



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

GEF ID:	4625		
Country/Region:	Malawi		
Project Title:	Shire Natural Ecosystems Management Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	117617 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; LD-1; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; CCA-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,578,000
Co-financing:	\$72,768,000	Total Project Cost:	\$79,346,000
PIF Approval:	September 20, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	November 09, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Paola Agostini,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	<p>Malawi is eligible to the GEF and the LDCF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Malawi is a party of CBD since 1994-02-02. - Malawi became a party of UNCCD on 06/24/1994. - Malawi is an LDC party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA. <p>Addressed.</p>	Addressed. No change since the PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A letter of endorsement is enclosed, in date of August 22, 2011, signed by the GEF OFP, mentioning a total financing of US\$7,440,000 (GEFTF + LDCF), including a preparation grant. The project title mentioned is "Shire natural Ecosystems management project".	

Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Addressed in the section C, p.13.	Addressed.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	<p>The baseline project is provided by an IDA credit for the "Shire River Basin Management Project" estimated about US\$105 million, which US\$65 million will be used as cofinancing of GEF activities.</p> <p>The WB has an extensive experience in the region and in Malawi of blended operations using IDA loans.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	Addressed at PIF level.
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>The project is consistent with the Bank's fifth Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) for Malawi 2001-2016. The GEF funded activities are particularly aligned with the outcome 3 (sustained rural livelihoods and improved protection of investments dependent on the resource base).</p> <p>The World Bank has a well staffed office in the country as well as the ability to draw on preeminent global expertise.</p>	Addressed at PIF level.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	<p>The project is based on the following breakdown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BD: US\$ 3,000,000, - LD: US\$ 1,190,000 - SFM: US\$ 1,369,000 - IDCF: US\$1 650 000 	<p>The project is evaluated at \$7,235,800 (project grant + fees) with \$2,999,700 from BD, \$1,190,200 from LD, \$1,395,900 from the SFM/REDD+ programme and \$1,650,000 from the IDCF. This is in conformity with the</p>

		<p>Based on the letter of endorsement mentioning a total amount of \$7,440,000, we understand that a PPG of \$204,000 (fees included) is planned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The STAR resources are within the limits of the STAR allocations. - The SFM incentive follows the rule of 3:1. <p>Sept. 15, 2011 A new letter has been sent with the revised PIF. The amount has been decreased to US\$7,236,000. Cleared.</p> <p>Addressed</p>	US\$7,236,000.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>Addressed.</p> <p>Please, cross the SFM option in the PIF template.</p> <p>Sept. 15, 2011 Cleared.</p>	The grant is within the available resources from the focal areas (BD, LD) and SFM/REDD+ programme.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	- CCA: YES. The requested grant is within the resources available from the LDCF under the principle of equitable access (LDCF: US\$1,650,000).	CCA: YES. The requested grant (\$1,650,000) is within the resources available from the LDCF under the principle of equitable access.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	NA	NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>The project is aligned with the result framework established for BD, LD, and SFM.</p> <p>CCA: YES. The project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.</p>	<p>Addressed.</p> <p>April 6, 2012 Sorry to come back on one issue not mentioned earlier, but for the table A, please maintain the same phrasing for outcomes and outputs than what you</p>

			<p>(http://www.thegef.org/gef/pubs/GEF-5_FA_Strategies).</p> <p>Please, include the codes for the outcomes to avoid any wrong interpretation.</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>April 24, 2012</p> <p>Addressed. Thanks.</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>The relevant GEF5 objectives are well identified for BD, LD, and SFM.</p> <p>CCA: YES. The project contributes towards CCA-1 through integrated flood management measures.</p>	<p>Addressed at PIF level. No change.</p> <p>CCA: YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1.2 by strengthening vulnerable physical, natural and social assets in response to the effects of climate change, including variability.</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>The project is in line with the Constitution of Malawi that includes the conservation and enhancement of biological diversity in the country and the prevention of the degradation of the environment.</p> <p>The project fits with the NBSAP (2006), the Forestry Act (1997), and the NAPA (1996).</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEARLY. The LDCF component does not explicitly refer to any priorities as identified in the NAPA. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please justify the adaptation component of the project through its linkage to the urgent and immediate needs identified in the NAPA of Malawi.</p> <p>09/15/2011 - CCA: YES. The revised PIF demonstrates that the activities financed by the LDCF address Malawi's</p>	<p>Addressed at PIF level. No change.</p> <p>CCA: YES. The proposed project would contribute towards several of Malawi's NAPA priorities, notably those associated with (i) sustainable rural livelihoods; (ii) improved agricultural production; and (iii) improved preparedness to cope with droughts and floods. The proposed project is also consistent with the National Program for the Management of Climate Change in Malawi.</p>

