



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL SIZE PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening the National Protected Areas System of Swaziland			
Country(ies):	SWAZILAND	GEF Project ID: ¹	5065
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4932
Other Executing Partner(s):	Swaziland National Trust Commission (SNTC) and Big Game Parks (BGP)	Submission Date:	June 26, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	BIODIVERSITY	Project Duration(Months)	72
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Agency Fee (\$):	539,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input 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 (\$)
BD-1: Improve Sustainability of PA Systems	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. <i>Indicator 1.1: Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by METT.</i>	Output 1. New protected areas (13) and coverage (71,151 hectares) of unprotected ecosystems.	GEF TF	2,784,308	15,088,117
	Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management. <i>Indicator 1.2: Funding gap for management of protected area systems as recorded by protected area financing scorecards.</i>	Output 3. Sustainable financing plans (6).	GEF TF	2,605,692	8,511,883
Total project costs				5,390,000	23,600,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To effectively expand, manage and develop Swaziland's protected area network in order to adequately protect the biodiversity and landscapes of the country.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1: Knowledge based	TA	PA management and biodiversity conservation	Biodiversity field surveys, vegetation assessments and tourism assessments carried out in PAs and surrounding landscapes	GEF TF	660,000	2,832,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

<p>management platform operationalised at the National and regional level to address current and emerging threats to PAs and biodiversity conservation.</p>		<p>guided by research and knowledge, for improved and adaptive management practices within and outside PAs.</p> <p><i>Indicator: Development of Management Plans for 18 new formal and informal protected areas and for three landscape clusters.</i></p>	<p>to fill information gaps. This results in enhanced research and monitoring, improved information on biodiversity, ecosystems, tourism and ecosystem services, improved understanding and awareness of biodiversity and the benefits of PAs including stakeholder consultations and dissemination of information as well as increased understanding of knowledge-based mechanisms for improved management of PAs and the wider landscapes.</p> <p>GIS-based knowledge and information management system operationalised and supports systematic biodiversity planning through identification of critical biodiversity areas, ecological support areas for maintaining ecosystem processes, biodiversity conservation targets (in line with Aichi targets and national plans) and determination of ecosystem and species management objectives. PA and landscape management plans that integrate conservation efforts with sustainable economic development practices in the four identified landscapes are developed incorporating field monitoring and knowledge-based management mechanisms.</p> <p>PA and Landscape based management plans that integrate conservation efforts with sustainable economic development practices in the wider landscape are developed and implemented, incorporating field monitoring and knowledge-based management mechanisms. Stakeholder consultations and prioritisation of the 18 new formal and informal PAs as per land-owner application, feasibility studies and boundary demarcation and clarification of the</p>			
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

			appropriate legal framework for each PA to be gazetted. Business plans developed for the prioritised existing and new PAs. Public awareness campaigns implemented to promote a conservation ethic.			
Component 2: Landscape approach operationalised and leads to expansion of PA network.	TA	<p>Legally designated PA estate expanded and effectively managed through the establishment of 18 formal and informal PAs covering an additional 71,973 hectares and implementation of landscape management plans within surrounding landscapes</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i></p> <p><i>Gazettement of thirteen (13) PAs under three mandated PA authorities (SNTC, BGP & Forestry)</i></p> <p><i>Development of agreements between the land-owner/community and national agencies for the establishment of 5 informal PAs by 2020, encompassing various types of land uses</i></p>	<p>Gazettement of informal PAs prioritised in Component 1 in accordance with land-owner application. Investments in the establishment of these informal PAs as part of the National PA system based on the PA management plans and feasibility studies from Component 1 including matching grants for fencing, reintroduction of native species, conservation equipment and machinery, staffing and other appropriate PA establishment costs.</p> <p>Selected areas of significant biodiversity established as new Protected Areas under the SNTC Act including: Shewula, Nkalashane, Makhonjwa, Sibebe, Motjane vlei, Mambane and Muti-muti; with grants for establishing management structures, hiring of PA staff, fencing, reintroduction of native species, conservation equipment and machinery, and other appropriate PA establishment costs as identified based on the PA management plans and feasibility studies from Component 1.</p> <p>Selected areas of significant biodiversity established as new Protected Areas under the Game Act including: Mahhuku, Ngwempisi, Manzimnyame and Mkhaya west; with grants for establishing management structures, hiring of PA staff, fencing, reintroduction of native species, conservation equipment</p>	GEF TF	2,000,000	10,821,072

			<p>and machinery, and other appropriate PA establishment costs as identified based on the PA management plans and feasibility studies from Component 1.</p> <p>Selected areas of significant biodiversity established as new Protected Areas under the Flora Protection Act including: Jilobi and Bulembu and new Community Conservancies in Mdzimba, Nyonyane, Mahamba, Ndlotane and Nsongweni; with grants for establishing management structures, hiring of PA staff, fencing, reintroduction of native species, conservation equipment and machinery, and other appropriate PA establishment costs as identified based on the PA management plans and feasibility studies from Component 1.</p> <p>Implementation of land-scape management plans within the Lubombo, Mkhaya, Malolotja and Ngwempisi landscapes; with appropriate sustainable management structures and co-operation emplaced including livestock stocking rates, shared game management agreements, eco-tourism traversing agreements, forest product harvesting quotas and harvesting permits and enforcement structures as well as field based monitoring.</p>			
Component 3: Strengthening PA functioning through improved Conservation management and Operational	INV	Technical and Operational capacity improved with respect to planning, financing, surveillance, policing, monitoring and	Systematic training and capacity development for key personnel and stakeholders in the different forms of PAs, to enhance PA management and landscape based management including technical capacity building on PA management, planning, administration, marketing,	GEF TF	2,460,000	8,760,792

