



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

GEF ID:	4729		
Country/Region:	Namibia		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Capacity of the Protected Area System to Address New Management Challenges.		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4623 (UNDP)
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:	\$4,000,000
Co-financing:	\$16,139,914	Total Project Cost:	\$20,139,914
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
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?	12-12-11 Yes. Namibia is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12-12-11 Yes. There is LoE from the OFP for \$4,510,000 dated 9-07-11. The project is for \$4,400,000. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	12-12-11 Yes. Information provided on p.10 of PIF. 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?	12-12-11 Yes. Information provided on p.10 of PIF.	

Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	12-12-11 Yes. Namibia has a BD allocation of \$6.8 million. The project is for \$4.4 million. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	12-12-11 Yes. Namibia has a BD allocation of \$6.8 million. The project is for \$4.4 million. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	12-12-11 Yes. BD-1 Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	12-12-11 Yes.	
	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?	12-13-11 Yes. The project was selected after comprehensive GEF 5 Prioritization consultations. The project is in line with The Strategic Plan for 2007â€“2008 and 2011â€“2012 of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), and Vision 2030. Cleared	

	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	12-13-11 Yes. Addressed on page 8 of PIF. Cleared	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	12-13-11 Yes. The baseline project is properly described on pages 3-6 of PIF. Cleared	
Project Design	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	12-13-11 Yes. As stated in the PIF, "The GEF funding will provide greater conservation security by addressing new management challenges such as fire and poaching that, if left unchecked, will erase recent conservation gains and result into loss of the aforementioned global environmental benefits. This will be achieved through three complementary components: a) Improving Current Systems for Revenue Generation and Developing New mechanisms for revenue generation, b) Cost-effective law enforcement through applying sound principles of the Enforcement Economic Model c)	

		Cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>12-13-11 Yes. The project is structured around the following components and related outcomes:</p> <p>1. 1. Improving Current Systems for Revenue Generation and Developing New and Innovative Mechanisms: Increased PA financing opportunities for new PAs covering 33,530 sq km and new Communal conservancies covering an area of 30,837 km², by developing and implementing new and innovative revenue generation mechanisms.</p> <p>2. Cost Effective enforcement through application of sound Enforcement Economics principles: 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>3. Integrated Fire Management: Effective Fire Management leading to reduced degradation of wildlife habitats</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>12-13-11 Yes. See pages 6-7 of PIF. Cleared</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?	12-13-11 Yes Cleared	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	12-13-11 Listed in Table under B.5 (p.8 of PIF). 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)	12-13-11 Yes. Cleared	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12-13-11 Yes. There is detailed information on the elements of the Action Plan for Financing PAs to be supported by this project (Table 3, p.9). There is also reference to other GEF supported projects in Namibia. Cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	12-13-11 Yes. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism will execute the project. Cleared	
	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?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12-13-11 The project management is 5.5% of the GEF funding. The maximum for projects more than \$2 million should be	

Project Financing		12-14-11 Properly addressed in revised PIF. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12-13-11 Yes. Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	12-13-11 Co-financing ratio is 1:4 Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	12-13-11 UNDP is providing \$500,000 in co-financing (cash). Cleared	
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	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	12-13-11 Yes. This PIF is recommended for Clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of		

	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.