



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

GEF ID:	4751		
Country/Region:	Botswana		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming SLM in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland District Productive Landscapes for Improved livelihoods		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,081,800
Co-financing:	\$28,599,000	Total Project Cost:	\$31,780,800
PIF Approval:	January 09, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	February 29, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Veronica Muthui

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Entry into force of the UNFCCC in Botswana: 26 of December, 1996	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	There is a letter in date of Oct. 3, 2011, signed by the OFP, and cc to the UNCDD focal point. However the letter shows many discrepancies that need to be fixed. - The project name mentioned in the letter is slightly different, please correct. - The total GEF resources mentioned in the third section (US\$3,081,800) are wrong. The given amount is the project grant, not the total financing (see third para. of the letter).	

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

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

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- The budget breakdown is not correct. Please do not round up figures. If Agency fees are 10 percent of \$3,181,800, the fees are \$318,180 (not \$318,200). And then, correct the total amount is \$3,480,000 and not \$3,500,000.</p> <p>December 30, 2011</p> <p>The point was not addressed in the revised PIF. However, through a separate sending, UNDP sent a letter of endorsement in word format (?) with revised figures. The title is still the former one (mainstreaming SLM in rangeland area...) and not the new one (using markets and policy incentives to enhance management of rangelands in Ngamiland distric productive landscapes).</p> <p>The point is considered addressed for the letter, but please make the title consistent in the different UNDP documents. For instance, the responses to the GEFSEC review in date of 12/21/2011 mentioned the title "mainstreaming SLM...".</p> <p>Actually, with the clarifications given in the responses and the revised PIF, we prefer the former title "Mainstream SLM in rangeland area of Ngamiland Productive landscapes for improving livelihoods". This title reflects how the GEF resource must be used on the top of baseline projects, whereas the other title mainly reflects what is financed by the cofinancing ("using markets and policy</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>incentives to enhance management of rangelands in Ngamiland district productive landscapes"). Please confirm the right title and make the documents consistent.</p> <p>January 9, 2011 The right title is "Mainstream SLM in rangeland area of Ngamiland Productive landscapes for improving livelihoods". Addressed.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Bostwana has an LD STAR allocation of \$5,21 million. The proposed project is around \$3,500,000 (see further for appropriate corrections), in the range of the available LD allocation.</p> <p>Please correct and adjust the table A: 1) The amounts for the management costs are reversed between the GEF and the cofinancing column. 2) same comment for the total project costs.</p>	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Table B: Management costs: \$201,800 versus \$200,000 in the table A. Please correct.</p> <p>Table D: If the project amount is \$3,191,820, the 10% fees have to be corrected (\$319,182), as well as the total.</p> <p>Please check that the amounts are compatible with what is mentioned in the letter of endorsement.</p> <p>At the end, please check that the amounts are consistent between tables A, B, C, and D. Thanks.</p> <p>December 30, 2011 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	n/a
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	- Outcomes and outputs in the table A are compatible, even if not identical, with the result framework. Depending on the changes in the result framework after revision of the incremental reasoning, please update the table A (and then use the same formulation for outcomes than those included in the	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>GEF5 LD strategy).  - See cell. 6 about the errors. Please revise the numbers.</p> <p>December 30, 2011  Addressed.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>		<p>LD-1  LD-3</p>
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes. The project is consistent with the Vision 2016 document, the National Strategy for Poverty Reduction (2006), the National Action Plan for combating land degradation (2006), and locally with the Okavango Delta Management Plan.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	<p>18 Nov 2013 UA:  Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>No. Please, explain how the financial incentives will be sustainable beyond the project duration.</p> <p>December 30, 2011  Addressed.</p>	<p>18 Nov 2013 UA:  Yes.</p>