<p>support for existing and new PAs including both formal and informal PAs.</p>		<p>infrastructure maintenance in the new and existing PAs.</p> <p><i>Indicator:</i></p> <p><i>Indicator scores on the Capacity Development Scorecard show an improvement of at least 30% over the project period.</i></p>	<p>customer care, conflict resolution, reporting, monitoring, policing and enforcement in PAs, ecotourism development and management, CBNRM practices and management, monitoring and enforcement and sustainable financing management.</p> <p>Establishment and implementation of a mobile alien invasive species harvesting, milling and removal business through a matching grant, with implementation of other alien invasive species control projects utilising cost-effective and efficient practices across the different forms of PAs in order to improve biodiversity conservation and habitat integrity.</p> <p>Strengthening of PA wildlife management for reintroduction of native species and for conservation equipment and infrastructure including fencing, bomas, equipment for game ranching, game product development and marketing, and other sustainable resource use initiatives across the different forms of PAs in order to improve the success of conservation initiatives.</p> <p>Strengthening of PA eco-tourism for eco-tourism equipment and infrastructure (including camps and trails), product development, branding and marketing across the different forms of PAs (including informal PAs) in order to improve PA revenue generation and sustainability.</p> <p>Employment of individuals from rural communities to co-ordinate and develop community based conservation initiatives and to monitor biodiversity in community PAs; matching grants</p>			
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

			for entrepreneurs resident in rural communities to establish conservation friendly businesses; and grants for residents of rural communities (as individuals, companies or CBOs) to establish conservation initiatives within their PAs or landscapes.			
			Subtotal		5,120,000	22,413,864
			Project management Cost (PMC) ³	GEF TF	270,000	1,186,136
			Total project costs		5,390,000	23,600,000

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 (\$)
Government Agency	Swaziland Environment Authority	Cash	2,200,000
Government Agency	Swaziland National Trust Commission	Cash	11,400,000
Development Agency	UNDP Swaziland	Cash	200,000
Private Sector	Big Game Parks	Cash	9,800,000
Total Co-financing			23,600,000

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	Swaziland	1,293,600	129,360	1,422,960
UNDP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Swaziland	2,371,600	237,160	2,608,760
UNDP	GEF TF	Climate Change	Swaziland	1,724,800	172,480	1,897,280
Total Grant Resources				5,390,000	539,000	5,929,000

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 (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	15,000	69,000	84,000
National/Local Consultants	1,041,000	4,788,600	5,829,600

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).

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

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. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. **N/A**

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

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: **N/A**

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

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:

Financing: The co-financing for the project has reduced from US\$ 25 Million to US\$24, 995,500. This is because some of the Government Agencies proposed to participate in the project i.e. Swaziland Tourism Authority and the Ministry of Agriculture through the LUSIP Project, will not be doing so after stakeholder consultations were conducted. These changes were also due to negotiations amongst government agencies on what can feasibly be allocated to the project.

Incremental Reasoning: The project goal and objective have undergone restructuring based on the full situational analysis and to enhance clarity in understanding the project's interventions. The project objective "To strengthen management effectiveness of Swaziland PAs to respond to existing & emerging threats to biodiversity" was reworded to become the project goal "*To strengthen the management effectiveness of the Protected Area System of Swaziland to ensure a viable set of representative samples of the country's full range of natural ecosystems are conserved, through a network of Protected Areas*". The Project objective thus became "*To effectively expand, manage and develop Swaziland's protected area network in order to adequately protect the biodiversity and landscapes of the country*". These changes provide clarity in understanding the project strategy and the proposed interventions to be implemented under the project.

The arrangement of the project framework has been altered since the PIF stage to enhance clarity and logic based on the full situation analysis and incorporating STAP comments. As a result, certain aspects have been shifted between components as well as the removal of some outputs. Under component 1, subcomponent 1 on Policy reform and knowledge was reworded to focus on Knowledge management systems and policy reform was removed. Component 1 was also split into 2 with subcomponent 2 on Landscape approach and PA expansion becoming Component 2. The number of components thus changed from 2 components to 3 with component 1 being split into 2 separate components. The change in the number of components and placement of outputs under the components was in order to clarify the focus of each component; with component 1 focusing on the establishment of knowledge management systems at the regional and national level; component 2 focusing on the expansion of the PA network; and component 3 focusing on enhancing operational support to the PAs for long term sustainability. The previous components were worded as:

Component 1: Policy reforms and knowledge enables PA expansion and removal of threats through co-management - Subcomponent 1: Policy and Knowledge; and Subcomponent 2: Landscape approach operationalised and leads to PA expansion.

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

Component 2: Strengthening Core PA functions to address existing and emerging threats to biodiversity

The revised Components are:

Component 1: Knowledge based management platform operationalised at the National and regional level to address current and emerging threats to PAs and biodiversity conservation.

Component 2: Landscape approach operationalised and leads to expansion of PA network.

Component 3: Strengthening PA functioning through improved Conservation management and Operational support for existing and new PAs including both formal and informal PAs.

Within Component 1, the number of outcomes was reduced to one while the outputs increased from 2 to 3; with the primary focus of the component being on the development and establishment of a knowledge management system at the regional and national level in order to enhance biodiversity conservation. During the PPG stage, concerns were raised over the possible effect of policy changes on the mandate of other national institutions as well as the functioning of key stakeholders in Protected Area management; for this reason output 1.1 “*SNTC Amendment Bill fast tracked, PA Regulatory Framework harmonised and Game Act revised (and harmonised); this leads to reformed policy and regulatory framework*” was removed as it would result in conflicts with the mandate of the BGP. New outputs were developed under component 1: Output 1.1 “*Biodiversity field surveys, vegetation assessments and tourism assessments carried out in PAs and surrounding landscapes to fill information gaps. This results in enhanced research and monitoring, improved information on biodiversity, ecosystems, tourism and ecosystem services, improved understanding and awareness of biodiversity and the benefits of PAs including stakeholder consultations and dissemination of information as well as increased understanding of knowledge-based mechanisms for improved management of PAs and the wider landscapes.*” Output 1.2 “*GIS-based knowledge and information management system operationalised and supports systematic biodiversity planning through identification of critical biodiversity areas, ecological support areas for maintaining ecosystem processes, biodiversity conservation targets (in line with Aichi targets and national plans) and determination of ecosystem and species management objectives. PA and landscape management plans that integrate conservation efforts with sustainable economic development practices in the four identified landscapes are developed incorporating field monitoring and knowledge-based management mechanisms.*” which deals with the development of landscape management plans; and Output 1.3 “*PA and Landscape based management plans that integrate conservation efforts with sustainable economic development practices in the wider landscape are developed and implemented, incorporating field monitoring and knowledge-based management mechanisms. Stakeholder consultations and prioritisation of the 18 new formal and informal PAs as per land-owner application, feasibility studies and boundary demarcation and clarification of the appropriate legal framework for each PA to be gazetted. Business plans developed for the prioritised existing and new PAs. Public awareness campaigns implemented to promote a conservation ethic.*”