		<p>The urgency of this area of action has been reinforced by recurrent flooding in the Lower Shire since the completion of the Malawi NAPA in 2006. The LDCF component is also relevant with respect to the first NAPA priority on "community resilience through sustainable rural livelihoods".</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>The project will strengthen the capacities to strengthen sustainable management of natural systems as part of the basin planning and catchment management approach in the Shire Valley. However, the sustainability of the whole approach will need to be further developed at CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>The project will reinforce the institutional mechanism to facilitate the Shire Basin multi-sectoral development planning and coordination. Each line agency active in the Shire Basin management will be supported to carry out their respective role in the basin approach. The project will also strengthen a set of relevant institutions on the ground, including producer associations and Civil Protection Committee (CPCs).</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. With respect to the activities proposed for LDCF financing in the Elephant Marshes, the CEO Endorsement Request and the Project Document present the participatory management plans and the associated pilot measures as a means to mobilize resources during later stages of the Shire River Basin program. Still, it is not clear how such activities fit within the objectives and outcomes of the program, nor is there a tentative investment plan indicating further measures to strengthen the Marshes as a buffer against severe flooding in the lower Shire floodplain.</p> <p>April 6, 2012</p>

			<p>re-submission provides no further information as to how the proposed participatory management plans and associated pilot measures would mobilize additional resources during the later stages of the Shire River Basin Management Program. The success of this sub-component appears to hinge on the extent to which it will be mainstreamed in, and scaled up through subsequent phases of the program. As the project has been fully prepared, greater detail would be expected in this regard.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe how the proposed management plans and pilot measures under component C.2 would be sustained and scaled up during and after the proposed project.</p> <p>04/24/2012 -- CCA: YES. The revised submission clarifies how the activities proposed for the Elephant Marshes would be sustained and scaled up during subsequent phases of the Shire River Basin Management Program.</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>The baseline project and the problems are well described (see p6 and 7, section B).</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	<p>- The Shire River Basin Management Project (SRBMP) provides a clear baseline project to 1) strengthen the institutional capacities at the basin level, b) invest in catchment management, and c) reduce erosion in priority catchments and sedimentation and floodings downstream. The GEF resources will be focused on critical ecosystems and biodiversity to be fully mainstreamed within the SRBMP. Almost half of the SRBPM resources</p>

		<p>avoid any linkages with the Kamuzu barrage. "Only" \$67 million are considered as cofinancing in a IDA operation of \$125 million.</p> <p>CCA: YES. The proposed GEF/LDCF grants are fully integrated into an IDA-financed Shire River Basin Management Project. With respect to climate change adaptation, the CEO Endorsement Request demonstrates clearly that while the baseline project makes a considerable contribution towards implementing the Malawi NAPA, particularly in the area of flood risk mitigation, management of the Elephant Marshes -- a crucial buffer against severe flooding in the lower Shire floodplain -- falls outside the scope of the baseline project and additional measures are thus required to enhance its resilience.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>- Three consultants are estimated at \$5,000 per week (hydraulic engineer x 10 weeks, bridge engineer x 10 weeks and elephant marshes studies x 120). Please clarify if these are lumpsums, estimations, or rates per week. These rates are much more higher than what is practised in other GEF projects in the region. Please confirm that the rate of \$5,000 per week applies WB rules and is acceptable in the region.</p> <p>- Please, explain (in ha, in US\$) how much will be invested in SLM activities in the targetted sub-basins, even from the baseline project, notably when the GEF LD resources are mainly used at basin planning level. The iustification of the use of all LD</p>

