



PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)
PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Securing multiple ecosystems benefit through SLM in the productive but degraded landscapes of South Africa		
Country	South Africa	GEF Project ID: ¹	5327
GEF Agency	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5054
Other Executing Partners	Department of Environmental Affairs, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research; Agricultural Research Council – Institute for Soil, Climate and Water; Dep. of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries; Development Bank of South Africa; Endangered Wildlife Trust; University of KwaZulu Natal; Rhodes University.	RE-Submission Date:	27 March 2013
GEF Focal Area	Land Degradation	Project Duration (Months)	72 months
Parent program	NA	Agency Fee (\$):	402,600

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²:

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
LD 3: Reduce pressures on Natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape	GEFTF	4,027,900	19,500,000
Project Management Cost		210,000	1,000,000
Total Project Cost		4,237,900	20,500,000

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To provide incentives (capacity, financial, governance) for the adoption of knowledge based SLM models for land management and land/ecosystem rehabilitation in support of the green economy and resilient livelihoods in the Karoo, Olifants and Eastern Cape						
Component	Ty _{pe} ³	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Grant (\$)	Co-finance (\$)
Knowledge and Capacity: Empowered and motivated natural resource management teams engage in knowledge based land management practices that reduce degradation in livestock and crop production and the restoration of currently degraded lands (in the Karoo, Eastern Cape and the Olifants landscapes)	TA	1. Landscape level uptake of economically viable, climate smart land/ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices in three landscapes covering over 30,000 ha (with a stretch target of 100 000ha), deliver ecosystem and development benefits which include: - Rehabilitation of degraded lands and ecosystems; Reduced soil erosion; Improved watershed management; Increased land productivity, based on Net Primary Productivity measure; % family incomes from SLM practices; and Positive carbon sequestration. <i>[Targets established at PPG]</i>	1.1: Uptake of improved land use and livestock management practices in two critical riverine systems rehabilitate the critical wetlands and riverine rabbit territory in the Karoo: the return of the Karoo riverine rabbit marks effective rehabilitation; 1.2: Improved ecologically viable livestock farming, vegetative cover and range resource management measures adopted by at least 1000 farmers in the Karoo and the Eastern Cape; 1.3: Improved watershed management practices (e.g. soil erosion control, soil and water conservation, water harvesting, run-off reduction, vegetative cover, range resource management) adopted by at least 25% of farmers in the critical part of the Olifants catchment, securing watershed services in over 100,000 ha; this reduces impacts of cultivation on soil erosion and impacts of droughts, flooding & siltation in dams; 1.4: Conservation agriculture adopted by at least 10,000 households in Eastern Cape; and over 100,000 tree seedlings planted in the strategic places in the three landscapes; 1.5: Best practices and lessons captured and upscaled to other regions through a participatory M&E system (including establishment of baselines and targets) for monitoring land and ecosystem rehabilitation at landscape levels.	GEF TF	1,500,000	5,000,000
			2. Knowledge forms the basis for shifting land management practices	2.1: <u>A geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system</u> supported by robust GIS systems is operational by end of project year 2; supports the development of	GEF	750,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the reference attached on the [Focal Area Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

³ TA includes capacity building, and research and development.

		towards managing for heterogeneity and complexity to enhance resilience:	<p>whole system approach to land and ecosystem rehabilitation, incorporating climate risk, ecosystem services, livelihoods and local economic development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Integrated map-based assessment of socio economic issues, climate-related hazards, vulnerabilities and climate-sensitive natural resources, identifying threats to ecosystem and livelihood resilience; and, knowledge based recommendations for mitigating the threats incorporated into the land/ecosystem rehabilitation models for the three landscapes; ➤ Cost benefit analysis of the current degradation, particularly of the watershed services in the Olifants; knowledge based mitigation recommended to ensure climate smart watershed management practices; ➤ Current carrying capacities of the land/ecosystems in the Karoo, Eastern Cape and the Olifants, revealing the discrepancies between the carrying capacities and current demands on the ecosystems (for small stock in Karoo and Eastern Cape and farming in the Olifants); <p>2.2. <u>Core staff of technical ministries, Regional and local extension support departments and land users in 3 landscapes trained on the use of improved data, tools and methods of ecosystem, livelihood and vulnerability assessments as the basis of decision making on land use within the context of a green economy;</u></p> <p>2.3. District soil conservation committees operational and linked to regional and national bodies;</p>			
Financial and policy incentives	TA	<u>3: A new methodology for establishing baselines for carbon in the Albany thicket rehabilitation works developed;</u> its adoption reduces transaction costs of small scale AFOLU & ARR projects, leads to <u>146 m tons CO2e sequestered over 30 years, and 900 000 CO2e over 5 years</u>	<p>3.1: <u>One new method for establishing and monitoring carbon stocks baselines available.</u></p> <p>3.2: <u>5,000 ha of degraded spekboom landscape rehabilitated,</u> reduces soil erosion and securing habitats for micro-biodiversity and livelihoods;</p> <p>3.3: <u>At least 10 30-year contracts on carbon credits signed between landowners and carbon credit buyers including clear outline of verification procedures (co-fin);</u></p> <p>3.4 :4.5:<u>10,000 person days of green jobs employment created per year (50,000 in 5 years).</u></p>		531,685	3,000,000
		<u>4: A land and ecosystems stewardship program incentivizes advancement of the green economy at the local level;</u> <u>accompanying land and ecosystems rehabilitation improves livelihoods, food security & incomes for 10,000 hhds</u>	<p>4.1: At least USD 4 million mobilized from the public and private sectors as co-finance to the GEF supported grants;</p> <p>4.2: At least 10 subprojects financed under the grants are implemented; this leads to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) at least 10,000 ha of land/ecosystems rehabilitated through the grants supported projects; ii) Household incomes increase by at least 25% for households involved in the sub-projects in the 3 landscapes; <p>4.3: <u>A strategy for upscaling within and beyond the three landscapes formulated</u></p>		1,000,000	4,000,000
		<u>5. SLM friendly land and ecosystem governance systems piloted in the three landscapes, lessons generated inform national debate on land reform and its role in the green economy</u>	<p>5.1: <u>Provincial (3) development policies, political and economic development processes and incentives reviewed;</u></p> <p>5.2: <u>A National Platform on SLM, land & ecosystem dialogue in place;</u> national dialogue on the role of SLM in the green economy on-going; dialogue supports and augments the value and reach of the National Coordinating Body for UNCCD to engage more strategically in SLM, land & ecosystem rehabilitation debate.</p>		246,215	2,500,000
Subtotal					4,027,900	19,500,000
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴					210,000	1,000,000
Total Project Cost					4,237,900	20,500,000

⁴ To be calculated as percent of subtotal.

