



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

GEF ID:	4848		
Country/Region:	South Africa		
Project Title:	Improving Management Effectiveness of the Protected Area Network		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4943 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$8,550,000
Co-financing:	\$49,559,113	Total Project Cost:	\$58,209,113
PIF Approval:	March 28, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	3-20-12 Yes. Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	3-20-12 There is a LoE from the OFP dated March 8, 2012 for \$9,515,000. Nevertheless, the figures in the table do not add up. Please address this. 3-22-12 Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	3-20-12 Yes. Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	3-20-12 As stated in the PIF: "UNDP is supporting the Government of South Africa's ongoing efforts to promote sustainable use of natural resources". "Past and ongoing projects implemented through UNDP Country Office include the CAPE project, the Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative, The National Grasslands Programme. The UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Team comprised of 1 Principal Technical Advisor and 4 Regional Technical Advisors sitting in the country office. Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3-20-12 Yes. South Africa has a BD allocation of \$21.68 M. Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?	3-20-12 Yes. South Africa has a BD allocation of \$21.68 M. Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	3-20-11 Yes. Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	3-20-12 Yes. BD1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems. Cleared	12-18-13 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?	3-20-12 Yes. "The project is consistent with South Africa's national priorities and policies, and specifically with the National Protected Area Expansion Strategy (NPAES). The project will also enable the Government of South Africa to contribute towards global target of ensuring 17-percent of the world's land area is under protection" Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	3-20-12 Yes. This will be achieved mainly through Component 2a) Improving Legal and Technical Capacity for contractual partnerships, and 2c) Targeted improvement of management effectiveness in select PA Agencies. Cleared	12-18-13 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?	3-20-12 Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to		12-18-13 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	3-20-12 Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	3-20-12 Please address the following issues: 1) Component 1. 1.1) The proposed expansion of the PA state is 197,000 ha. or 2.5%. The budget allocated to this component is \$28M, or \$142/ha. Is that the average cost for establishing a new PA in South Africa? 2) Component 2. 2.1.) The proposed investment to improve the management effectiveness of \$1,100,000 ha is \$14 M, or \$13/ha. That is a low investment per unit area, considering that 2 out of 3 of the subcomponents are investments in institutional capacity building. How much of the investments will actually reach the ground directly? Are there enough financial resources to tackle poaching heads-on? 2.2) The outcome of the component states that management effectiveness will improve in 1,100,000 ha (100,000 ha in subcomponent b. and 1,000,000 ha	12-18-13 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in subcomponent c.) in the Succulent Karoo, the Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany-Hotspot, and the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem. What are the PAs totaling 1.1 M ha that will benefit from this component? Not having a clear geographic scope for this component makes difficult the definition of targets for improved management of PAs (no estimate provided).</p> <p>2.3) What are the "agencies" that will benefit from this component?</p> <p>2.4) Output 2.1 does not capture the results of activities under subcomponents 2a., 2b. and 2c. which are mostly about building institutional capacity.</p> <p>3) Component 3.</p> <p>3.1) The outcome and outputs of this component will benefit from adding the area of the target PAs (Addo Elephant National Park, Garden Route National Park, and Baviaanskloof Mega Reserve).</p> <p>3.2) Is it realistic to think about developing of PES schemes (carbon and watershed) in these PAs? Who are the buyers for these services? Have they expressed interest and commitment to purchase the services? What is the level of investments in these schemes?</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Experience shows that if no buyers have been identified, and significant resources invested, the probability of successfully establishing these schemes is significantly reduced.</p> <p>3-22-12 Issues addressed in Response to GEF Comments. Cleared</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	3-20-12 Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	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?	3-20-11 Yes. See pages 9 and 10. Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	3-20-12 Yes. See page 11. Cleared	12-18-13 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)	3-20-12 Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	3-20-12 Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	3-20-12 Executing partners are listed on page1.	12-18-13 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		12-18-20 The changes were at the output level and described on page 6 of the CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	3-20-12 GEF Project Management Costs is 5% of the GEF total. Co-financing PM is 9.5%. Cleared	12-18-13 Please add the Subtotal and calculate the Management Cost as up to 5% of the project subtotal. In addition, please recalculate the Agency fee on Table D. It should be 9.5% of the Grant Amount; It is currently 10%. 2-7-14 Properly addressed in the revised CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	3-20-12 Please review the allocation of GEF funding among components. Is GEF funding to component 1 too high when compared to component 2? 3-22-12 See response to GEF Comments (item 14). Cleared	12-18-13 Cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;	3-20-12 The co-financing is \$47M and the co-	12-18-13 The LoC were provided for all co-

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	financing ratio of 1:5. Cleared	financiers, except UNDP. Please include that letter in the re-submission. 2-7-14 Properly addressed in the revised CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	3-20-12 UNDP is providing \$800,000 (cash). Cleared	2-7-14 Yes Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		12-18-13 Cleared
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		12-18-13 Cleared
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		12-18-13 Annex B was pasted in a way that half of the table cannot be read. Please address this matter. The questions put forward by the Council require a more straight forward answer. 1. For "conservation tenure". Please clearly state if the ownership of the lands to be added to the PA system as presented in the Outcome of Component 1, will: i) be passes to the national or regional governments, ii) stay in the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>hands of current owners, iii) something else (in between the i and ii). There is reference to a "declaration" under the National Environmental Management Act: Protected Areas). What does this "declaration" entails regarding land-tenure and actual opportunities for conservation? In the case legal tenure of the land stays in the hands of the current owners, what is the likelihood that these areas will indeed provide an opportunity for conservation and sustainable development in "perpetuity"? Paragraphs 75, and 81-88 of PAD do not answer these questions.</p> <p>2. For "community benefits". The word "benefits" is used through the project, but it is not entirely clear how and to what extent these communities will benefit. Please simply list the mechanisms to be designed or used by the project to achieve this objective. Be as explicit as possible on how these mechanisms will become operational. Some of the mechanisms listed in the project are: eco-tourism, generation of green jobs, game sales. What is the real potential of "eco-tourism" to benefit local communities? Is there such a demand for eco-tourism to make a difference in the target areas? Is this community based eco-tourism or high-end ecotourism? Same sort of questions for the other mechanisms.</p> <p>2-7-14</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			These questions were properly addressed in the Revised CEO Endorsement and Responses to GEF Comments attachment. Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	3-20-12 No. Please address issues under items 2, 14 and 24. Thanks. 3-22-12 This PIF is recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	3-22-12 1). List and areas of the PAs totaling 1.1 M ha that will benefit from component 2.2	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		12-18-13 No. Please address outstanding issues uder items 23, 25 and 29. Thanks. 2-7-14 Yes. This CEO Endorsement is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 20, 2012	December 18, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 22, 2012	February 07, 2014
	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?	10-24-12 The project has the following activities: 1. Baseline data collection and information gap analysis: i) each proposed pa site, ii) management effectiveness within pas and buffer zones, iii) protected area economics and finance. 2. Assessment of the capacity of different agencies to support the implementation of project activities 3. Project strategy development Cleared
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	10-24-12 Yes. All local consultants at \$1500/week. Cleared
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	10-24-12 Yes. PPG approval is recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 24, 2012
	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.