Within Component 2, the number of outputs increased from 4 to 5; with the primary focus of the component being on the establishment and formalisation of different forms of PAs under the different wildlife and biodiversity acts and institutions. Output 2.4 “*Capacity development and training for all newly gazetted or created PAs increased*” was moved to Component 3 as it dealt with improving the operational support to PAs. A new output was developed under component 2 i.e. Output 2.1 “*Gazettement of informal PAs prioritised in Component 1 in accordance with land-owner application. Investments in the establishment of these informal PAs as part of the National PA system based on the PA management plans and feasibility studies from Component 1 including matching grants for fencing, reintroduction of native species, conservation equipment and machinery, staffing and other appropriate PA establishment costs*”; the next three outputs under component 2 each deal with the establishment of different forms of PAs where Output 2.2 deals with PAs under the SNTC act, Output 2.3 deals with PAs under the Game Act, and Output 2.4 deals with Forest reserves and Community conservancies. The final Output 2.5 deals with support for implementing the co-operative landscape management plans and Conservancies. The separation of PAs under different outputs is due to the different

legislation and establishment criteria required for the different forms of PAs as well as differences in the management institutions. The selection of areas to be developed as PAs was based on assessments at the PPG stage of the Protection Worthy Areas (PWAs) in Swaziland.

Within Component 3, the number of outputs increased from 3 to 5 with a focus on enhanced operational support and improving PA functioning to all the different PAs to be established. New outputs were developed based on assessments of needs at PPG stage; these include: Output 3.2 *“Establishment and implementation of a mobile alien invasive species harvesting, milling and removal business through a matching grant, with implementation of other alien invasive species control projects utilising cost-effective and efficient practices across the different forms of PAs in order to improve biodiversity conservation and habitat integrity”*; Output 3.3 *“Strengthening of PA wildlife management through reintroduction of native species and for conservation equipment and infrastructure including fencing, bomas, equipment for game ranching, game product development and marketing, and other sustainable resource use initiatives across the different forms of PAs in order to improve the success of conservation initiatives,”*; Output 3.4 *“Strengthening of PA eco-tourism through eco-tourism equipment and infrastructure (including camps and trails), product development, branding and marketing across the different forms of PAs (including informal PAs) in order to improve PA revenue generation and sustainability”,* and Output 3.5 *“Employment of individuals from rural communities to co-ordinate and develop community based conservation initiatives and to monitor biodiversity in community PAs; matching grants for entrepreneurs resident in rural communities to establish conservation friendly businesses; and grants for residents of rural communities (as individuals, companies or CBOs) to establish conservation initiatives within their PAs or landscapes”*.

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:

In addition to the risks identified at the PIF stage, several more have been identified, and the updated table of risks is as follows:

Identified Risks	Category	Rating	Mitigation Measures
Resistance by local communities to the expansion or establishment of PAs.	OPERATIONAL	Medium	The project will build on the strong community education and BD advocacy program of the baseline (particularly the SNCT) to cultivate support and this will be complemented by the implementation of the land use plans and increased participation in tourism business (through CBNRM) which will demonstrate the returns from biodiversity conservation. The project will also raise awareness on the financial benefits of eco-tourism and ecosystem services. The communities around the PA buffer zones and areas proposed for the CCA have been involved in the discussion on the PA work at various stages: during the initial assessment of the protection-worthy areas; in the processes of establishing the Lubombo Conservancy and TFCA initiatives; during PIF formulation and at the PPG stage. These consultations are intended to raise awareness on the benefits of the different forms of PAs and to enhance local community participation.
PA financial sustainability measures meet resistance as well as slow operationalisation.	OPERATIONAL	Low	The project aims to develop the technical capacity of stakeholders in order to enhance their ability to implement financing measures as well as facilitating investment and donor support for these financing measures. Domestic tourism is being addressed by the baseline program (restructuring and commercialisation of SNTC), which is mounting an aggressive national campaign to encourage domestic tourism. The project will support this effort by developing tourism products targeted

Identified Risks	Category	Rating	Mitigation Measures
			at the various segments of potential tourists. The project will also develop branding and marketing strategies for Swaziland as a tourist destination. Combined with the baseline initiative on developing the infrastructure further, these measures will contain this risk.
Climate change could lead to change in distribution of biodiversity.	ENVIRONMENTAL	Medium	Maintaining healthy ecosystems plays a key role in adapting to and mitigating effects of climate change; the project will contribute to improving the integrity of the ecosystem and therefore contribute to improving resilience to climate change. A focus on landscape level management (as opposed to small areas); with sufficient buffer zone protection mitigates against climate change. The maintenance of a landscape approach in the PAs of Swaziland encourages the adoption of improved and sustainable land use practices to improve resilience to climate change.
Land use pressure from local communities hamper landscape based management efforts.	ENVIRONMENTAL / OPERATIONAL	Low	The project will implement landscape based management strategies that integrate multiple uses particularly sustainable land use practices that enhance conservation efforts. The project will seek to manage trade-offs between real development needs and conservation actions within the PA system. Improved enforcement will serve as a deterrent against encroachment into PAs. The project will also introduce alternative income activities and improved technologies that will promote sustainable development.
Limited cooperation between stakeholders and stakeholders are reluctant to establish PAs.	OPERATIONAL/ STRATEGIC	Low	The project aims to develop management strategies that take into consideration stakeholder needs. The benefits to be accrued by the different forms of PAs are explored and explained to stakeholders including the autonomy of PAs under different forms of PA management. Interest in the project was also generated during the PPG activities and stakeholders interested in the project were identified. In addition, matching grants for the different types of PAs will provide significant incentive for stakeholder involvement.
Limited political will to gazette PAs owing to fear of lost resource use opportunities.	OPERATIONAL/ STRATEGIC	High	The project aims to improve education and awareness around opportunities to conserve biodiversity whilst still allowing certain resource use and extraction. The project aims to facilitate additional categories of PA which will enable consumptive use and extraction of resources in a controlled manner, such PAs will be enabled by the SNTC amendment bill anticipated to be passed in the near future.
Limited participation by women due to cultural norms.	OPERATIONAL	Medium	The role of women in economic development and conservation is emphasised in the project. The participation of women in the project will be ensured through engaging the participation through women's groups and the development of alternative income-generating activities geared towards women such as beekeeping and silk worm rearing. The project will also provide education and access to markets for the products from sustainable economic activities.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives: N/A

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

The PPG phase included consultations with the Project's key stakeholders at the national and local levels. Field trips were carried out to the target areas, where all project sites were visited. Local authorities and community organisations were presented to the project proposal. A workshop was also held and the Project was thoroughly discussed. In addition, several bilateral meetings were held, mostly with donors and key stakeholders who could not attend the workshops. Generally, project design was a highly participatory process, in line with UNDP's and GEF's requirements.