C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
Government Agencies	Various under Ministry of Agriculture (described in A.2 Stakeholder Table, including LandCare, Working for Water, Eastern Cape Spekboom, CSIR)	Grant	15,500,000
GEF Agency	UNDP South Africa	Grant	1,000,000
Private Sector (DBSA)	Dry Lands Development Fund (DBSA)	Grant	4,000,000
Total Co-financing			20,500,000

D. INDICATIVE TRUST FUND RESOURCES (\$) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount (\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b) ²	Total (\$) c=a+b
UNDP	GEF	LD	South Africa	4,237,900	402,600	4,640,500

E. PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)⁵:

Please check on the appropriate box for PPG as needed for the project according to the GEF Project Grant:

Amount Requested (\$) = 100,000	Agency Fee for PPG (\$) ⁶ 9,500
---------------------------------	--

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

PROJECT OVERVIEW

A.1. Project Description

Context and Global Significance: South Africa places a high premium on the role of land and the constituent ecosystems in the quest for a green economy⁷. 80% of the land is used for agriculture and subsistence livelihoods; 11% of it (12.76 million ha) has arable potential, while majority (69%) is used for grazing; 82% of the 12.76 million ha of cultivated land is under commercial agriculture, most of it rainfed. About six million people depend on agriculture for their livelihoods; nearly a million of them employed as farm workers. The smallholder agricultural sector provides employment for an additional 1.3 million households. Indeed, about 43% of South Africa's 46 million people live in rural areas and depend on natural resources to sustain livelihoods⁸. Despite the importance of land and its ecosystems, South Africa is however prone to land degradation, currently exacerbated by human activities that disturb the delicate but dynamic equilibrium between soils, vegetation, and climate. According to WWF (2209), South African soils are extremely vulnerable to degradation and have low recovery potential; more than 5 million hectares (more than double the size of Kruger National Park) of cultivated lands are already seriously acidified. This is a serious problem in the Karoo, the Albany thickets and the Olifants catchment, three of the nine biomes (Map in Annex 1) the country depends on for economic development. The 3 biomes currently exhibit signs of degradation of critical ecosystem services. In these biomes, land degradation is due to improper soil management practices, cultivation of unsuitable soils, improper management of cultivated crop land, deforestation and extensive removal of natural vegetation (including over-exploitation of vegetation for domestic use), overgrazing, alteration of surface/subsurface flow and inappropriate water abstraction. Consequences of degradation in these areas are reduced quantity and quality of water available to both nature and people, reduction of soil moisture content, disrupted water flow regimes, reduced recharge of groundwater table, increased sediments and pollutants in fresh water bodies, and low capacity of wetlands to buffer flooding and pollution, particularly in the Olifants.

The Karoo and the Albany Thicket biomes: Covering more than 30% of the country's land surface, the Karoo and the Albany Thicket biomes are deserts and xeric shrublands, which form part of the WWF eco-regions of Namib-Karoo-Kaokoveld Deserts and Cape Floristic communities respectively. Here, rainfall averages ten inches or less and evapotranspiration well exceeds rainfall. Despite the hyper-arid conditions, the two biomes are the backbone of small livestock production in the country. The Karoo is floristically rich desert ecoregion, with highly diverse endemic plant communities; containing about 3,500 species of plants dominated by dwarf, succulent shrubs, about half of which are endemic. In its natural state, the Albany Thicket (Eastern cape) is a dense, spiny shrubland rising about 2 to 2.5 metres, dominated by succulents and semi-succulent shrubland, such as Spekboom (*Portulacaria afra*), *Euphorbia bothae*,

⁵ On an exceptional basis, PPG amount may differ upon detailed discussion and justification with the GEFSEC.

⁶ PPG fee percentage follows the percentage of the GEF Project Grant amount requested.

⁷ Which it defines as a "sustainable development path based on addressing the interdependence between economic growth, social protection and natural ecosystems

⁸ All the information in this paragraph was obtained from the South Africa State of Environment Report of 2004

Euphorbia ledienii and Noorsdoring (*Euphorbia coerulescens*), occupying the eastern part of the Cape Floristic Region and into the Eastern Cape, where a greater proportion of rain falls in the summer months (Midgley *et al.* 1997)⁹. The xeric thickets (Eastern Cape) and xeric shrublands (Karoo) have low to no levels of ecosystem resilience and thus will not undergo Clementsian succession, presenting significant abiotic and biotic barriers to the recolonisation by indigenous seedlings. Overgrazing by small stock has led to the reduction of plant cover and changes in species composition within thicket and succulent shrub communities, exacerbating soil erosion and impacting soil, water and nutrient cycling, and biodiversity. Indeed, both landscapes show significant levels of invasion by alien invader plants that threaten biodiversity, water security, food security and rural livelihoods. The blue bush (*Pteronia incana*) is particularly problematic in the Eastern Cape, and it is spreading from stream valley bottoms onto abandoned fields and grazing lands. Further land clearance along the rivers in the Eastern Cape where orchards and pasture are grown without adequate consideration of SLM principles has led to loss of the natural vegetation, including the high carbon storing Spekboomveld. It is estimated that intact subtropical thicket secures ~900 t CO₂e per hectare. The 800,000-1,000,000 hectares of Albany Thicket reported to be degraded by overgrazing of small stock is estimated to have released vast amounts of this sequestered carbon (~50% of total carbon stocks), leading to accelerated contributions to anthropogenic climate change, loss in productive landscapes and soils, severe loss of biodiversity and ultimately a steady path to desertification. In the Mhlontlo municipality (LM) of OR Tambo district, land degradation impacts have negatively affected the thousands of smallholder farmers dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods and food security—in addition to silting a great number of rivers and streams that drain the eastern Cape catchments flowing to the Indian Ocean. A recent study by Reyers *et al.* (2009)¹⁰ shows that 52% of the Little Karoo is degraded through overgrazing and that ecosystem services are declining, with an 18% decline in water-flow regulation and a 44% decline in erosion control—ecosystem services that underpin the region's agricultural economy. In addition to reducing land productivity, the degradation has affected the Karoo biodiversity including the Critically Endangered Riverine Rabbit endemic to seasonal Karoo catchments.