			<p>acceptable if the cost effectiveness is demonstrated. Please, develop.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would use LDCF resources to hire international consultants for 120 person weeks at \$5,000 per week to undertake studies of the Elephant Marshes (Annex C). The total cost of \$600,000 represents 40 per cent of the LDCF grant and nearly 40 per cent of total GEF/LDCF expenditure on international consultants. Yet, it is unclear whether the proposed studies contribute towards the core results associated with the LDCF grant (CEO Endorsement Request, p. 17) directly and in a cost-effective manner. Moreover, the proposed consultants' rates appear significantly higher than rates for comparable assignments in previous GEF projects in the country, particularly for such a number of person weeks.</p> <p>Please refer also to sections 13 and 24 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the CCA recommendations under sections 13 and 24, please ensure that all LDCF-financed technical assistance activities proposed contribute directly and in a cost-effective manner towards the achievement of the core results associated with the LDCF financing.</p> <p>April 6, 2012 Addressed for GEFTF.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>04/10/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. The cost estimate has not been revised and the proposed rates for international consultants still appear considerably higher than rates for comparable assignments in previous GEF projects in the country. While, in its response to GEFSEC comments, the World Bank notes that the consultants' rates are based on "standard rates being used in the Project budget for international consultants under firm contract", such standard rates should nevertheless comply with GEF recommendations (currently \$3,000/week for international consultants).</p> <p>If, as suggested in the World Bank's response to GEFSEC comments, the precise number of hours cannot be specified and that focus should be placed on the overall cost, the specific nature, scope, outcome and outputs of the proposed assignments should be described in greater detail to demonstrate cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing CCA recommendations under sections 13 and 24 below, please ensure that all LDCF-financed technical assistance activities have been designed in a cost-effective manner and in compliance with relevant GEF recommendations.</p> <p>04/24/2012 -- CCA: YES. The revised submission describes in greater detail the activities proposed to build the knowledge base for the sustainable and</p>
--	--	--	---

			Elephant Marshes. The consultant rates have also been adjusted in accordance with GEFSEC recommendations.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>An incremental reasoning is proposed (p8, section B2). The activities financed by the GEF are clearly incremental/additional (focusing on ecosystem services and Global Environment Benefits) while being mainstreamed within the Shire River Basin Management Project (SRBMP). As often, a more detailed incremental reasoning is expected at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. The PIF focuses on the anthropogenic drivers of environmental change in the Shire River Basin, while providing only limited information about the current and expected effects of climate change on the Basin and the local communities. Hence, it remains unclear to what extent the baseline project and its beneficiaries are vulnerable to climate change and to what extent the proposed Component C covers the additional cost of increasing their climate resilience.</p> <p>In particular, provided that the LDCF grant under Component C will contribute towards developing the Elephant Marshes management strategy and implementing community management activities, the PIF should demonstrate that such activities are specifically geared towards reducing the vulnerability of local communities to climate change and that such activities</p>	<p>We thank the Agency to have provide a more robust incremental reasoning as it was requested for CEO endorsement (see cell 28). However, some questions are still pending.</p> <p>i- We understand that hydrological flows along the Shire are already highly managed by the the Kamuzu barrage and hydro development in the middle Shire. Please, take note that GEF resources can be used to reinforce institution capacities, knowledge management and decision support systems, but please confirm that GEF resources are not directly used for Environment Impact Assessments or compensatory environmental measures. This kind of activity is considered as business-as-usual and cannot be considered incremental. Please, clarify the framework of GEF activities. CLEARED.</p> <p>- We acknowledge the reasoning that is proposed for SFM and parts of the BD resources. The activities are focused on the improvement of management of protected areas and forest reserves. The Global environment benefits are estimated in ha of protected areas, forest reserve, and in tons of CO2.</p> <p>ii- We are not sure to be able to follow the same reasoning for the LD focal</p>