STAKEHOLDER	RELEVANT ROLES
Swaziland National Trust Commission	Leadership and coordination for implementation of the project. Executing and implementing the project. Providing co-finance. Day to day operational execution of the project. Technical consulting and capacity building. Marketing and infrastructure development. Support to development and growth of the PAs under the mandate of the SNTC Act.
Big Game Parks	Leadership and coordination for implementation of the project. Executing and implementing the project. Providing co-finance. Day to day operational execution of the project. Technical consulting and capacity building. Marketing and infrastructure development. Support to development and growth of the PAs under the mandate of the Game Act.
Swaziland Environment Authority	Executing and implementing the project activities. Technical consulting and capacity building.
<i>Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Affairs</i>	Leadership and coordination for the implementation of the project. Executing and implementing the project. Providing co-finance. Technical consulting and capacity building. Support to development and growth of the PAs under the mandate of the SNTC Act and Flora Protection Act.
Swaziland Tourism Authority	Technical consulting and capacity building. Support to eco-tourism development and marketing of the different forms of PAs. Providing co-finance.
Ministry of Agriculture	Providing co-finance. Executing and implementing the project. Technical consulting and capacity building.
University of Swaziland	Biodiversity surveys and ecological research. Technical consulting and capacity building. Executing and implementing the project. Formal training and education.
Lubombo Conservancy	Support to development and growth of the different forms of PAs. Technical consulting and capacity building. Executing and implementing the project. Providing co-finance.
Swaziland Game Ranchers Association	Support to development and growth of the different forms of PAs. Technical consulting and capacity building.

STAKEHOLDER	RELEVANT ROLES
	Executing and implementing the project. Co-ordination and co-operation.
All Out Africa Foundation	Biodiversity surveys, ecological research and monitoring. Technical consulting and capacity building. Executing and implementing the project. Field training and education.
Rural Communities	Support to development and growth of the different forms of PAs. Executing and implementing the project. Technical consulting and capacity building.
Private PAs	Support to development and growth of the different forms of PAs. Executing and implementing the project. Technical consulting and capacity building. Providing co-finance.

The project will provide the following opportunities for long-term participation of all stakeholders:

Decision-making – through the landscape mechanisms and stakeholder groups. The establishment of these structures will follow a participatory and transparent process involving the confirmation of all stakeholders; conducting one-to-one consultations with all stakeholders; development of Terms of Reference and ground-rules; inception meeting to agree on the constitution, ToR and ground-rules for the mechanism and its active land use planning, ecological monitoring and community development units.

Capacity building – at systemic, institutional and individual level – is one of the key strategic interventions of the project and will target all stakeholders that have the potential to be involved in brokering, implementing and/or monitoring management agreements related to activities in and around the reserves.

Communication - will include the participatory development of an integrated communication strategy.

The communication strategy will be based on the following key principles:

- providing information to all stakeholders;
- promoting dialogue between all stakeholders;
- promoting access to information.

The project will be launched by a well-publicized multi-stakeholder inception workshop. This workshop will provide an opportunity to provide all stakeholders with updated information on the project as well as a basis for further consultation during the project's implementation, and will refine and confirm the work plan.

Based on the extensive list of stakeholders (mostly consulted) a more specific stakeholder involvement strategy and plan can be developed at that inception stage.

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):

The proposed project seeks to strengthen the management effectiveness of the PA system of Swaziland to ensure a viable set of representative samples of the country's full range of natural ecosystems are conserved, through a network of PAs. Given the small size of the country and the distribution of biodiversity important areas, the project will advance a landscape approach that will operationalise a cluster of PAs in critical landscapes, under an admixture of State, private and community management, depending on tenure, to ensure that communities participate in, and benefit from conservation and strengthen the management capacity and financial sustainability of the existing and new PAs.

The project will put in place governance and institutional frameworks including knowledge-based management systems and mechanism, to facilitate inclusive landscape level management of the PA system of Swaziland for integrated biodiversity conservation and economic development. This will deliver global benefits through enhanced habitat integrity and through the maintenance of ecosystem function and resilience. The multi-use landscape level approach demonstrated by the project is expected to serve as a new model for managing similar systems throughout Swaziland – one which maximises environmental, economic and social benefits to the society.

Improved management of the PAs and wider landscapes through the implementation of a landscape based integrated land use plan while lead to the dissemination of multiple benefits to a wide range of users and reduce threats to wildlife and conservation. The identification of areas of high biodiversity and wildlife movement, as well as the establishment of PAs, Conservancies or CCAs in these areas, will reduce pressures from competing land uses, improve wildlife movement and reduce degradation of soil and water resources in the ecosystem. This project will deliver benefits to local communities and PA stakeholders: i) direct and immediate livelihood benefits resulting from increased sustainability of natural resource uses and from tourism activities: ii) indirect benefits from improved ecosystems structure and functionality, such as resilience—critical to the provision of ecosystem services. The project will lead to improvement in the management of natural resources in the community PAs, which will increase food productivity and availability of natural products on the farms, with direct benefits to the communities.

The project will lead to the development of sustainable financing mechanisms for the different forms of PAs that will result in the improved PA management. In addition, the project's attention to increasing the role of local communities and women in conservation will increase direct tourism benefits from the different forms of PAs while reducing the burden placed by wildlife conservation. Benefits from an increased PA estate and more effective management are intended to improve the viability of the tourism industry and the project will lead to increased benefits from tourism for local communities, through increased participation. Women are identified as active natural resource users and will be targeted as key beneficiaries. The project will expend efforts in carrying out, wherever possible, gender analysis for the design of project interventions and shall take steps to ensure that perceptions of both women and men are taken into consideration as well as fair and equitable access to and distribution of project benefits.