The Olifants, in contrast, is a sub-basin of the Limpopo River basin shared by Botswana, Mozambique, South Africa, and Zimbabwe. On the South Africa side, the basin is characterized by highly variable rainfall, ranging from 400 to more than 1000 mm, and is home to more than 3 million people, 67% of them living in 26% of the rural areas, largely dependent on agriculture for food security and livelihoods, in the rural parts of the former homeland areas (Lebowa, KwaNdebele, and parts of Bophuthatswana and Gazankulu). These areas are severely degraded with significant soil loading into the Olifants River and the dams on the Olifants and its 7 tributaries (and sub-catchments). As a result, the Olifants catchment is water stressed, with demand exceeding supply. The government is addressing this by raising dam walls, clearing invasive alien plants and implementing water demand/conservation strategies. Future projections of water use indicate that the Olifants is likely to remain water stressed, especially with implementation of the Ecological Reserve. Yet at the same time there are many people without adequate access to water for both productive and domestic use. Land degradation in the catchment threatens the capacity of the catchment to generate sufficient water resources to support the demand.

Threats: Land and ecosystems degradation is likely to be exacerbated by the effects of climate change. South Africa in general has been approximately 2% hotter and at least 6% drier over the ten years between 1997 and 2006 compared to the 1970s¹¹. Although the use of water has increased greatly over this same period, droughts are a frequent occurrence in the country and often have serious ecological and economic consequences. The negative impacts of drought tend to get more severe with increased land degradation¹². Consequently, it could be argued that rising livelihood vulnerability is driving increased dependency on biodiversity and ecosystem services, which, in turn, is rendering ecosystems more vulnerable. Farmers are sensitive to environmental change as they rely on low diversity of breeds or cultivars. In addition, farmers become vulnerable to global change, like climate change, if they do not have sufficient resources to diversify or divert income to other production activities, and if local institutions have weak capacities and inadequately support rehabilitation measures¹³. This is likely to play out in the Karoo where fracking may be undertaken in the near future; the local land users and their institutions are inadequately equipped to fully understand the short and long-term costs versus benefits of the mining, or to manage and monitor them.

⁹ Midgley D.C., Pitman W.V. and Middleton B.J., 1994. Surface Water Resources of South Africa 1990. WRC Report 298/5.1/94. Pretoria, South Africa.

¹⁰ Reyers, B., O'Farrell, P.J., Cowling, R.M., Egoh, B.M., Le Maitre, D.C. and Vlok, J.H.J., 2009. Ecosystem services, land-cover change and stakeholders: finding a sustainable foothold for a semi-arid biodiversity hotspot. *Ecology and Society* 14(1): 38.

¹¹ Blignaut, J., Ueckermann, L. & Aronson, J. 2009. Agriculture production's sensitivity to changes in climate in South Africa. *South African Journal of Science* 105, January/February 2009 61-72

¹² Vetter, S. 2009. Drought, change and resilience in South Africa's arid and semi-arid rangelands. *South African Journal of Science* 105, January/February 2009: 29-33

¹³ Ibid.

Baseline project: The proposed project will build on a total baseline of US\$ 63.83 million, of which US\$ 20.5 million will be co-finance invested in the period 2013-2018; this is the same period proposed for the project under development. The sources of co-finance are described below.

LandCare Program: US\$ 40 million from 2008-2012 and US\$ 7 co-fin for the period 2013-2018: Launched in 1997, the LandCare Program is a national community-based and government-supported program with a goal of ensuring environmental and ecological sustainability of agriculture. Housed by the Department of Agriculture, the initiative's flagship program is the Area-wide Planning (AWP) approach (and strategies), which is supporting community level work on land rehabilitation, erosion control, water management and control of invasive alien plants. The LandCare AWP Process fits perfectly with the principles of Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM), including promoting partnerships among the communities, private sector and the Government for the management of natural resources. The AWP objectives are supported through a grants program, which issues a maximum of US\$12,500 to projects that support the general objectives of the LandCare program. Following many years of successful implementation, the LandCare program has now established sub-programs on WaterCare, VeldCare and SoilCare. The SoilCare sub-program encourages rural farmers to adopt the concept of Conservation Agriculture (CA) and to build innovative structures to combat soil erosion. The national budget for the LandCare program for 2011-2012 period was about ZAR 57 million (approximately US\$ 8 million). This program will therefore contribute about US\$ 7 million between 2013-2018 being the continued investment by LandCare in the three landscapes (Olifants, Karoo and Eastern Cape).

Working for Water Program (WfW): US\$ 11 million between 2004-2012 and US\$ 4 million co-fin over the period 2013-2018: The Working for Water (WfW) Program is a Department of Environmental Affairs initiative that supports the rehabilitation of watersheds through the clearance of water-wasting invasive species. The WfW has created jobs targeted at the poorer segments of society throughout the country. In the Olifants, the program is supporting research to develop a statistically sound monitoring methodology for the comprehensive mapping of major IAP species at national, regional and quaternary catchment scales. The program works closely with other Government departments including the Departments of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Agriculture, and Trade and Industry, provincial departments of agriculture, conservation and environment, research foundations and private companies. Data provided from Gamtoos Irrigation Board (albeit incomplete) indicates that at least US\$ 11 million has been spent nationally on the eradication of invasive plants since the program started. The budget for the 3 landscapes covered by the proposed GEF project is estimated to be US\$ 4 million for the period 2013-2018, which will constitute co-finance.