	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>There is an analysis of the current situation and an information about the baseline projects.  - Please detail the time frame and the origins of funding for each project used in the baseline (national budget? external donors?).  - Please explain the differences between the baseline project amounts (\$25 million) and the proposed cofinancing (\$12.5 million).  - Please explain the use of the \$1 million</p>	<p>18 Nov 2013 UA:  Yes. The baseline has been strengthened as compared to the PIF.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>from the UNDP's core resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- From the table summarizing the incremental reasoning (see B.2), please explain how and who will finance operations that seem out of the scope of the GEF strategy (beef processing and packaging, financial support to the livestock farmers, beef marketing policy).</li> <li>- Please, clarify what will be achieved without the GEF and with the GEF as separate columns. The GEF incremental role is not clear in the table provided in the section B.2.</li> </ul> <p>December 30, 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We take note about the statement that the lack of market opportunities led to high concentration of cattles, associated to overgrazing. However, a reference or a scientific evidence should be welcome, as other papers say the opposite (FAO, Burgess). Actually, after the outbreaks in the mid 90's and the slaughter of 350,000 head of cattle, the Ngamiland area is the region where an impressive recovery of grazing area was demonstrated.</li> <li>- All other points are addressed.</li> </ul> <p>January 9, 2011</p> <p>We acknowledge receipt of the references and the rewriting. Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>From what we understand of the project, the activities under the component 1 are eligible and well based on an incremental reasoning. We welcome the use of 2/3 of the resources for field oriented activities. We will invite the agency to explore ways to mobilize a maximum of resources for activities on the ground with local stakeholders - smallholders, local communities, and professional organizations. Please, develop.</p> <p>However, we are not sure about the reasoning and the use of GEF resources for activities under the component 2 (2.1., 2.2 please note there are two outputs 2.1 in the table B, 2.4). It seems that these activities should be financed by the baseline projects. All activities linked to market and trade in livestock and non-livestock products (2.1, 2.2, 2.3) and finance (2.4 "deal flow brokerage of grants and loans from private and public institutions..." are not welcome for financing under the LD focal area. Some of these outputs are even not really outputs, but please clarify and correct.</p> <p>- The outputs 2.5 and 2.6 (corrected</p>	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>numerotation) on land governance are however welcome. The support to a network of livestock producer is certainly one of the most appropriate activities on the top of baseline projects (if it is not financed elsewhere).</p> <p>- We do not understand how the outcomes linked to "land tenure, agriculture, and livestock policies recognize SLM principles + revision of the three tier land holding system" will be addressed. Please develop (and probably reinforce) activities linked to land tenure and governance.</p> <p>December 30, 2011</p> <p>- We take note of the explanations and the confirmation that the GEF resources will used for SLM aspects on the ground and that the market and trade related activities will be covered by UNDP and BMC.</p> <p>- However, we still have a question about the reasoning: it is mentioned in the para 14 (p6) that the EU market constraints are too expensive. However these constraints have a clear purpose: the protection of the consumers to ensure that the meat is not contaminated with different diseases that are frequent in Bostwana and especially in the Ngamiland. Parts of the cofinancing projects seem to address concern raised by meat processors to export in other areas than UE, as the SADC. There are potential reputational risks for the GEF</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>that need to be clarified. Please, address the complementary questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is there not a risk to be associated to a cheapest value chain with risks to produce a lower quality product?</li> <li>2) Will there be a quality process (equivalent to the EU and BMC system) to protect the health of consumers?</li> <li>3) Does not a new value chain outside the EU and BMC regulations present a higher risk to sell contaminated meats?</li> <li>4) On the long run, don't you think that a too big development of the meat value chain in the Ngamiland will not be a threat for protected areas? Are the ranchers ready to live close to protected areas where the buffaloes are a source of endemism of cattle diseases?</li> </ol> <p>January 9, 2011 We take note on the elements provided on the meat value chain and the different products, as well as the elements related to protected area management. Addressed.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	- Please, take note that based on our understanding of the reasoning and the details given on components, a large part of the project framework (component 2) seem not eligible and not welcome under the GEF LD strategy and the LD1 objective "to maintain or improve flow of agroecosystem services to sustaining the livelihoods of local communities".	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please address the comments on outputs made in the cell. 13 and the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Component 1, output 1.2: We understand that a bush control program will provide incentive for harvesting bush for the production of charcoal and woodfuel. First, it sounds weird to promote the use of charcoal and woodfuel, as it is a concern in many areas for greenhouse gases emission reasons and because of the potential threatening on natural areas. Second, what will happen once the areas will have been bush-cleared or when the project will be out of resources to finance the incentive program? Is this output sustainable on the long term?