GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**9382**		
Country/Region:	**South Africa**		
Project Title:	**Shepherding biodiversity back into South Africa's Productive Landscapes**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4 Program 9;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,017,750**
Co-financing:	**$5,500,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$6,517,750**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jane Nimpamya**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	3-11-16 Yes. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	3-11-16 The project is well structured and documented, based on a wealth of experience, and with a clear objective in mind. It is innovative and has the potential to render tangible results on the ground.There are nonetheless some outstanding issues that need to be address at this stage. Cleared	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	3-11-16 Yes. Item 11 in MSP. Cleared	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	3-11-16 Yes Cleared	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	3-11-16 No. Under item, 1.2 (Baseline scenario and associated projects) please separate the "Background" information (i.e. general description of the topic) from the "Baseline project". In the GEF, the "Baseline Project", is the project or projects related to the subject matter that will be carried-out whether or not the GEF project gets approved. Another way of looking at this. The "Baseline Projects" are those on which the GEF project is standing on to deliver tangible and measurable results on the ground. Having a clear "Baseline Project" and the proposed investments by the MSP, should greatly facilitate the description of the "Incremental Reasoning" under item 1.5 of MSP. 5-1-16 Cleared	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently	3-11-16	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	This is a very interesting project that has potential to deliver tangible and measurable results on the ground. There are nonetheless, a number of issues that need to be address at this stage. COMPONENT 1. According to the MSP, the focus of this component is to "reintroduce and redevelop shepherding as a profession, building on the traditional shepherding skills currently absent or being lost on farms". What makes the project proponents believe that it is possible to reintroduce this practice? Is it possible that the traditional shepherding are absent or being lost on farms, simply because people have moved to some other jobs batter paid in cities or suburbia? Isn't this what is happening around the globe as economic development progresses? Being able to bring this practice to life is a significant assumption that needs to be taken seriously. Please elaborate on the subject. Output 1.1.is not eligible for funding. It is a bit confusing why a project already developed (like this one-step MSP) would start by conducting a "scientific evaluation of the actual environmental and economic impact of all methods of management of predation and damage-causing animals on livestock farms, both lethal and non-lethal". If this is not known, how is that there is proposal for	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		implementation as described on the other outputs of this component? Why would the project suggest testing shearing methods without knowing the ecological and economic consequences? There is reference of experience of over 20 years by the Landmark Foundation, the Savory Institute and African Centre for Holistic Management studying and promoting wildlife-friendly livestock management methods. Output 1.2 Is it realistic to think that the project can test shepherding practices, among other things, in 100,000 ha considering budget and time? Output 1.3 Same as above but with the number of BD-Friendly shepherding associations developed and operational at 15 farms covering 60,000 ha. Do these BD-Friendly Shepherding Associations exist or is the project planning on putting them in place? Output 1.4 What activities will the GEF support in the development and running of the "Shepherding Academy"? Is there a business-model for this Academy? The GEF cannot support "bricks and mortar" infrastructure. Output 1.5. The GEF cannot finance "veterinary plans". COMPONENT 2.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		The development of a PES scheme would take significantly more resources (and time) than those allocated to the component. The GEF experience on the matter of PES is that these schemes take a long time to be developed and that unless there is a buyer already identified and willing to pay, the sellers are unlikely to gain from these enterprises. Output 2.1. The branding scheme "Fair Game" would require significant more resources than those allocated to the component. What elements of this Branding scheme are already developed by LF? COMPONENT 3 It is not clear who is going to carry-out, and cover the recurrent costs associated with the proposed activities listed under outputs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. Please elaborate. Needless to say, the budget associated with this component is not enough to pay for even the start-up costs of these activities. Who does "law enforcement"? The monitoring of species listed in Table 1 is going to require significant financial and technical resources. Who has the background information on the status of the species? Why not to concentrate in only a few mammals? Perhaps only one is needed. Leopards? 5-1-16 Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	3-12-16 The project will address socio-economic issues as it has the potential to generate jobs and support economic development in the farms associated with the program. Cleared	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	3-11-16 No. There are far too many deliverables for the funding and time requested for this project. There is a significant risk of "overpromising" and "under-delivering". The GEF suggests re-scaling the geographic and thematic scope of the project. 5-1-16 Cleared	
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	3-12-16 The risk associated with the capacity to identify, trained and specially retain motivated shepherds is ranked low. Nevertheless, this is a risk that may be actually quite high if current lack of shepherds is the result of people moving into other economic activities because of higher wages or simply because livestock farming models have changed so much that these shepherds are no longer required (not to say that this is necessary better). Please reconsider this subject, not simply to change the risk level but to think about the assumption that it is indeed possible to change the production level back to shepherding (see comment above). 5-1-16 Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	3-12-16 Please confirm that the co-financiers listed on Table C know they are listed in the MSP and associated with the amounts and type of co-financing. Please state what activities will be supported by the $4.6M co-financing of the Tamarisk Trust. Thanks. 5-1-16 Cleared	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	3-12-16 Yes. Annex 10. Cleared	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	3-16-12 Item 8. on Coordination, please only list those ongoing projects that this MSP is intending to coordinate because of geographic and thematic overlap. It is not the list of all GEF projects consulted during the development of this MSP. Some of the projects listed are not even in S. Africa. 5-1-16 Cleared	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	3-12-16 Yes Cleared	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	3-12-16 Yes. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	5-1-16 Cleared	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	3-12-16 No. Please address issues listed under items 5,6,8,9,10 and 13. When submitting the revised MSP, please provide a copy highlighting in yellow the parts that have been changed. That would facilitate and speed up the review process. Please also provide the regular response matrix. The GEF secretariat remains available for consultation over email or teleconference. 5-1-16 This MSP is being recommended.	
Review Dates	First Review	March 12, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 01, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		