Thicket restoration Program: US\$ 11.83 million in the period 2004-2012, and US\$ 4.5 co-fin in the period 2013-2018: The Department of Environmental Affairs initiated the Subtropical Thicket Restoration Programme in 2004, building on extensive research on the carbon potential of the Albany thicket spekboom conducted by Universities of Stellenbosch and Rhodes. The program aims to provide a financial incentive for the restoration of subtropical thickets while alleviating poverty through the sale of carbon credits. Several partner agencies will provide US\$ 4.5 million co-finance in the period 2013-2018.

The Drylands Fund: US\$ 4 million in the period 2012-2018: The Drylands Fund is a partnership between the private sector, civil society and the government; its objective is to provide an efficient financial mechanism for channelling funds from the private sector to rural areas, as part of the financial incentives for adopting sustainable land management and the rehabilitation of degraded landscapes/ecosystems. The baseline is US\$ 1 million and the anticipated resource mobilisation component that the Drylands Fund will raise is estimated to be US\$ 4 million (this will come from the public sector, private sector companies and from sale of credits through the Thicket Agency for Addo Elephant Park, Baviaanskloof and Fish River over the project period).

Despite the considerable baseline (described above), there are still major governance, incentives, knowledge and capacity barriers (described below) to the widespread adoption of SLM in the country, and land degradation continues to shrink the resource base and opportunities for the future generation to create and sustain wealth from the green economy.

The long-term desired solution In order for South Africa's ecosystems to sustainably underpin the development of the green economy, the long-term vision is that the country reaches a target of zero net land degradation by adopting measures that arrest further degradation, and rehabilitate already degraded land. In South Africa the achievement of this vision is hampered by knowledge, incentives and capacity barriers.

Barriers: Barriers to the widespread adoption of SLM in South Africa include:

Knowledge and capacity barriers: The formulation and adoption of a model to advance the concept of a zero net land degradation in South Africa is hampered by inadequate knowledge on the following fronts (amongst others): i) land

rehabilitation and management techniques that would be effective in rehabilitating the currently degraded land and for reducing further land degradation effectively in the face of a changing climate; ii) the relationships between land degradation, resilience and livelihoods; iii) carrying capacity of livestock under the current state of degradation and accounting for the full cost (including ecological/environmental costs) in the production calculus.

Being a semi-arid subtropical environment, the Karoo and the Eastern Cape have highly variable patterns of primary production leading to overstocking during seasons of below average rainfall. Since overgrazing is one of the key drivers of land degradation, this necessitates the use of knowledge based grazing systems that respond to fluctuations in forage supply through adoption of flexible animal stocking rate practices. This information is however lacking. As reported in the LADA Assessment Reports (2012), there was a concerted effort to determine sustainable stock capacity indices for Karoo farmland in the 1970s, driven mainly by the Department of Agriculture; the research resulted in the development of grazing assessment indices and recommend Grazing Capacity Norms or Stocking Rates for the Karoo. However not much has been done to update these recommended stocking rates or practices over the last 30 years for the Karoo or anywhere else, and overgrazing is rampant on many rangelands. Many changes have occurred in both the natural and socio-economic environment in the country, which renders those estimates ineffective. Even where such data and rehabilitation methods might be known, the knowledge sharing systems are weak and ineffective: and, the collation and implementation of rehabilitation techniques in the farming landscape to encourage regional uptake have been missing. A key challenge facing many of the institutions governing land management in the country is the conflicting perspectives by stakeholders on the causes of, and remedies for land degradation.

Although it is now commonly understood that resilient and functioning ecosystems are needed to reduce vulnerability to climate change, the links between land degradation, drought, climate change and vulnerability are still not well understood. What is clear is that human vulnerability is increasing on the three landscapes, particularly for farmers and the poor who are inadequately capacitated and have limited assets to cope with unanticipated events. This makes it impossible to deal with ecosystem degradation in South Africa without linking it to climate change, drought and the social causes and consequences, and what this means for human well-being and adaptation in a rapidly changing world. The current baseline programs are not addressing these issues adequately as they lack the science and the capacity to comprehensively model these complex relationships and generate practical measures to inform extension. Part of the complexity is due to the fact that establishing these linkages needs to be long term, flexible and based on opportunistic research to capture slow and stochastic processes. In particular, droughts are likely to pose increasing challenges to rangeland users in the future, yet the long-term work needed to understand the processes and find ways to reduce their ecological and economic impacts has not yet taken root. To generate this and similar types of knowledge as well as integrate it into management models requires rigorous ecological assessments using integrated trans-disciplinary frameworks for analysis; however, there is inadequate capacity in the relevant institutions with the mandate for the baseline programs. Indeed, the knowledge barrier is compounded by additional and related capacity barriers (described below).

Capacity barrier: Although the government recognizes the importance of adopting sustainable land management in the country's agriculture, the extension services that have the mandate for rolling out SLM have very limited capacity and inadequate resources. In South Africa, resilience thinking has become influential in the management of many conservation areas, where the emphasis is shifting from preventing change and reducing the effects of environmental variability, to managing for heterogeneity and complexity, aiming to enhance the resilience of these ecosystems¹⁴. This thinking needs to spread to sustainable land management and landscape rehabilitation programs. This will however require a paradigm shift that expands the concept of capacity building to encompass adaptive capacity, so that land users can incorporate managing resilience as part of SLM (including rehabilitation). In addition to building traditional capacity for SLM, the new concept needs to deliver tools, methods, knowledge and institutions to manage resources for heterogeneity and complexity to maintain resilience and secure livelihoods in the face of climate change. Delivering this type of capacity is undermined by the fact that the current institutions responsible for extension service and research are currently under-capacitated (personnel and resources) and are struggling to meet the demand for support, particularly to the new farmers. These knowledge and capacity barrier are further compounded by incentives and governance barriers (described below).