</li> <li>- Component 2: Only the third outcome (land tenure, agriculture, and livestock production policies recognizing SLM policies) is eligible under the GEF based on our understanding of the reasoning. The other two outcomes linked to an increase of 20-30% in sales of livestock and livestock products and the access to additional funding to improve trade should be financed by the baseline projects. Please revise.</li> <li>- In the text, p9, section 16: "Under markets, the project will work with the private sector to explore and expand alternatives markets for livestock and livestock products". This part should be</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>financed by the cofinancing baseline projects, but not with GEF resources. Please clarify.</p> <p>- In the text, p. 10, first section: "the project will adopt a two pronged approach: producing a broader range of meat products for a broader range of markets". This statement reinforces our previous comment. These activities are not eligible and should be financed by the cofinancing.</p> <p>- Further, it is mentioned in the same section that "the project will pilot the development of small scale feedlots at community levels as an alternative to the handful of large commercially operated feedlots upon which BMC currently relies upon". Please clarify, but it seems that this activity is not welcome under the GEF financing."</p> <p>- Same section: "the project will pilot innovative further sanitation technologies such as the construction of long drop sanitation pits for rural communities to reduce measles in cattle". Again, we understand the interest of the measure, but this activity is not eligible under the GEF LD strategy. Please, revise.</p> <p>- "The project will also identify a range of other non livestock based income generating activities. This will reduce the pressure on livestock..." The</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>evidence and the reasoning are not obvious - if there is an increase of market with livestock products, we do not see why other activities will reduce the pressures on livestock. At the end, there will probably be more diverse economic activities, but no less pressures on livestock and land. Please, clarify.</p> <p>December 30, 2011 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Please, develop the methods and indicators to measure the GEB. Please, see how to include an indicator to measure the enhancement of productivity as proposed in the GEF strategy for LD (greenness measure as proxy) and the livelihood of heirders (farmer income).</p> <p>December 30, 2011 Addressed.</p>	<p>18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>Yes. p. 10 section 23. cleared.</p>	<p>18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to section B.2 in the CEO endorsement template.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>- We understand and welcome that the local communities should be the main beneficiaries and will be involved in the implementation and monitoring of processes initiatives, processes, and impacts (see B. 5). This aspect is critical for the project and need to be further</p>	<p>18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to section B.1 including the Table on stakeholders.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>developed during the PPG.  - Please confirm the part of the project that will be spent for activities on the ground and addressing local issues (and not spent for planning, processes, studies, or training of institutions).</p> <p>December 30, 2011  - Ok to provide a further analysis on local communities during the PPG.  - We take the point that around 90 percent of the GEF resources will be used for field oriented activities to improve range management practices and bush encroachment and 10 percent will be assigned to planning and training. Please, confirm it at CEO endorsement.  - Please clarify why you mentioned in the response under the cell. 20 that GEF resources will also be used for marketing of livestock? In the result framework, we understand that all activities related to markets and trade are covered by cofinancing. Again, we do not see how GEF resources can be justified for such activity. Please clarify.</p> <p>January 9, 2011  Addressed.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>Main risks are described. Please include a comprehensive risk analysis at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>December 30, 2011  Please include a comprehensive risk analysis at CEO endorsement. At PIF</p>	<p>18 Nov 2013 UA:  Yes. Refer to section A.6 in the CEO endorsement template.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		level, sorry to not get your attention before, but please mention the risks due to climate variability and changes. Actually, Botswana has encountered 12 dry episodes in the last 22 years with potentially economic consequences on ranches and notably severe impacts to the poorest communities (Mafisa herders).	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	A list of projects and initiatives are given. We understand that coordination mechanisms will be identified during the PPG.	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to section A7 of teh CEO endorsement template.