



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9154		
Country/Region:	Botswana		
Project Title:	Managing the Human-wildlife Interface to Sustain the Flow of Agro-ecosystem Services and Prevent Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Drylands		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5590 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2 Program 3; LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,996,789
Co-financing:	\$22,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,646,789
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Pheмо Kgomotso

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental		

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

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	6-20-15 This is a \$150K PPG for a \$5.9 project Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 			
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review	June 20, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	1-8-17 The changes were explained in detail on pages 7-9 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	1-8-17 GENERAL We understand that the project is targeting the Kalahari landscape and especially the wildlife managed areas (corridors) between the Kgalagadi Transfrontier park and the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, with integrated landscape planning and management in the districts of Ghanzi and Kgalagadi. However, it is difficult appreciate the geographic scope of the proposed interventions. The Kgalagadi and Ghanzi districts	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>cover a huge area (+223,000km²), equivalent to Kentucky+Pennsylvania or two times the size of Liberia. Map 1 in Project document needs to be customized for the target geographies and neighboring PAs. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>1. Except in the project objective mentioning the two districts, the result framework is silent on the targeted areas. Please define scope for each of the components/outcomes or outputs as appropriate, and update the result framework. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>2. Since the geographic scope of the project is not clearly defined, it is not possible to understand the relevance of the interventions in the wider landscape, compared to the existing investments (and needs) in adjacent protected areas. (As stated before, Map 1 in Project document needs to be customized for the target geographies and neighboring PAs). March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>3. Move (after improving) detailed description of the Components from Project Document to GEF CEO Endorsement template. As the later</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>document is read first (and probably the only one), that may reduce unnecessary questions for a potential review. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>4. Result framework (table B) and table E: please justify the proposed corporate results of 500,000 ha under the CR1 and 3 million of ha under the CR2. It is dubious that the project can claim 3 million ha under SLM (equivalent to the size of Maryland State or Belgium). Having integrated landscape plans at the Wildlife Management Area or district level is not synonymous of SLM. Same questioning for the 1.0 million ha under improved management for global importance biodiversity (area equivalent to Lebanon for instance). March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>5. Detail: We suggest to always use the same units in the tables and the text – hectares of km2- It is confusing to mix both. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>1. Understanding the component is for national-level activities</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>(especially National Strategy on interagency collaboration), the component will greatly benefit from having a more focused geographic target where these investments can be tested. Otherwise, the capacity building activities are likely to get diluted across the country and dissipate soon after project conclusion. ACTION REQUESTED: Suggest a pilot target areas. If Ghanzi and Kgalagadi Districts, then mention them in Table B of CEO Endorsement. It is difficult to see the target area (whatever that may be) in Map 1 of Project Document. Need to show the perimeter of the target area more clearly. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>2. Output 1.3 Please make reference to the recent decision by CITES COP 13 and the position of Botswana related to the trade of ivory. Please also reflect on the likelihood (and risk) of the proposed interventions not being sufficient for communities to replace the gains made by trading with hunting. What are the incentives for communities to do "monitoring and reporting on wildlife crime" when some of the poachers or informants may be from the communities themselves.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p> <p>1. This component needs to relate to the overall objective of the GWP. Are the target areas relevant to the GWP? March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>2. Output 2.1 (capacity building program) should be quantified (# of training, # of beneficiaries) to reflect the nature and importance of the activities under this output. If relevant, please provide geographic target and details of the proposed interventions in all these fields. We wonder if the output 2.1 on a capacity building programme should not be transferred in the component 1, under the outcome related to the increased capacity to tackle wildlife issues. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>3. Output 2.2. Need geographic target. More detailed maps will be welcome, other than the map 1 in the Project Document. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>4. Output 2.3: the development of platforms of dialogue is welcome in general in GEF projects with SLM and NRM aspects, but you have to</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>develop the institutional anchorage of such entity, preferably using existing structures and processes, and the sustainability aspects once the project will have closed. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>5. Output 2.4. Are the target communities in areas affected by HWC? Are 500 ha meaningful in the context of GWP? March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>6. Output 2.5 provide more detail on the mechanisms to be used. Current language more appropriate for PIF than for CEO Endorsement. Please use scientific references. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>7. Output 2.6: The rehabilitation of pasture can be potentially financed by GEF resources if you can clarify the sustainability and monitoring aspects, but the point of entry to remove IAS on 500,000 ha is not. The GEF finances removal of IAS in very special cases (islands), not in open areas subject to reinvasion. Only systems designed to avoid the entry of IAS are GEF eligible (see BD Strategy). March 29, 2017: addressed.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>COMPONENT 3.</p> <p>1. The GEF finances biodiversity conservation/management and Sustainable Land Management for quantifiable Global Environment Benefits. Integrated landscape planning can be a part of technical assistance and investment to produce GEB, but is not enough. You cannot claim for 3 million of ha under SLM. SLM is different from landscape planning. Please revise. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>2. Same reasoning for the 500,000 ha to maintain global importance biodiversity: you have to demonstrate that the bush control operations will restore/preserve natural habitats and/or species of global importance. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>3. There is a partial overlap with or embedded in Component 2 (CBNRM). Please clarify or merge. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>4. Please elaborate on the proposed "value chains". Difficult to know what the project will actually do on the ground. These value chains require significant efforts to get the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>job done. March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>5. What is the meaning of developing strategies for CCA and Fire management without providing investments for implementation? March 29, 2017: addressed.</p> <p>6. Output 3.2 The project should be more assertive regarding the proposed interventions. March 29, 2017: addressed</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>1-8-17</p> <p>1. It is difficult to quantify and identify the value for money with only a breakdown of resources per component (Table B in CEO Endorsement). Please provide a budget for each of the Outputs.</p> <p>2. The Budget for Component 1 appears excessive as most of the interventions on developing strategies and capacity building are relatively inexpensive [\$1.6 million for i) a National strategy on inter-agency collaboration and intelligence sharing for combatting wildlife crime; ii) Capacity for inter-agency collaboration; iii) Capacity for CSOs, communities and academia to collaborate with law enforcement, iv)</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Training modules]. The output with the most likely use if significant financial resources is the one on: Local enforcement agencies and National Veterinary Laboratory. The budget for this component (in Project Document) includes around \$848,000 for international and national consultants; ½ of the budget. That appears excessive as they are only being "consulted" and produce documents. No execution. On the other hand, are \$525,000 enough for the proposed activities under outputs 1.2, 1.3 and 1.5 ACTION REQUESTED: Consider reduction in budget of component in favor of funding activities on the ground activities (other components), and reduce funding for consultants (TA) and more for investment.</p> <p>3. Half of the budget is for international/national consultants and experts, leaving only \$1.0 million for investment. As in Component 1, this appear excessive considering the needs for investments on the ground. This component is very unlikely to deliver tangible and measurable results on the ground, when ½ budget is devoted to consultancies.</p> <p>4. In our understanding, the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>component 3 should focus on practical implementation of CBNRM and SLM to secure livelihoods and biodiversity. After the second component – with \$2 million assigned for planning and training (!) – it is not convincing to see again capacity building (output 3.2) and strategies (outputs 3.3 and 3.4). The budget should be reassessed under the different components and a more important part should be assigned to investments on the ground.</p> <p>5. How much will be invested in wildlife based economy and activities on the ground to "make the point that ecotourism is the best opportunity and alternative? Do you think it will be enough? We are mainly seeing capacity development and planning exercises, not much or enough demonstrative exercises on the ground.</p> <p>6. p14: The use of economic valuation of ecosystems is mentioned. Are these studies developed under the current project? They are not reflected in the result framework. Please, revise.</p> <p>March 31, 2017 All points addressed. Explanations</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		and clarifications taken.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	1-8-17 Cleared.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	1-8-17 Please check, revise, and confirm the table C on cofinancing: All cofinancing is announced "in grants", but the details of the proofs of cofinancing reveal a different situation: - The \$1,000,000 from the UNDP country office come from the services of two in-house technical advisors. Not sure if it can be categorized as "grant"; - \$6 million from the Ministry of Agriculture: the letter mentions "in cash"; - \$15 million from the Ministry of Environment: the letter mentions \$14,023,718 in-kind and \$976,282 in cash; - \$500,000 from Birdlife: the letter mentions \$300,000 in projects (grants?) and \$200,000 in-kind. March 31, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Addressed	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	1-8-17 Please confirm with WB that the template submitted to the GEF is the final. March 31, 2017 Addressed	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	1-7-17 1. Please elaborate on the coordination of this project with current and upcoming investments by bilateral agencies (USAID, GIZ and AFD). 2. Please provide a paragraph describing how the project in Botswana has gained from participating in the Global Wildlife Program. 3. Does the project need to consider trans-boundary issues with neighboring countries?	