Incentives and governance barriers: South Africa is currently implementing a financial incentives program in support of biodiversity: the mechanism of biodiversity stewardship. Although the stewardship has an allowance for encouraging SLM, its implementation is particularly challenging in communal lands in arid areas where no real tangible short-term incentives exist for communities to engage in the program. While it has been relatively easy to identify and implement incentives applicable to

¹⁴ Vetter 2009.

high-productivity areas in private lands that support abundant wildlife and eco-tourism and receive tax incentives, this has not worked as well for communal lands, particularly communal drylands. The arid areas of South Africa require innovative financial and other incentives to encourage SLM and stewardship programmes: the Drylands Fund and the Spekboom carbon initiatives are promising, but they are both new and are inadequately funded to demonstrate their potential and win over private sector confidence and investment in the programmes. Additional funding is required to demonstrate practical partnerships to enable upscaling of the lessons and successes that will be gleaned from these projects. The spekboom carbon project has demonstrated the potential of earning carbon credits from rehabilitating the Albany thickets landscape. However, the widespread uptake of the initiative is hampered by the fact that the current methodology for monitoring and verification is too complicated. Although the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) has invested heavily in the compilation of the VCS Project Document (PD) for the purpose of earning carbon credits for the current project, the project cannot be launched before the validation process, which will include the establishment of rigorous and defensible baselines for the carbon (and biodiversity). The methodology currently employed relies entirely on the available and published CDM or VCS methodologies—specifically for the Agriculture, Forestry and Land Use (AFOLU)/ Afforestation Reforestation and Revegetation (ARR) sectors. Under these methodologies, data collection is tedious, costly and exceptionally time-consuming, thus it is acting as barrier to progress. Further to this, there is in general insufficient knowledge and methodologies for the estimation of carbon and other ecosystem service baselines in degraded and intact subtropical thickets. Indeed, for the 112 subtropical thicket types, only a handful of scientifically defensible case studies are available for the carbon stock baselines for the intact or degraded states, yet this is a body of knowledge that is required to reduce the transaction costs of further restoration projects, as well as facilitate the REDD carbon credit initiatives in subtropical thicket. There is therefore an urgent need to develop a simplified remote sensing based monitoring and verification protocol to speed up the completion of the carbon and socio-economic baselines, and thereby reduce the transaction costs significantly.

There are other clear gaps in the provision of incentives for land rehabilitation and SLM uptake: despite the fact that about 80% of the land is under private farmers (for example, in the Karoo), the state does not provide any financial incentives for commercial farmers to take up rehabilitation and erosion control on their farms. This is because priority is currently on redressing the negative impacts of the political history on the subsistence farmers, and the fact that LandCare programme has limited funds available, which they focus more on small-scale and emerging agriculture. Indeed, the soil conservation subsidies that were provided in the past to farmers interested in land-reclamation were stopped in 2004. In addition, insecure tenure has emerged as a disincentive for the commercial farmers to adopt a more ecologically responsible farming. While the current emphasis is fully justified, there is a need to find other alternatives that encourage land rehabilitation and uptake of SLM by all the farmers, if South Africa is to achieve its goal of building a green economy. This is particularly in the light of the current weak natural resources governance systems.

The political history of South Africa left a legacy of disempowerment, making agency a major determining factor in governance. One of its main outcomes was to disempower the majority of indigenous citizens, vesting agency only in those favoured by the authorities, such as individuals who could be useful to them (for instance, the ‘presidents’ of the so-called ‘Bantustans’ or ‘homelands’ (Mamdani 1996)). Despite the removal of many barriers to individual and collective agency since the advent of democracy in 1994, individual capacity to exercise new freedoms remains severely constrained, and agency remains atrophied. The abilities to negotiate effectively with other role-players, agree rules and processes, and make decisions (and just as importantly, belief in these abilities) are often weak especially among local communities. This has weakened resource management, and compounded the land degradation problem. On the other hand, collapse of some of the resource governance systems operating pre-1994 have left a gap that has not been effectively filled. Indeed, up to 1994, resource conservation was actively promoted by organized agriculture (associations and unions) with strong support from the Department of Agriculture. This was mainly through District Soil Conservation Committees, Provincial Soil Conservation Committees and a National Conservation Advisory Board who directly advised the Minister of Agriculture on resource conservation related issues. After 1994, most of these structures ceased to exist or have become ineffective. Where these structures still exist, they are at Provincial level with no over-arching controlling body that oversees them, making them ineffective. There is evidence to show that the soil conservation committees had a real impact on the control of soil erosion and that similar governance structures could be developed to replace obsolete ones, albeit suited to the current socio-economic and political construct; and modelled on the principles of Community Based Natural Resource Management.

On the policy and regulatory front, the current Environmental Impact Assessment tool and regulations for sustainable development does not adequately mitigate threats to environmental resources¹⁵ and furthermore the current MPRDA (Mineral and Petroleum Development Act) legislation does not allow for effective environmental impact assessment of

¹⁵ De Villiers et al. 2008. Review of the effectiveness and efficiency of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) system in South Africa. 20 November 2008. Mosakong Management cc. In association with: Environomics cc Savannah Pty Ltd. And environmental counsel cc

mining activities; leaving a critical gap in policy and regulation around sustainability of fracking. South Africa does not possess any fracking-specific policies or regulations, at a time when the country is considering allowing fracking in the Karoo. Consequently, there are no systems for independent and objective assessment and monitoring the impacts of shale gas mining on the hydrology and ground water of the Karoo, or how this will impact sustainable livelihoods in the region. The rural authorities have limited institutional capacity to undertake such analyses or manage the consequences of fracking.