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

The project's cost effectiveness is evident in the inclusive strategy it has employed. The project will work with a wide range of stakeholders, building support for the implementation of the project activities across multiple sectors and local communities. The inclusive nature will lead to the development of a management and governance framework that incorporates stakeholder interests and enhances adaptive conservation management measures. The project thus enhances ownership of management plans leading to effective implementation and reduced resistance to the management plans.

The cost efficiency of biodiversity management will be addressed in the project by:

- (i) Managing productive landscapes rather than a patchwork of protected areas as well as expanding PAs to include critical ecosystems, thus generating significant economies of scale in overall biodiversity management operations.
- (ii) Improving institutional effectiveness and capacity for PA and landscape management, thus ensuring that resource utilisation is improved and threats to wildlife reduced.

The project is also considered cost effective as it builds on the best practices and recommendations of other similar systems such as the **National Capacity Self-Assessment for Environmental Management**, by ensuring timely sharing of information and resources and by avoiding biodiversity degrading and economically unsound investments, which would require additional resource.

The incorporation of privately owned land into the PA estate through contracts and agreements such as conservation easements enable land to be used for conservation purposes, either for a long time period or in perpetuity, while allowing land owners to retain their ownership of the lands and title deeds. This is a cost effective means of PA expansion as the government does not have to buy the land from the owners and management costs are shared with the land owners resulting in lower costs per hectare for PAs.

The landscape-based management and multiple use approach aims to reduce degradation of the ecosystem by encouraging a shift from unsustainable to sustainable practices such as sustainable pastoralism and tourism. The project will increase biodiversity benefits without undermining the economic viability of production systems. This has the added benefit of mitigating potential land degradation thereby avoiding potential rehabilitation costs.

The project aims to increase the benefits from tourism through diversification of tourism products and the equitable sharing of these benefits. The alternative livelihoods proposed offer some solutions for generating suitable revenues that are sustainable. The project puts emphasis on the inclusion of women in the implementation of these economic activities to reduce vulnerability to environmental risk such as droughts.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

A Project Inception Workshop (IW) will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit. A fundamental objective of this Inception Workshop will be to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal and objective, as well as finalise preparation of the project's first AWP. This will include reviewing the log-frame (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalising the AWP with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

Additionally, the purpose and objective of the IW will be to: (i) introduce project staff with the UNDP-GEF team which will support the project during its implementation, namely the CO and responsible RCU staff; (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RCU staff vis-à-vis the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting M&E requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the Annual Review Report (ARR), as well as mid-term and final evaluations. Equally, the IW will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget re-phasing. The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines.

A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by project management, in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the PIR. Such a schedule will include: (i) tentative time frames for Project Steering Committee Meetings (PSCM) and (ii) project related M&E activities. Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the NPM based on the project's AWP and agreed indicators. The NPM will inform the UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion. The NPM will also fine-tune the progress and performance/impact indicators of the project in consultation with the full project team at the Inception Workshop with support from UNDP-CO and assisted by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit. Specific targets for the first year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at this Workshop. These will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the AWP. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team.

Measurement of impact indicators related to global biodiversity benefits will occur according to the schedules defined in the Inception Workshop, using tracking tool scores, assessments of forest cover, wildlife movements and other means. Periodic monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP-CO through quarterly meetings with the Implementing Partner, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities. Annual Monitoring will occur through the Project Steering Committee Meetings (PSCM). This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to PSCMs four times a year. The first such meeting will be held within the first six months of the start of full implementation.

A terminal PSCM will be held in the last month of project operations. The NPM is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU after close consultation with the PSCM. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the terminal PSCM in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the PSCM. The terminal meeting considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objectives. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learnt can be captured to feed into other projects under implementation.

UNDP COs and UNDP-GEF RCU as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to project sites based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's PIR/AWP to assess first hand project progress. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP-GEF RCU and circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team, all PSC members, and UNDP-GEF.

Project Reporting

The core project management team (under the NPM) in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF extended team will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process. The first six reports are mandatory and strictly related to monitoring, while the last two have a broader function and their focus will be defined during implementation.

A Project Inception Report (PIR) will be prepared immediately following the Inception Workshop. It will include a detailed First Year Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. This Work Plan will include the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the UNDP-CO or the Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) or consultants, as well as time-frames for meetings of the project's decision making structures. The Report will also include the detailed project budget for the

first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the AWP, and including any M&E requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months' time-frame.

The PIR will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. When finalised, the report will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to this circulation of the PIR, the UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF's Regional Coordinating Unit will review the document.

The Annual Project Report/ Project Implementation Review must be completed once a year. The APR/ PIR is an essential management and monitoring tool for UNDP, the Executing Agency and PCs and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from on-going projects at the portfolio level.

Quarterly progress reports: Short reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF RCU by the project team, headed by the Policy Specialist using UNDP formats.

UNDP ATLAS Monitoring Reports: A Combined Delivery Report (CDR) summarising all project expenditures, is mandatory and should be issued quarterly. The NPM will send it to the PSC for review and the Executing Partner will certify it. The following logs should be prepared: (i) the Issues Log is used to capture and track the status of all project issues throughout the implementation of the project. It will be the responsibility of the NPM to track, capture and assign issues, and to ensure that all project issues are appropriately addressed; (ii) the Risk Log is maintained throughout the project to capture potential risks to the project and associated measures to manage risks. It will be the responsibility of the NPM to maintain and update the Risk Log, using Atlas; and (iii) the Lessons Learned Log is maintained throughout the project to capture insights and lessons based on the positive and negative outcomes of the project. It is the responsibility of the NPM to maintain and update the Lessons Learned Log.

Project Terminal Report: During the last three months of the project the project team under the NPM will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarise all activities, achievements and outputs of the Project, lessons learnt, objectives met, or not achieved, structures and systems implemented, etc. and will be the definitive statement of the Project's activities during its lifetime. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure the long term sustainability and the wide replicability of the Project's outcomes.

Periodic Thematic Reports: As and when called for by UNDP, UNDP-GEF or the Implementing Partner, the project team will prepare Specific Thematic Reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNDP and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learnt exercise, specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered.