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Legitimate partners are mentioned, mainly institutional. Please develop, even briefly, how the project will be implemented to deliver results and impacts on the ground for local stakeholders.  December 30, 2011 Addressed.	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to UNDP Project document, p. 48 f.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. The project has benefitted from the project cycle, taking STAP advise and PM comments into account during PPG.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No. Please, maintain management costs strictly under 5 percent. Please confirm the resources allocated for technical components. Based on the table B (C1:\$2,000,000 and C2: \$990,020 \$2,991,820), the management	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		costs should be under \$149,501.  December 30, 2011 Addressed	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Address comments above (cell. 11, 13, and 17).  See cell. 11, 13, and 17, some comments stay pending.  January 9, 2011 Addressed.	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The cofinancing ratio is 1:3.91. Based on the information given on the baseline projects and the other initiatives, the cofinancing ratio should be improved. Please, correct.  December 30, 2011 The cofinancing has been improved to 1:5 Addressed.	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. All co-financing listed in Table C has is supported by confirmation letters.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	See cell. 11: Please detail the nature of the work financed by UNDP's core resources.  December 30, 2011 Addressed.	18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. UNDP contributes \$1 million in cash.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. LD TT provided.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. The project has taken STAP advise into account during PPG and responded to STAP comments.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		n/a
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>December 30, 2011            The PIF has significantly been improved. However, some clarifications are still needed. Please address the pending comments in cells 2, 11, 13, 17 (and then 24). Thanks. At CEO endorsement, please include the responses to the items included in the cell 31.</p> <p>January 9, 2011            All points have been addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	<b>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide a comprehensive risk analysis.</li> <li>- Detail and confirm the cofinancing.</li> <li>- Include a Monitoring plan with indicators compatible with the GEF5 LD strategy (productivity, income).</li> <li>- Detail implementation arrangements.</li> <li>- Detail the social and traditional structure in the villages and how the project is going to work with the appropriate local stakeholders.</li> <li>- Provide the breakdown of resources used for field oriented activities,</li> </ul>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		planning, and training.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		18 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. PM recommends the project for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 05, 2011	November 18, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 30, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 09, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>We understand that the PPG will be used to develop activities that will inform the preparation of the Full Size Project. These activities deal with 1) baseline data collection and information gap analysis, 2) assessment of various capacities, and 3) final analysis to refine the strategy, the reasoning, the budget, and the M&amp;E Plan. These activities are typically compatible with a PPG.</p> <p>- There is no information about the consolidation/finalization of the project document. We understand, by omission, that this aspect will be taken by the cofinancing. Please confirm that UNDP will lead this finalization.</p> <p>- Please, confirm that the tracking tools will be part of the final package.</p> <p>- It is mentioned that the cofinancing is brought up by the Gouvernement of Botswana. Is there any cofinancing from the Agency?</p>

		<p>February 16, 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The point related to the tracking tool is taken.</li> <li>- Please, confirm that the consolidation of project and other relevant documents for submission are financed by the agency and/or the cofinancing. Thanks.</li> </ul> <p>February 28, 2012 Addressed.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please confirm the timeframe in the section A (please, remind that we use the Month/Day/Year system).</li> <li>- There is a discrepancy between the table E (25 weeks of local consultants for \$40,000, meaning \$1,600 per week) and the annex A (26.7 weeks at \$1,500 for a total of \$40,050). Please, make the information consistent.</li> </ul> <p>February 16, 2012 Addressed.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	<p>Not yet. Upon receipt of a revised version properly addressing the points above (see cell. 1 and 2), the PPG will be recommended.</p> <p>February 16, 2012 Please address the point in the cell 1. Once the clarification will be given, the PPG will be recommended. Thanks.</p> <p>February 28, 2012 The PPG is recommended for clearance.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 30, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 28, 2012

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.