Incremental reasoning and Global Benefits: The UNCCD proposes that a zero net land degradation can be achieved through the adoption of: i) knowledge-based technologies, policies and practices that integrate land, water and biodiversity in land use; and ii) soil and vegetation management practices that enhance primary productivity while creating a positive carbon sequestration. These are the same conditions South Africa proposes as relevant for advancing the green economy. While the large baseline program is addressing various aspects of land degradation, soil and water conservation, none of it is being done within the context of either advancing the zero net land degradation, or the green economy. This is primarily because the resource management models that would facilitate the achievement of the two important concepts are not yet in place, and the institutional, policy and financial incentives needed for the effective formulation and sustainable implementation of the models are unknown. Without the GEF intervention, implementation of the baseline programs will continue without linking the important factors of ecosystem functionality, droughts and zero net land degradation to the green economy, making them less effective. The proposed project will build on the impressive baseline to establish the capacity, knowledge and policies required to tweak the baselines to develop and implement models of achieving zero net land degradation in South Africa, in support of the green economy and resilient communities. Working in three landscapes (Eastern Cape, Karoo and Olifants), the project will forge partnerships across the private sector, academic institutions, farmers, civil society and government, and use the partnerships to develop and test a knowledge-based model for rehabilitating currently degraded land and reducing further degradation of land and ecosystem services. The model will include a combination of technologies, capacities, incentives, policies and practices that integrate land and water in land use, managing for heterogeneity and complexity, in order to increase primary productivity sustainably and enhance the resilience of the agro-ecological systems.

In the Eastern Cape project will focus primarily on the Cacadu District Municipality with a few sites in the Chris Hani, Amatole and OR Tambo District Municipalities. In the Karoo, the project will work in the Central Karoo and Ubuntu Municipalities, which are based in the Nama-Karoo biome, and are critical dryland ecosystems, supporting agriculture and tourism. Here the project will focus on critical riparian ecosystem services, in an area likely to be one of the hardest hit by climate change and where the ecosystem is under increasing pressure from proposed industrial developments such as uranium mining, wind farming and shale gas exploration. In the Olifants, the project will focus on the Greater Sekhukhune District Municipality, which is part of the former homeland of Lebowa and home to a large number of rainfed subsistence farming households.

The project will in particular put in place measures to reduce soil erosion and degradation, which costs South Africa nearly US\$ 256 million annually in dam sedimentation and increased water treatment costs. The costs associated with neutralizing the effects of acid rain (caused by energy generation) on soils in Mpumalanga are estimated at US\$ 3.2 million per year, while the loss of soil nutrients through degradation costs US\$ 192 million per year. By providing a model to safeguard these valuable resources, the project will help South Africa advance the Green Economy and improve the quality of life sustainably.

The full realization of the expected global environmental benefits described above requires GEF support and provides significant added value to efforts to reduce land degradation in South Africa. Since sub-tropical thickets are exceptionally rich in carbon (given the semi-arid areas in which they occur), if landowners adopt the methods and restore the degraded landscapes, it is estimated that about 146 million tons of CO₂e would ultimately be sequestered over a 30-year period (subject to investor funding). This is because roughly 150-200 t CO₂e will be sequestered for every hectare that has been replanted. Should a methodology become available for REDD in subtropical thicket, a further 9 million tons of CO₂e would be secured and degradation of 250 000 hectares of semi-arid thicket would be prevented. In addition, intact landscape carbon stocks provide sustained and optimal ecosystem goods and services, equating to sustained rural livelihoods. Indeed, it is estimated that every hectare of restored subtropical thicket secures a hectare of topsoil, in addition to securing the habitat and hence biodiversity in one of the 34 Global Biodiversity Hotspots.

The projects will help achieve the objective as described below.

Component 1: Knowledge skills and institutional capacities support SLM model development and guide ecosystems and land rehabilitation programs while building resilience:

The project aims to leverage scientific understanding, institutional and human capacities to put in place land management, livestock and agricultural production systems that simultaneously increase primary productivity, rehabilitate land and ecosystems and build resilience of natural resources dependent communities; thereby reducing the vulnerability of agro-ecosystems to environmental change (i.e. climate change, land degradation and other human induced impacts). This component will be achieved through two key outcomes, namely: i) knowledge, and ii) capacities. Under the first outcome (knowledge), the project will support the formulation of a robust geo-based agro-ecological and hydrological information system, which will enable analysis of the linkages between land and ecosystem degradation, drought, climate-driven vulnerabilities and resilience of ecosystems and livelihoods. This will provide the knowledge basis for developing and piloting land management models that increase productivity while simultaneously rehabilitating degraded lands, and increase resilience under uncertainty related to climate change. The assessments will be complemented by analyses of critical supporting issues such as the cost-effectiveness of land and ecosystem rehabilitation in the context of a green economy; the current carrying capacities of the land/ecosystems in the three biomes and the discrepancies between the carrying capacities and current demands on the ecosystems (for small stock in Karoo and Eastern Cape and farming in the Olifants); integrated assessment of climate-related hazards, vulnerabilities and climate-sensitive natural resources. The latter will identify threats to ecosystems and livelihood resilience. Collectively, these assessments will form the basis of knowledge-based recommendations for mitigating the threats which will be incorporated into the land/ecosystem rehabilitation models for the three landscapes.

Under the second outcome, the communities in the Karoo, Eastern Cape and Olifants will be empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to increase ecological viability, rehabilitation, ecosystem services delivery and resilience. This will increase sustainable production, advance local level green economy, and reduce vulnerability of the natural and social capital for over 50,000 households, with potential for upscaling to cover over 100,000 hectares. More specifically, the project will deliver the following outputs: training programs formulated and used to increase skills for technical staff of relevant institutions (government, municipalities, CSO, CBOs) and resources users in the fields of SLM, land/ecosystem rehabilitation, climate change and relatedness to resilience, productivity and landscapes, etc.; local level institutions for the successful adoption of CBNRM principles established and/or strengthened with management, monitoring, planning, land use technical skills and operational capacities, putting over 100,000 ha under SLM; a strategy for maintaining capacity developed by the project formulated and implementation agreed. It will also facilitate the identification of economically viable, climate smart land/ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices for over 100,000 ha. This will lead to improvement in livelihoods and vital ecosystem attributes in the landscapes (NPP, reduced soil erosion, increased cover, increased structural complexity of agro-ecosystems). It will also lead to the rehabilitation of critical riverine and other important wetlands in the Karoo, where the return of the riverine rabbit will be used as an indicator for effective rehabilitation. Negative impacts of overgrazing will be addressed through the piloting of “an SLM compliant ecologically viable livestock farming system” by at least 1000 farmers in the Karoo and the Eastern Cape. In addition, the negative impacts of cultivation on soil erosion, declining soil fertility and reduced food production will be reduced via adoption of conservation agriculture (which includes zero tillage) by at least 10,000 households. Over 100,000 tree seedlings will also be planted in carefully selected strategic places in the three landscapes. The impact of droughts, flooding and siltation in dams will be reduced through the establishment of strategic rehabilitation measures in sensitive areas including construction of check dams to slow water flow, rehabilitation of old gulleys /rills; creation of and maintenance of large, structurally complex patches of vegetation; improving/creating buffers around sensitive areas e.g. river banks.