Technical Reports are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specialisations within the overall project. As part of the PIR, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. Technical Reports may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive, specialised analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national and international levels.

Project Publications will form a key method of crystallising and disseminating the results and achievements of the Project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the Project, in the form of journal articles, multimedia publications, etc. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance, scientific worth, etc. of these Reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other research. The project team, under the NPM, will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and will also (in consultation with UNDP, the government and other relevant stakeholder groups) plan and produce these Publications in a consistent and recognisable format. Project resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget.

Independent Evaluations

The project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows: An independent Mid-Term Evaluation will be undertaken at exactly the mid-point of the project lifetime. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organisation, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit.

An independent Final Technical Evaluation will take place three months prior to the terminal Project Steering Committee meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the mid-term evaluation. The final evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Technical Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget USD <i>Excluding project team Staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP GEF 	\$10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Team ▪ UNDP CO 	None	Immediately following Inception Workshop
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members 	To be finalised in Inception Phase.	Start, mid and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by National Project Manager ▪ Monitoring and Evaluation Officer ▪ Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR and PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Team ▪ UNDP-CO ▪ UNDP-GEF 	None	Annually
Quarterly progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project team 	None	Quarterly
CDRs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Project Manager 	None	Quarterly
Issues Log	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff 	None	Quarterly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget USD <i>Excluding project team Staff time</i>	Time frame
Risks Log	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO Programme Staff 	None	Quarterly
Lessons Learned Log	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO Programme Staff 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project team ▪ UNDP- CO ▪ UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	\$30,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project team, ▪ UNDP-CO ▪ UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	\$30,000	At the end of project implementation
Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project team ▪ UNDP-CO ▪ local consultant 	Funds are budgeted for local consultants to assist where needed	At least one month before the end of the project
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project team ▪ Monitoring and Evaluation Officer ▪ UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc.) 	0	Yearly
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP-CO ▪ Project team 	\$3,000 per annum	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP Country Office ▪ UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	Paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		USD 150,000*	


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)
Stephen Zuke	OFP and Director Swaziland Environment Authority	MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS	JULY 25, 2012

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 Executive Coordinator and Director a.i		June 26, 2014	Veronica Muthui – RTA, EBD	Tel: +2712 354 8124	veronica.muthui@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and Assumptions
Objective – To effectively expand, manage and develop Swaziland’s protected area network in order to adequately protect the biodiversity and landscapes of the country.	Legally protected PA network increased.	Current baseline of 3.9% of the country	PA system covers at least 6%	PA Formalisation and gazettment notices Independent mid-term and final evaluations Project reports Land use plans and GIS maps	<u>Risk:</u> - Limited cooperation between stakeholders and stakeholders are reluctant to establish PAs. <u>Assumption:</u> - Continued interest and support of government and staff in the implementation of strategies and programmes to mainstream biodiversity conservation and economic development in national planning
	Number of capacity building programmes developed for improved PA management	0	At least 3 PA capacity building programmes to improve the management and operations of PAs	Capacity building curriculums and reports Project reports Independent mid-term and final evaluations	
Component 1 – Knowledge based management platform operationalised at the National and regional level to address current and emerging threats to PAs and biodiversity conservation.					
Outcome: PA management and biodiversity conservation guided by research and knowledge, for improved and adaptive management practices within and outside PAs.	1.1 Biodiversity field surveys, vegetation assessments and tourism assessments carried out in PAs and surrounding landscapes to fill information gaps. This results in enhanced research and monitoring, improved information on biodiversity, ecosystems, tourism and ecosystem services, improved understanding and awareness of biodiversity and the benefits of PAs including stakeholder consultations and dissemination of information as well as increased understanding of knowledge-based mechanisms for improved management of PAs and the wider landscapes. 1.2 GIS-based knowledge and information management system operationalised and supports systematic biodiversity planning through identification of critical biodiversity areas, ecological support areas for maintaining ecosystem processes, biodiversity conservation targets (in line with Aichi targets and national plans) and determination of ecosystem and species management objectives. PA and landscape management plans that integrate conservation efforts with sustainable economic development practices in the four identified landscapes are developed incorporating field monitoring and knowledge-based management mechanisms. 1.3 PA and Landscape based management plans that integrate conservation efforts with sustainable economic development practices in the wider landscape are developed and implemented, incorporating field monitoring and knowledge-based management mechanisms.				<u>Risks:</u> -Complexity in stakeholder collaboration due to differing interests and wide range of stakeholders, resulting in slow operationalisation of knowledge management platform. <u>Assumptions:</u> - Governance systems will enable the necessary cohesion and pace of implementation of the knowledge management platforms and landscape management plans.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and Assumptions
	Stakeholder consultations and prioritisation of the 18 potential new PAs and informal PAs as per land-owner application, feasibility studies and boundary demarcation and clarification of the appropriate legal framework for each PA to be gazetted. Business plans developed for the prioritised existing and new PAs. Public awareness campaigns implemented to promote a conservation ethic.				
	Number of biodiversity field surveys	0	At least 6 PA and 3 landscape level biodiversity surveys carried out	Field survey reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations; Project reports	
	Number of information management systems at regional and national level	0	1 GIS-based knowledge and information management system	System database reports; Operational guidelines, manuals and reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations; Project reports	
	Number of landscape-based management plans	None	4 landscape based management plans	Government and GIS maps PA assessment reports PA management plans; Landscape management plans; SNTC and BGP TA reports Project reports	
Component 2 – Landscape approach operationalised and leads to expansion of PA network.					
Outcome: Legally protected PA estate expanded and results in: <i>(i) maintenance of wildlife populations and ecosystems functionality in the PAs under Community, SNTC</i>	<p>2.1 Gazettement of informal PAs prioritised in Component 1 in accordance with land-owner application. Investments in the establishment of these informal PAs as part of the National PA system based on the PA management plans and feasibility studies from Component 1 including matching grants for fencing, reintroduction of native species, conservation equipment and machinery, staffing and other appropriate PA establishment costs.</p> <p>2.2 Selected areas of significant biodiversity established as new Protected Areas under the SNTC Act including: Shewula and Nkalashane, Makhonjwa, Sibebe, Motjane vlei, Mambane and Mutimuti; with management structures developed including hiring of PA staff, fencing, reintroduction of native species, conservation equipment and machinery, and other appropriate PA establishment requirements as identified based on the PA management plans and feasibility studies from</p>				<p>Risks: - Resistance by local communities to the expansion or establishment of PAs.</p> <p>- Land use pressure from local communities hamper landscape based management efforts.</p> <p>- Climate change could lead to both changed distributions of</p>