		<p>the LDCF grant.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Kindly provide more information about the current and expected effects of climate change on the project area and the intended beneficiaries; describe the extent to which the baseline project is unable to address such effects; and clarify how LDCF funded activities proposed under Component C contribute to the climate resilience of the baseline project.</p> <p>09/15/2011 -CCA: YES. The revised PIF clarifies that the lower Shire Floodplain is highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change, particularly more frequent floods and droughts. The baseline project will address the vulnerability of the local population and their livelihoods through community preparedness and small-scale physical infrastructure. The activities financed by the LDCF will complement the baseline project through investments in natural infrastructure (expansive wetlands) that further buffers the effects of extreme weather events. Moreover, the LDCF will strengthen the resilience of natural-resource dependent livelihoods.</p>	<p>area deal with "operating costs for systematic natural habitat and ecological surveys, as well as technical services for the development of knowledge products based on that information. The main outputs deal with site level ecological survey reports, basin ecosystem knowledge products, including maps and a spatial database". Most of the activities seem very BD oriented. Please explain how these activities are going to address LD3 requirements. How these activities might achieve "enhanced enabling environments toward harmonization and coordination between sectors in support of SLM"? Please, develop the linkages with SLM activities (probably cofinancing activities developed under the LD1 objective?).</p> <p>CLEARED.</p> <p>iii- Most, if not all LD resources and partially BD resources are used for knowledge and planning tools. In general, we try to maintain a balance between knowledge and capacity activities and field oriented activities. So, please, confirm that the capacities and the tools that will be developed through this project will be associated to activities on the ground at least from the cofinancing if it is not from GEF resources, and 2) explain how these activities will be sustainable after the project. Who will manage and finance the management and the updating of these mapping, data, and planning tools?</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>the point - However, we do not find any response about the sustainability. Please provide elements of response for this point.</p> <p>- It is mentioned that one of the output under the LD focal area will be "increased collaborative research activities within forest and ecological research institutes". We are not sure this kind of output will contribute to the output 3.1 "integrated land management plans developed and implemented. Please, clarify. ADDRESSED.</p> <p>iv- We are not sure to understand the meaning of the "cluster approach". We can understand that national and local partners are looking for a certain flexibility. But, please, explain the added value for the GEF. Confirm there is no risk to lose the traceability of outputs and the impacts. Please, confirm that this way of doing will not weaken the incremental reasoning. ADDRESSED.</p> <p>- For BD related activities, please confirm the incremental reasoning. We understand the use of GEF BD resources to support technical assistance, training, and equipment to update management planning, strengthen community relations, monitoring and patrolling. We take also note of the access infrastructure and water points. But these activities seem basic protected area management activities (business-as-usual) and we do</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>choice to focus on these activities in the Lengwe National Park, Linwonde National Park.</p> <p>NOT FULLY ADDRESSED. When a comment asked for clarification for the reasoning, please, provide elements to figure out this reasoning (baseline, strategy, justification of GEF resources, and sustainability). The comment "these activities are routinely funded through GEF resources" is not very helpful and actually is wrong. The activities appear as a disparate and opportunistic list of BD oriented activities without a real strategy and elements of sustainability. Please provide these elements of reasoning and sustainability we did not find.</p> <p>- Please explain the activities financed to strengthen regional planning and management coordination between protected areas. Provide the reasoning and explain the sustainability. Some of these activities seem similar than those financed by LD. Please, clarify.</p> <p>NOT ADDRESSED.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. The additional reasoning has not changed substantially since PIF. The baseline project contributes considerably towards climate change adaptation and particularly flood risk mitigation, but the Elephant Marshes -- a crucial buffer against severe flooding -- lies beyond its scope. Accordingly, the proposed core results for the LDCF grant -- (i)</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>for flood risk mitigation; and (ii) strengthening climate-resilient livelihoods -- are based on additional reasoning.</p> <p>Still, with respect to specific activities, the project would allocate LDCF resources for hydrological and ecological studies of the Elephant Marshes at an amount exceeding \$600,000. Moreover, the project framework (Table B) proposes LDCF financing for the "submission of proposals for the designation of Elephant Marshes as Ramsar site and Community Conservation Area". Both activities represent business-as-usual ecosystem management and biodiversity protection activities. Indeed, similar studies appear to be financed with resources from other GEF focal areas under Component A.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that LDCF resources are allocated exclusively towards activities that are clearly based on additional cost reasoning.</p> <p>April 6, 2012 We thank the agency for the elements of response. However, some of the points are not fully addressed. Please see above.</p> <p>04/10/2012 -- CCA: NOT CLEAR. The re-submission provides little additional information regarding the additional reasoning justifying the proposed activities to be financed under the</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>While the core of the activities proposed for LDCF financing is based on additional reasoning and consistent with what was approved at PIF, the project, as presented in the CEO Endorsement Request and PAD, would allocate 40 per cent of LDCF resources towards ecological and hydrological analyses of the Elephant Marshes. Based on the information provided in the CEO Endorsement Request and the PAD, these analyses would appear to (i) be highly relevant even in the absence of climate change, rather than limited to addressing the additional cost of climate change; (ii) be eligible for other sources of financing within the same project, rather than calling for additional resources under the LDCF; (iii) extend considerably above and beyond what is required to initiate participatory management planning and associated pilot measures in the Marshes; and (iv) exceed GEF recommendations for international consultants' rates (see Section 12 above). To the extent that the project plans to undertake further-reaching, foundational analyses of the ecology and hydrology of the Elephant Marshes, above and beyond what is required to initiate climate-resilient management planning and pilot activities in accordance with the mandate and the eligibility criteria of the LDCF, other sources of financing should be considered.</p> <p>As for the "submission of proposals for</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>a Ramsar site and national Community Conservation Area [LDCF funded]" under Component C, this would not address climate change adaptation in accordance with the principle of additional cost. The re-submission clarifies that this could be achieved at "a minimal incremental cost to the project" and would strengthen the legal framework for the management of the Marshes. Accordingly, it is not clear why the activity has not been proposed for financing through other, more suitable sources within the same project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please limit LDCF financing for scientific and technical assessments to activities that focus on the effects of climate change and appropriate adaptation measures, and that are entirely necessary for the implementation of the proposed participatory and climate-resilient planning activities and associated pilot measures under Component C. For further-reaching studies, as well as for the designation of Elephant Marshes as a Ramsar site, kindly seek other, complementary and more suitable sources of finance and revise the Project Framework (Table B) and the description of the additional reasoning accordingly.</p> <p>April 24, 2012 GEFTF: addressed.</p> <p>04/24/2012 -- CCA: YES. The revised submission provides a more detailed</p>
--	--	--	---