Component 2: Incentives for the adoption of SLM devised and implemented, and governance systems support SLM:

This component will investigate the potential financial incentives for the effective adoption of ecologically sustainable land and resource use practices. Working with the Dry Lands Fund, this component will produce two clear outputs: development of a methodology for validation of the carbon content of spekbooms in the Albany thicket (Eastern Cape) and expand the area under carbon credits; and development of a land and ecosystems stewardship program that overcomes the current limitations of the effectiveness of the biodiversity stewardship program in the communal lands, particularly in the dry lands. Under output 1, the project will deliver a new Voluntary Carbon Standard methodology for effectively assessing the carbon storage of the highly variable subtropical thickets and croplands. It is estimated that by the end of the project, approximately 10,000 ha of land would be under the carbon project (to be confirmed during PPG). The project will therefore facilitate the completion of basic feasibility studies for the carbon project expansion, including mapping the vegetation and extent of degradation (building on the LADA assessments). It will also facilitate the signing of 30-year contracts between landowners and carbon credit buyers (voluntary market along the current project) to secure

the investment. It will also ensure that the detailed baseline methodologies are followed for the Voluntary Carbon Standard (VCS) and CCBA validation purposes; and, that Project Documents (PDs) are compiled and completed for VCS and CCBA.

Under output 2, the DryLands Fund will mobilize funds from the public and private sectors and other development agencies to plug funding gaps critical to scaling up of environmental and poverty alleviation initiatives; and, fast track a green economy in the project areas. The business sector has expressed interest in the Fund and several company heads sit on the Fund’s Steering Committee. It is envisaged that the mines will play a substantial role in supporting the Fund through their corporate social responsibility programmes: indeed, a 2010 Directorate of Environmental Affairs study reported that there was potentially about ZAR 30m (US\$ 4 million at an exchange rate of 7.5) available from private sector for land restoration and sustainable land use management practices. The Drylands Fund will therefore seek to support income generating SLM practices that rehabilitate degraded lands, increase green jobs, increase food security, advance mitigation and adaptation, demonstrate ways of increasing productivity without causing land degradation etc. This will also advance the applicability of the land stewardship program, identifying incentives that effectively facilitate uptake of stewardship under land rehabilitation and management context.

Under output 3 (governance), the project will facilitate the identification of SLM friendly land and ecosystem governance systems cognizant of the need to redress the negative impacts of the political history in tandem with promoting ecologically viable land management practices; these will be piloted in the three landscapes, lessons will be generated and used to inform the national debate on land reform and its role in the green economy. The question of land and natural resources governance in South Africa is particularly difficult due to the political history of the country, and the resultant inequalities it caused. However, it has become increasingly clear that the current land and resource governance arrangements are not adequately facilitating the widespread adoption of land and resource management practices that integrate ecological considerations in the pursuit of economic development. The advent of the green economy concept creates an opportunity to strengthen land and resources governance, in a manner that promotes securing of the ecosystem services that ultimately must underpin sustainable development of the country, particularly one based on increased productivity from the land and creation of jobs in line with the concept of a green economy.

A.2. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder	Indicative roles and responsibilities
Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA)	Responsible for environmental policy, legislation and developing and implementing South Africa’s UNCCD program of work, including advancing the concept of Zero Net Land Degradation. DEA will provide the primary oversight for the project, and will coordinate the participating institutions to implement their components.
CSIR, EWT, Rhodes University	These institutions will lead on the technical aspects of the project: CSIR on the Olifants, Rhodes will lead the Eastern Cape (Carbon Finance work) and EWT will lead the work on the Karoo. The specific roles and responsibilities will be further detailed during PPG, including budget allocation and project implementation/collaboration mechanisms.
National Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) – represented by the Agricultural Research Council and the LandCare Program	Responsible for some regulatory, compliance and enforcement functions in the target Districts/ Municipalities. Will benefit from capacity development initiative and play a key role in the implementation of the Olifants program (together with CSIR).
Development Bank of South Africa	Is hosting the Dry Lands Fund. DBSA will lead the outcome on the Grants, working/collaborating with all the other institutions.
District Municipalities, including Municipal Councils in the Karoo, Eastern Cape and Olifants (Focal Points to be identified at PPG):	Responsible for planning, budgeting, service delivery and economic development in the target District municipalities. Key implementation partners for all components and co-leaders of the project.
Local communities and community institutions	Local communities will be important beneficiaries of all the project interventions.

A.3 Risk Management

Risks	Risk Mitigation Response
Municipal instability and absorptive capacity of the municipality: Party politics and staff turnover rates have considerable impacts on institutional stability,	Capacity building is a key component of this project, through which issues of staff turnover and general capacity deficiencies will be comprehensively addressed. This will also include expanding partnerships with non-government agencies and building the capacity of the land managers and their committees

and the sustainability of land management programs and interventions.	to boost the government technical teams.
Conflicts between different stakeholder groups: Different mandates and imperatives of the regulatory authorities and different expectations of local stakeholders could result in conflicts between stakeholder groups.	The project will seek to minimize conflicts between stakeholder groups by developing the detailed project in a participatory, inclusive manner. In so doing, it will seek to expose potential conflict areas, and create a platform for discussion and conflict resolution. It is envisaged that the coordination mechanisms that the project will put in place will provide a platform to resolve potential future conflicts, and enable integrated and cooperative planning and governance.
Community willingness to invest resources in improved practices: Many CBNRM type initiatives have failed to deliver expected economic benefits to participating communities and there is a high level of skepticism regarding the returns on investing in improved practices, especially since such investments tend to be profitable in the long-term: short-term livelihood needs may be too compelling and force inappropriate short-term exploitation of resources.	The project will utilize knowledge and lessons generated from successful initiatives to build compelling evidence based arguments for the land users to discount potential short-term benefits and opt for the long-term sustainable benefits. This will be supplemented by the direct support provided by the DBSA-led Drylands Fund (Grants), which will inject short-term benefit yielding projects. Improvement in the extension service will also help with the short-term increase in the productivity of the land.
Climate change: if the current trends of unpredictable droughts continue, this could jeopardize the long-term effectiveness of the project initiatives.	The project will take cognizance of climate scenarios within the target areas so as to anticipate changes and ensure all project activities are climate-proofed. This will be part of the drive to set up systems for research to increase the understanding of the relationships and effects of climate change, drought and land degradation and resilience in the country, using the target areas as the pilots.