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and Assumptions
<i>and BGP management; (ii) compatibility of land uses in adjacent communities with overall biodiversity management goals; (iii) containment of threats from Commercial agriculture, infrastructure placement and tourism impacts</i>	Component 1. 2.3 Selected areas of significant biodiversity established as new Protected Areas under the Game Act including: Mahhuku, Ngwempisi, Manzimnyame and Mkhaya west; with management structures developed including hiring of PA staff, fencing, reintroduction of native species, conservation equipment and machinery, and other appropriate PA establishment requirements as identified based on the PA management plans and feasibility studies from Component 1. 2.4 Selected areas of significant biodiversity established as new Protected Areas under the Flora Protection Act including: Jilobi and Bulembu; with management structures developed including hiring of PA staff, fencing, reintroduction of native species, conservation equipment and machinery, and other appropriate PA establishment requirements as identified based on the PA management plans and feasibility studies from Component 1. 2.5 Implementation of landscape management plans within the four clusters/landscapes; with appropriate sustainable management structures and co-operation emplaced including livestock stocking rates, shared game management agreements, eco-tourism traversing agreements, forest product harvesting quotas and harvesting permits and enforcement structures as well as field based monitoring.				BD components, and changes in demands on biodiversity-based resources. <u>Assumptions:</u> - Stakeholders buy-in to the expansion and formalisation of new PAs has been ascertained. - Landscape approach understood and bought into by stakeholders
	Number of informal PAs established as National PAs	None	At least 4 informal PAs gazetted and managed as National PAs	Government gazettelement notices PA legal documents Project reports Independent mid-term and final evaluations	
	Number of new PAs gazetted and operationalised	0	6 new PAs are established, gazetted and managed for biodiversity conservation	Government gazettelement notices PA legal documents Project reports Independent mid-term and final evaluations	
	Number of streamlined PA and landscape management structures and	0	At least 3 streamlined landscape management structures and management plans implemented based on international	Management guidelines and reports Landscape management structure reports Project reports	

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and Assumptions
	standards developed		conservation standards	Independent mid-term and final evaluations	
Component 3 – Strengthening PA functioning through improved Conservation management and Operational support for existing and new PAs including both formal and informal PAs.					
Outcome: Technical and Operational capacity improved with respect to planning, financing, surveillance, policing, monitoring and infrastructure maintenance in the new and existing PAs; particularly for the formal and informal PAs identified at PPG and to be developed by the projects interventions in component 2.	3.1 Systematic training and Capacity development for key personnel and stakeholders in the different forms of PAs, to enhance PA management and landscape based management including technical capacity building on PA management, planning, administration, marketing, customer care, conflict resolution, reporting, monitoring, policing and enforcement in PAs, ecotourism development and management, CBNRM practices and management, monitoring and enforcement and sustainable financing management. 3.2 The establishment and implementation of a mobile alien invasive species harvesting, milling and removal business based on matching grants and the implementation of other alien invasive species control projects utilising cost-effective and efficient practices across the different forms of PAs in order to improve biodiversity conservation and habitat integrity. 3.3 Strengthening of PA wildlife management through matching grants for reintroduction of native species and for conservation equipment and infrastructure including fencing, bomas, equipment for game ranching, game product development and marketing, and other sustainable resource use initiatives across the different forms of PAs in order to improve the success of conservation initiatives. 3.4 Strengthening of PA eco-tourism through matching grants for eco-tourism equipment and infrastructure (including camps and trails), product development, branding and marketing across the different forms of PAs in order to improve PA revenue generation and sustainability. 3.5 Employment of individuals from rural communities to co-ordinate and develop community based conservation initiatives and to monitor biodiversity in community PAs; matching grants for entrepreneurs resident in rural communities to establish conservation friendly businesses; and grants for residents of rural communities (as individuals, companies or CBOs) to establish conservation initiatives within their PAs or landscapes.			Risks: - PA financial sustainability measures meet resistance as well as slow operationalisation. - Climate change could lead to change in distribution of biodiversity. - Limited participation by women due to lack of awareness and cultural norms. Assumptions: - Clear and defined interest in economic engagement by appropriate stakeholders including women.	
	Number of training programmes developed	0	At least 8 programmes on PA management, planning, administration, marketing, customer care, conflict resolution, reporting, monitoring, policing and	Training programmes curriculums and reports Project reports	

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and Assumptions
			enforcement in PAs, ecotourism development and management, CBNRM practices and sustainable financing management and at least a third of the participants should be women		
	Number of invasive alien species control programmes	None	At least 1 sustainable control programme per PA management category (SNTC, BGP, Private, Community)	AIS control reports Project reports Independent mid-term and final evaluations	
	Number of conservation infrastructure or equipment programmes	0	At least 1 conservation infrastructure or equipment programme per PA management category (SNTC, BGP, Private, Community)	Equipment or infrastructure purchase receipts Project reports Independent mid-term and final evaluations	
	Number of ecotourism infrastructure, product development or marketing programmes	0	At least 1 ecotourism infrastructure, product development or marketing programme per PA management category (SNTC, BGP, Private, Community)	Infrastructure purchase receipts Product development reports Tourism marketing and branding reports Project reports Independent mid-term and final evaluations	
	Number of CBNRM programs developed	0	At least 4 CBNRM co-ordinators employed and capacitated and at least 2 sustainable CBNRM programs developed.	Employment contracts CBNRM reports Project reports Independent mid-term and final evaluations	