			technical assessments proposed for LDCF financing under Component 3, demonstrating that these are instrumental for understanding the effects of climate change in the Elephant Marshes and the surrounding communities, and for the sustainable and climate-resilient management of these critical wetlands.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The project framework is very clear and consistent.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	<p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. There are slight discrepancies between the project framework (Table B), the description of the additional cost reasoning for Component C (p. 16), and the core results for the proposed LDCF grant (p. 17). Contrary to Table B, Section B.2 of the CEO Endorsement Request (p. 16) appears to suggest that the expected outcome on "national and international recognition" and the associated output on proposals to designate the Elephant Marshes as a Ramsar site would not in fact be financed through the LDCF.</p> <p>Moreover, while Section B.2 (p. 16) of the CEO Endorsement Request cites a need for "initial analyses of the ecology, hydrology and threats to the Elephant Marshes" and while such analyses appear to take up a large share of the LDCF grant (Annex C), these are not found among the outcomes and outputs of Component C in the project framework, nor are these clearly aligned with the key results for the LDCF grant (p. 17).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing CCA recommendations under sections 13 and 24, please ensure</p>

			<p>activities associated with Component C and the LDCF grant are consistently reported across the documentation.</p> <p>04/10/2012 -- CCA: Please address CCA recommendations under sections 13 and 24 and revise the Project Framework accordingly.</p> <p>04/24/2012: CCA: YES.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes. GEF financing will support incremental natural habitat knowledge and field management activities that will complement, enhance, and leverage baseline investments. Incremental activities will focus on 1) addressing the current dearth of precise and systematic information on the ecological assets of the Shire Basin, providing the opportunity to incorporate ecological infrastructures into basin-wide hydrological modeling, economic analysis and management planning and 2) proving the concepts on the ground by investing in sustainable management of key areas (notably the Lengwe national park, Thanbani and Mtandwe forest reserves, and the Elephant marshes wetland system) that combine key biodiversity and watershed functions.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. Overall, the project seeks to generate concrete benefits by strengthening physical and natural flood mitigation infrastructures. With respect to the activities financed by the LDCF, however, the adaptation benefits should be further clarified based on the vulnerability of the</p>	<p>- The description of incremental benefits is clear and quantified for BD and SFM resources.</p> <p>- It is less clear with the LD resources. Please develop the expected impacts of SLM activities that will take place in the basins covered by the planning and mapping tools. ADDRESSED.</p> <p>- Please, confirm what are the right carbon values to consider: In the PAD, it is mentioned p121 that the work done on targeted areas in the project is expected to contribute around 650,000 t CO2 of emission reductions through reduced degradation and natural regrowth; while p136, the 43,700 ha of forest reserve under improved management will contribute to an estimated enhancement of carbon storage of 2,400,00t CO2 equivalent. ADDRESSED.</p> <p>- What kind of monitoring system is planned to actually check what the carbon benefits are from the project? ADDRESSED.</p>