A.4. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed and other initiatives

This project will collaborate with:

- The GEF Grasslands Programme, which is a 20-year partnership between national and provincial government departments, conservation agencies, non-governmental organisations, municipalities, and the private sector that seeks to sustain and secure the biodiversity and associated ecosystem services of the grasslands biome for the benefit of current and future generations. The initial phase, funded from 2008-2013 through an investment from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) aimed to ensure that major production sectors are directly contributing to the achievement of biodiversity conservation priorities in the grassland biome.
- It will also collaborate with the training department of Rhodes University. Rhodes University has been running internationally and locally acclaimed short training courses on wetland rehabilitation and health assessment, community-based natural resource management, land degradation assessment and urban forestry. The expertise in running these courses and experience in working with poor rural communities in the Eastern Cape Province is a major strength that will enable us to offer these short courses to local communities and government and non-governmental officials associated with the project. The courses will go a long way in developing local human capacity to facilitate sustainable land management and restoration of degraded areas by combining proven scientific knowledge and local ecological knowledge.

Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions:

This project was prioritized through the National Portfolio Identification Exercise undertaken by the key UNCCD and Land Management stakeholders in South Africa. Its development was guided by a significant representation of those stakeholders, led by the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), the Agricultural Research Council (ARC), Rhodes University, the Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA) and the Endangered Wildlife Conservation Trust (EWCT) – and chaired by the Department of Environment (DEA). It is in line with all the key national policies and strategies, notably the *National Development Plan Vision for 2030* that recognizes that natural resource management, economic growth and poverty alleviation are closely intertwined; Linked to this is *Presidential National Outcome 10* and the new call for advancing the Green Economy. It is also in line with the country's National Action Program (NAP), which seeks to protect and restore land resources as well as promote awareness training and mitigation strategies. The project will contribute to on-going efforts by the Department of Agriculture's LANDCARE program and the Department

of Environmental Affairs Stewardship Program.

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

Although South Africa has not accessed much GEF funds for addressing Land Degradation in the past, it has a large body of work (and investments) addressing land management, to which this project will be closely coordinated with. In the Karoo, it will build on the work done by the CEPF-funded Succulent Karoo Ecosystem Programme (SKEP), which was multi-stakeholder bioregional conservation and development programme of Namibia and South Africa. The project aimed to develop conservation as a popular land-use rather than and defined sustainable grazing management principles. The CEPF funding ended although is currently involved with sustainable communal grazing management and thus provides baseline information on working with biodiversity stewardship in communal land practices. Within the Nama-Karoo, the project will collaborate with the Karoo Development Forum, which is however limited in scope to small-scale research mostly on alternative livelihoods for the Karoo, such as tourism, and Renu-Karoo. They are supporting small-scale restoration business led by individuals with linkages to academic institutions. The group has been generating baseline research on the Nama-Karoo ecology and rehabilitation for more than twenty years.

The project will operate in line with the third Land Degradation Focal Area Objective: Reduce pressures on Natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape. It will contribute to outcomes 3.1 and 3.2: Enhanced enabling environments between sectors in support of SLM, and good management practices in the wider landscape demonstrated and adopted by relevant economic sectors

B.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage for implementing this project

The project is in line with UNDP Country Programme Component II: Climate Change and Greening South Africa's Economy; Outcome 2 on harnessing of South Africa's biodiversity resources to address sustainability whilst creating economic opportunities. This outcome focuses on strengthening nature-based options for poverty reduction and employment generation, while also assisting South Africa to strengthen its role as a knowledge and policy hub for pro-poor biodiversity management. UNDP will contribute US \$1.0 million of co-financing from its country program.

UNDP is the lead agency within the United Nations (UN) system helping countries to develop capacity for Ecosystems and Biodiversity Management. With 40 years of transformational work in Ecosystems and Biodiversity management, and building on an established global network of country offices and regional centres, UNDP has been supporting countries to shape and drive natural resources management for sustainable development—driven by national commitments, needs and priorities. More specifically, UNDP works directly with countries to integrate ecosystems management and biodiversity into poverty reduction, development planning and economic sectors through: (a) developing capacity at the individual, institutional and systemic levels to remove barriers to, and identify new options for, effective governance and finance for biodiversity and ecosystem management and (b) assisting countries to identify, access, combine and sequence environmental finance to address the biodiversity and ecosystem financing gap, mobilize pro-poor markets for ecosystem goods and services, and generate sustainable livelihoods.

Last but not least, UNDP has a wealth of experience in supporting ecosystems and biodiversity management projects in South Africa. Past and ongoing projects implemented through UNDP Country Office include the CAPE project, the Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative, The National Grasslands Programme, to mention a few. The UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Team comprised of 1 Principal Technical Advisor and 4 Regional Technical Advisors sits in the country office and is on hand to provide technical assistance and ensure smooth implementation.

PART III: ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT AND GEF AGENCY

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Zaheer Fakir (Mr)	GEF Operational Focal Point	DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS	18 TH JANUARY 2013

B. GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation.

Agency & Coordinator	Signature	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone & email address
Adriana Dinu OIC UNDP GEF		27 March 2013	Veronica Muthui - RTA, EBDUNDP	+27123548140 veronica.muthui@undp.org