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

COMMENTS	RESPONSES	REFERENCE IN PROJECT DOCUMENT
Response to GEF Secretariat Review		
At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?	The Agency included the progress of PPG through progress reports and workshops held during PPG stage. Information obtained during PPG activities formed the baseline assessment for the project document.	Please refer to Section I, Part IA Situational Analysis.
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?	<p>The cost effectiveness of the project has been sufficiently demonstrated with the project design approach demonstrably more cost effective than other alternative approaches; whereby the project will work with a wide range of stakeholders, building support for the implementation of the project activities across multiple sectors and local communities. The inclusive nature will lead to the development of a management and governance framework that incorporates stakeholder interests and enhances adaptive conservation management measures. The project is also considered cost effective as it builds on the best practices and recommendations of other similar systems such as the National Capacity Self-Assessment for Environmental Management, by ensuring timely sharing of information and resources and by avoiding biodiversity degrading and economically unsound investments, which would require additional resource.</p> <p>The project aims to increase the benefits from tourism through diversification of tourism products and the equitable sharing of these benefits. The alternative livelihoods proposed offer some solutions for generating suitable revenues that are sustainable. The project puts emphasis on the inclusion of women in the implementation of these economic activities to reduce vulnerability to environmental risk such as droughts.</p> <p>The project design is cost effective as compared to alternative approaches as it builds on lessons learnt and best practices from other GEF projects in the country and the region.</p>	Please refer to Section I, Part II Project Strategy under the Cost effectiveness section.
Is the project structure sufficiently close to	During PPG the project structure underwent significant	Please refer to Section I, Part II Project

COMMENTS	RESPONSES	REFERENCE IN PROJECT DOCUMENT
what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?	changes based on baseline assessments and stakeholder consultations. These changes ensured clarity in the project design as well as enhancing stakeholder inclusion in the project. Under component 1, subcomponent 1 on Policy reform and knowledge was reworded to focus on Knowledge management systems and policy reform was removed. Component 1 was also split into 2 with subcomponent 2 on Landscape approach and PA expansion becoming Component 2. The number of components thus changed from 2 components to 3 with component 1 being split into 2 separate components. The change in the number of components and placement of outputs under the components was in order to clarify the focus of each component; with component 1 focusing on the establishment of knowledge management systems at the regional and national level; component 2 focusing on the expansion of the PA network; and component 3 focusing on enhancing operational support to the PAs for long term sustainability.	Strategy under the section on Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities.
If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	No non-grant instruments are being implemented under the project; therefore a calendar of reflows was not required.	
Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	The appropriate Tracking Tools for Biodiversity have been included with information for the relevant indicators. This includes the Environment and Social Screening Programme.	Please refer to the Biodiversity-1 METT excel document as well as Annex 1 of the project document for the ESSP report.
Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan has been developed, including a corresponding budget. The plan entails an inception workshop, project reporting, independent evaluations, as well as learning and knowledge sharing.	Please refer to Section I, Part IV of the project document: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget. Table 13 details each component of the plan and its associated budget.
Response to Comments from STAP Review Agency		
The proposal is supported by a strong and referenced information sources, and builds on previous interventions in terms of reviews of the PA system in Swaziland. In developing the project document, it might wish to draw on the lessons learned from earlier interventions in Swaziland, how well their recommendations have been	This project will collaborate closely with, and build on the findings of, other GEF projects in Swaziland, without repeating the efforts made in those projects. Notably, these are: To Promote the Implementation of National and Transboundary Integrated Water Resource Management that is Sustainable and Equitable Given Expected Climate Change. The goal of the project was to	Please refer to Section I, Part II Project Strategy under the section on Linkages with GEF-Financed Projects.

COMMENTS	RESPONSES	REFERENCE IN PROJECT DOCUMENT
<p>implemented, and what challenges these faced.</p>	<p>ensure that the management of Swaziland’s water resources is adapted to take into account the anticipated impacts of climate change. The interventions planned would indirectly improve the status of the communities as they will be better equipped to manage climate risks and adapt to climate change.</p> <p>National Biodiversity Strategies, Action Plan, and the Report to the COP. The project aimed at helping SEA, relevant government ministries, NGOs, local communities and research institutions to formulate a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) and the first country report to the COP. The NBSAP would determine the current status of, pressures on, options and priority actions to ensure conservation and sustainable use of the country’s biodiversity.</p> <p>National Capacity Self-Assessment for Environmental Management. The project aims were to take stock of existing capacities and establish needs and priorities for capacity development to assist Swaziland to implement multilateral environmental conventions to which it is signatory.</p>	
<p>The important role of the private sector in participating in the project is welcomed by STAP. The absence of any scientific or academic institutions in the listing of stakeholders is of concern to STAP, and efforts might be made to include collaboration from such institutions during project development.</p>	<p>During the PPG stage, stakeholder inclusion in project development was enhanced through stakeholder meetings as well by conducting assessments on the Institutional and governance capacity of the different stakeholder groups. The relevant roles of various stakeholders was then determined including the roles of various private sector organisations as well as collaborations with scientific and academic institutions.</p> <p>The University of Swaziland (UNISWA) will support the project through: Conducting biodiversity surveys and ecological research; Technical consulting and capacity building; Executing and implementing the project; and Providing formal training and education.</p>	<p>Please refer to Section I, Part IA on Institutional; please also refer to Section I, Part IB on the Stakeholder Analysis section.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

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

During the PPG stage, concerns were raised over the possible effect of policy changes on the mandate of other national institutions as well as the functioning of key stakeholders in Protected Area management; for this reason output 1.1 “*SNTC Amendment Bill fast tracked, PA Regulatory Framework harmonised and Game Act revised (and harmonised); this leads to reformed policy and regulatory framework*” was removed as it would result in conflicts with the mandate of the BGP.

The arrangement of the project framework has been altered since the PIF stage to enhance clarity and logic based on the full situation analysis and incorporating STAP comments. As a result, certain aspects have been shifted between components as well as the removal of some outputs. Under component 1, subcomponent 1 on Policy reform and knowledge was reworded to focus on Knowledge management systems and policy reform was removed. Component 1 was also split into 2 with subcomponent 2 on Landscape approach and PA expansion becoming Component 2. The number of components thus changed from 2 components to 3 with component 1 being split into 2 separate components. The change in the number of components and placement of outputs under the components was in order to clarify the focus of each component; with component 1 focusing on the establishment of knowledge management systems at the regional and national level; component 2 focusing on the expansion of the PA network; and component 3 focusing on enhancing operational support to the PAs for long term sustainability.

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000			
<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>
Baseline Data collection	70,000	70,000	0
Institutional arrangements and capacity of different agencies to support the implementation of a landscape approach to strengthening PA management in Swaziland	40,000	40,000	0
Feasibility analysis, Budget	40,000	35,000	5,000
Total	150,000	145,000	5000

⁵ 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