Republic of Namibia for bilateral Financial Cooperation (KfW) on Integrated National Park Management and for Technical Cooperation (GIZ) on Biodiversity Management and Climate Change.</p> <p>In view of transboundary issues involved in fire management and law enforcement (e.g. in the targeted Mamili, Mudumu and Babwata NPs in the KAZA transfrontier conservation area) relevant regional programmes should be taken into account, such as the SADC Regional Fire Management Programme and SADC Programme on Transfrontier Conservation Areas</p>		
Comments from the GEF Secretariat		
All comments provided at PIF stage were addressed before PIF approval.	-	-
Comments from STAP		
None		

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁴

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

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<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>
Activity 1-- Project Preparation*	100,000	52,464.80	47,535.20
Total	100,000	52,464.80	47,535.20

*Note: Project preparation covers the following activities as per the PPG request: (1) Development of an enforcement protocol/strategy, (2) An integrated fire management strategy, (3) Project strategy, feasibility analysis and budget.

¹⁴ 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.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A