		<p>project to the effects of climate change.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon clarifying the additional cost reasoning (see Section 13 above), please describe the adaptation benefits associated with the LDCF funded activities proposed under Component C.</p> <p>09/15/2011 -CCA: Yes. The revised PIF clarifies the additional cost reasoning. The proposed LDCF grant will strengthen natural infrastructures as a buffer against extreme weather events and contribute towards the resilience of natural-resource dependent livelihoods in one of the most vulnerable regions in the country. The description of these adaptation benefits is based on sound assumptions.</p>	<p>benefits associated with the participatory management plans and associated pilot measures in the Elephant Marshes are clearly described, but as there are outstanding issues regarding the additional cost reasoning for other activities, this Section will be revisited once CCA recommendations under sections 13 and 24 have been addressed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address CCA recommendations under sections 13 and 24 above.</p> <p>April 6, 2012: Addressed for the GEFTF.</p> <p>04/10/2012 -- CCA: Please address CCA recommendations under Section 13 above.</p> <p>04/24/2012: CCA: 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>The primary project beneficiaries will be the rural populations living in and around project sites. These sites will benefit 1) from sustainable land and water management investments in agricultural and agro-forestry systems (see sub-component B2) and 2) from the maintenance of the resource base and ecological services. At the end, the project will also provide new opportunities for sustainable livelihoods (fisheries, sustainable charcoal, ecotourism, etc.) as well as better conditions for sustainable nature resource based industries (crops, wood fuels, hydropower, etc).</p>	<p>Yes. see section B3 of the CEO endorsement, p6 in the PAD as well as in the annex 6 related to the economic and social analysis.</p>

	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>The importance of local communities is highlighted, notably in the pilot sites where there is a strong demand from local communities to end current and ineffective state management of forest blocks. The project will notably be inspired and will scale up recent and successful pilot community forest management experiences in Malawi. The baseline project will include a community livelihood development fund and community based planning in and around protected areas. The role of women is also highlighted and the GEF will follow gender sensitive approaches developed under the baseline project. Opportunities of partnerships with the private sector will be explored during the preparation phase. During the project preparation, a deeper analysis of local communities is expected, as well as a particular attention to the participation of public, the status of indigeneous people, and the involvement of CSO, notably NGOS.</p>	<p>The question was addressed in the responses to GEFSEC comments and completed in the annex 8.</p> <p>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>A preliminary list of risks is proposed. A deeper analysis is expected at CEO endorsement, notably about the environmental risks and the potential concerns due to upstream dam management.</p>	<p>As it was requested at PIF level and through WB safeguards, we understand that an independant environmental and social impact assessment was done, including an environmental and social Management and Resettlement Plan Action Plan for the upstream barrage. The whole project, including GEF activities, is covered by a environmental and social Management Framework. A Strategic environmental and social Assessment has been publicly disclosed.</p> <p>We understand that hydrological flows</p>

			<p>managed by the the Kamuzu barrage and hydro development in the middle Shire. Moreover, all IDA activities related to the Kamuzu barrage are not included in the baseline project. However, please confirm that the use of GEF resources is not associated to controversial activities or with reputational risks.</p> <p>April 6, 2012 Addressed.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes. The project is consistent with other efforts in the Shire Basin (UNDP, FAO, UE, JICA). A coordination structure will be established to improve collaboration between the national authorities in charge of park management and those in charge of forests. NGOs and various entities will also be involved (Mulanje Mountain Conservation Trust, Malawi Environmental endowment Trust, and African Parks).</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. As the project draws resources from the LDCE, adequate coordination should be ensured with the AfDB project Climate Adaptation for Rural Livelihoods and Agriculture (CARLA), which will begin implementation in 2011. In particular, it should be ensured that the projects address Malawi's NAPA priorities in a complementary manner and that mechanisms for knowledge sharing be explored.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Kindly describe indicative measures to ensure</p>	<p>Yes. Different modes of coordination are proposed in the B.7. section.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>