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	1-8-17 Yes. Cleared	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>1-8-17 Yes. Component 4. But please, address the following points: - P14: We agreed with the need to increase the capacities of institutions and individuals and procedures to reduce poaching, wildlife poisoning, and trafficking. However, we are not seeing clearly how it will "ensure environmental sustainability" once the project will have closed. We are conscious that sustainability aspects are challenging, but please develop the reasoning or the directions for sustainability. - p15: you probably meant "MIKE trends"?</p> <p>March 31, 2017 Addressed</p>	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>UK (April 12, 2017)</p> <p>This is a valuable programme which should be supported. Two related comments – first, although it is a single-country programme, its</p>	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>geographic area abuts both Namibia and South Africa, so it would be good to have more information about what the programme is learning from and collaborating with trans-frontier initiatives involving both these countries. Second, to what extent are they learning from KAZA (the Kavango-Zambezi transfrontier conservation area) in northern Botswana, which is facing similar challenges (and with which our regional CRIDF – Climate Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility, is involved)? I was surprised not to see any reference to KAZA in the project documentation</p> <p>5-9-17</p> <p>U.S. Technical Comments: GEF Project #9154, Botswana</p> <p>The United States is pleased that GEF project Managing the human-wildlife interface to sustain the flow of agro-ecosystem services and prevent illegal wildlife trafficking in the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Drylands proposes measures to establish wildlife corridors and reduce habitat fragmentation. The core of this project is integrated land use planning, and we are supportive of</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>the migratory and broad-ranging species taken into account. We would like to note the link between range connectivity and the beef industry's segmentation of land into red, yellow, and green zones for foot and mouth disease (FMD) – a link that we believe is important for project implementers to take into consideration as they further develop the project. Those fences, which are vital for preserving the FMD zones, are disastrous for migratory species.</p> <p>We welcome the ecosystem approach to tourism presented in the project document, which includes a network of strategically planned commercial conservation centers rather than one-off, investment driven enterprises. As many ecotourism ventures often have significant environmental and social impacts, we request that the project implementers adhere to proper safeguards.</p> <p>We are pleased with the strong recognition of the role that invasive species play in land degradation, and the plans to develop a productive supply chain for exotic species that aids in their management and reduces encroachment.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>We agree with the segments of the proposal related to the threat to vultures from both direct and indirect poisoning, which is an issue throughout southern Africa.</p> <p>The risk management section is brief and should be expanded to include more detail and clear risk mitigation actions. Risks such as drought and flooding need more thorough consideration in this section as well. The project proposal seems to assume that there will be no such incidents. However, greater consideration needs to be given to reduce the impact of these frequent events to ensure long-term success.</p> <p>In Component 1, we believe additional information is needed on the plans for enhancing management practices, as well as plans for increasing capacity for existing or soon-be-established protected areas. We are concerned that the new WMAs could simply be an interconnected series of paper-parks. While we are pleased that the project proposal provides a fair amount of information on community involvement, we would like to see more on the implementation of these activities at the management level.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>The proposal's explanation about the lack of suitable groundwater between the CKGR and the KTP, given that its location is in the center of the Kalahari Desert, is unclear. We would appreciate a clearer explanation, since this will continue to be a difficult challenge to manage.</p> <p>At its root, the CBNRM challenge in Botswana is one of policy and lack of consultation with communities. This proposal casts the issue as the result of a lack of awareness among the communities, and a lack of information about alternative business options (e.g. page 13 and onward). The human-wildlife-conflict issue featured in this project proposal will not be resolved with a skills development and supply chain training for villagers, nor will it be resolved with more earnest training of DWNP officers on public education/outreach. Communities (especially in the North) feel estranged by a lack of government consultation surrounding the January 2014 hunting ban, and the delay and shortage of paid compensation, as well as unresolved questions about land tenure and rights offered to joint venture partners (compared with the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>communities). The government needs to meaningfully address this in the ranges that matter (Ngamiland and Chobe), otherwise we may see continued vulnerability to unsustainable practices by local communities.</p> <p>Finally, we are pleased that the project proposal features clear Global Environmental Benefits, as well as benefits towards the CBD and CCD's strategic goals. We support the strong consideration of gender implications as well.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>1-8-17 The project cannot be recommended yet. Please address the outstanding issues above.</p> <p>March 31, 2017 All points have been addressed. The project is recommended for Council information.</p> <p>5-2-17 Please address comments from GEF Council (Item 11) Thanks</p> <p>5-9-17 Please address US Council Comments. Thanks.</p>	
Review Date	Review	January 10, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 31, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 02, 2017	