



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

GEF ID:	5789		
Country/Region:	Botswana		
Project Title:	Using SLM to Improve the Integrity of the Makgadikgadi Ecosystem and to Secure the Livelihoods of Rangeland Dependent Communities		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5359 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$792,832
Co-financing:	\$6,795,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,587,832
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	NB: This is a one step-MSP.	Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		There is a letter from the GEF OFP. We will consider the total amount that is mentioned (\$858,131), as the fee calculation is not right. May 21, 2014 Cleared.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 		The requested grant (US\$850,387) is within the available resources for

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

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Botswana (\$868,151).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 		Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCE under the principle of equitable access 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		NA
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>		<p>The project is aligned with the LD3 objective.</p> <p>May 21, 2014 We understand that the project will report on the LD3 objective and the outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 (table A, p1). However, please, note that the text also refers to the outcome 3.3. Even if the project also targets to leverage more investments, we suggest to focus on the first two outcomes LD 3.1 and 3.2, and to not overpromise.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>		<p>The project is in line with the NAP developed under UNCCD and the National Strategy for Poverty Reduction.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	<p>6. 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>The problems and the baseline projects are described.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?		<p>The project framework is concise and clear. The outcomes are clear. The outputs reflect the expected results from the activities.</p> <p>Activities are detailed in the project document.</p>
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?		<p>The section 66, p15, could be better developed, but the information is available in the project document. Please remind it is a project financed by LD allocations: SLM benefits are the priority. Biodiversity and carbon benefits are welcome as ancillary benefits.</p> <p>The project is developed under the LD focal area: Global Environment Benefits are expected to be multiple, due to the better management of 1,900,000 ha of lands and rangelands in the Southern Sua Pan region. SLM issues will be mainstreamed in decision making process.</p> <p>May 21, 2014 Cleared.</p>
	9. 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>Yes. Chapter A3, sections 76, 77, and 78.</p> <p>A particular attention is paid to gender issues (UNDP gender marker, women self help groups, community support, etc).</p> <p>Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?		Yes, we appreciate the stakeholder analysis, the major role of local farmers/pastoralists, their associations, as well as the partnerships between government agencies and NGOs (Birdlife).
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		Addressed, including climate change risks.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		Chapter A6, p21. Addressed.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		This is a one step MSP.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		<p>The cost-effectiveness is challenging. The project is designed to be catalytic and help mainstreaming SLM in rangeland areas of Makgadikgadi. The project will target legitimate stakeholders and extension services to replicate and extend the approach. Empowerment and participation at regional and local levels will be instrumental.</p> <p>Can you elaborate on how an NGO as BirdLife will have enough powers and legitimacy to help institutions and agencies to mainstream SLM in their policies? We understand the technical role of Birdlife for the activities on the ground to complete the lack of capacities and human power of institutions. However, we would like clarification on the buy-in and ownerships from the Department of Forestry and Range Resources, the Department of Environmental Affairs and other sectors (animal production, crop production). What mechanisms will be in place to help government agencies and their staff to mainstream SLM in their policies and their processes? Please clarify the partnerships between the NGO and government agencies.</p> <p>May 21, 2014 Cleared.</p>
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes		The project budget is limited in regards to the ambition of the project, but the project is using all possible GEF resources.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	and outputs?		An section on financing sustainability will be appreciated. May 21, 2014 Cleared.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		The cofinancing ratio reaches 1:8.8. Please provide letters of cofinancing.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?		The project management costs are under five percent and particularly low for such project. May 21, 2014 Cleared.
	19. <u>At PIE</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		NA
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Please, address the comments in the cells 15 and 17. You are also invited to revise or complete some information (cells 8 and 16). May 21, 2014 The project is recommended for approval. However, the approval will become effective on receipt of the LD tracking tools. Please, also note the comment made in the cell 4.
	First review*		April 10, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		May 21, 2014
Review Date (s)	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.**