		<p>project AfDB project Climate Adaptation for Rural Livelihoods and Agriculture (CARLA).</p> <p>09/15/2011 - CCA: Yes. The revised PIF clarifies in Section B.6 relevant coordination and knowledge sharing arrangements with CARLA, as well as with other climate change adaptation initiatives in the country, notably the ongoing Lake Chilwa Basin Climate Change Adaptation Program.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>The project is country executed. The basic principles of legitimacy and coordination are mentioned. At CEO endorsement, please develop the implementation arrangements.</p>	<p>Yes. p 22 of the CEO endorsement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Component A will be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Resources. A technical sub-committee will bring together natural habitat management agencies, as well as specialized NGOs and research institutions. - Components B & C will be implemented by DNPW within national parks and the Elephant Marshes, and by DoF within forest reserves, working with villages through the Village Natural Resource Management Committees (VNRMC) wherever appropriate. NGOs will also be associate in the work at community level. <p>Addressed.</p>
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>The result framework is identical with the one included in the PIF.</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		

Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No management costs are requested from the GEFTF or the LDCF. Management costs are provided by the cofinancing (7.45% of the US\$ 68 million of cofinancing).	No management costs are requested from GEF resources.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The whole framework is consistent as well as the complementary between the baseline project and the GEF resources. The estimated funding and cofinancing seems appropriate. However, a deeper analysis of costs per ha and the rationale are expected at CEO endorsement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10\$/per ha are planned to improve the management of existing protected areas (GEF+cofinancing). - US\$587 per ha is planned to improve agricultural management. - US\$237 per ha for good management practices in forests 	<p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. Given outstanding issues regarding the additional cost reasoning for certain LDCF-financed activities, the funding associated with Component C is not entirely justified.</p> <p>In particular, the proposed designation of the Elephant Marshes as a Ramsar site and the comprehensive studies of the Marshes do not appear to be based on additional cost reasoning, and the latter do not appear to be designed in a cost-effective manner (see sections 12 and 13 above). Consequently, there may be an opportunity to re-allocate the LDCF grant with a greater emphasis on pilot management activities for a greater number of beneficiaries around the Elephant Marshes.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address CCA recommendations under sections 12 and 13 and revise the funding amounts for Component C accordingly.</p> <p>04/10/2012 -- CCA: Please address CCA recommendations under section 13 above.</p> <p>04/24/2012: CCA: YES.</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	The PIF is well structured with a a good	The cofinancing is confirmed and was

	At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	cofinancing and the GEF activities.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes.	Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Addressed.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Addressed.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		The project information package sent by the WB includes responses to comments made by the STAP.
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		The project information package sent by the WB includes responses to comments made by Germany.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>The PIF is not recommended yet for clearance.</p> <p>CCA: Please refer to sections 9, 13, 15 and 19.</p> <p>Please, also address the comments included in the cell. 31 at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>09/15/2011 - All recommendations made in the initial review have been addressed in the revised PIF. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>At CEO endorsement, please address the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a detailed incremental 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A deep analysis of local communities is expected with a particular attention to the participation of public, the status of indigenous people, and the involvement of CSO, notably NGOS on the ground. - Please, pay a particular attention to the risk analysis, notably the environmental risks and the potential concerns due to upstream dam management. - Please develop the implementation arrangements. - Please, develop the sustainability aspects of the approach. - Please, provide an analysis and justify the costs per ha (for protected areas, forests, and SLWM practices). - Please, provide an estimation of carbon benefits to justify the leverage of the SFM incentive. - Please, explain how pilot community management activities are going to be sufficient to secure the GEBs in the Elephant Marshes. We recommend to include a conservation status for this area. 	
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?		NA
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>Not yet. Please address all comments above.</p> <p>April 6, 2012 The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address comments above, and notably see cell. 7 and 13.</p> <p>CCA: NOT YET. Please refer to sections 10. 12. 13. 14. 15 and 24.</p>

			April 24, 2012 Addressed.
			04/24/2012: CCA: YES.
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 08, 2011	March 20, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 15, 2011	April 10, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		April 24, 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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.