



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

GEF ID:	9842		
Country/Region:	Malawi		
Project Title:	Shire Valley Transformation Program - I		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	163582 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; BD-2 Program 3; BD-3 Program 8; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-2; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$5,587,156
Co-financing:	\$39,100,000	Total Project Cost:	\$44,687,156
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	

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 degradation, issues of sustainability,		

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
	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? 		
	<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		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?	<p>6-13-17 Please provide a summary of the changes between the PAD and the Child Project included in the GWP (PMIS 9071).</p> <p>Title of the project changed. From: "Malawi: Strengthening Landscape Connectivity and Management to Improve Livelihoods and Conserve Key Biodiversity Areas in Malawi" (GEF PMIS 9662) to "Shire Valley Transformation Program – I". (GEF PMIS 9842).</p>	<p>The project remains within the scope of the originally defined project. However, the number of sites has been reduced, consistent with the resources available and to avoid potential overlap with the second phase of the Shire River Basin Management Program (SRBMP 2). It is anticipated that support for sites in the middle Shire will be included in the design of the forthcoming SRBMP Phase 2.</p>
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>6-13-17</p> <p>1. What are the specific investments in support of the implementation of the recommendations of the National Elephant Action Plan (NEAP) and the Elephant Protection Initiative (EPI)?</p> <p>2. The outcome "Increased effectiveness of trans-border surveillance and enforcement of anti-poaching and trafficking laws through cross-border collaboration" listed in the GEF Data Sheet is not mentioned in the PAD. Why? Please elaborate and include in PAD.</p>	<p>1. Two sites – Majete Wildlife Reserve and Lengwe National Park support elephants. There is a stable and growing population of Elephants at the former. For New Lengwe, elephants enter the park from adjacent Mozambique but there is no resident population. Strengthened conservation management (including enhanced patrolling capacity and improved access for patrols and monitoring) at these sites should benefit the Elephant conservation objectives of the EPI.</p> <p>The project will also support a feasibility study for a possible community conservancy that might, over the longer-term, link Majete with Lengwe National Park. It is not currently clear how feasible this might be, but if this is a</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>3. What are the proposed interventions in nature-based tourism to attract the private sector?</p> <p>4. What system(s) will be used to "access geospatial applications for monitoring, analysis, and mapping of enforcement data collected by forest guards and DNPW patrols to improve strategy and targeting"?</p> <p>5. New Lengwe and Majete Wildlife Reserve: a). What measures will be supported to reduce Human Wildlife Conflict in New Lengwe? B). What role will African Parks play in Majete Wildlife Reserve?</p> <p>6. Mwabvi Wildlife Reserve and Matandwe Forest Reserve: a). What are the specific investments in support of the development of nature-based tourism? b). Was Matandwe FR part of the "Shire Natural Ecosystems Management Project"? If so, what is the difference between the two projects? c). What are the ongoing and upcoming investments of the EU Matandwe Forest Reserve? d). Who is going to be the responsible party for the establishment and management of the "Village Savings and Loan Schemes"?</p>	<p>possibility, then this would provide an opportunity to expand the range of the growing elephant population within Majete NP.</p> <p>In the longer-term, and given strengthened management, Lengwe NP could also support a stable Elephant population and could therefore offer opportunities for range expansion within Malawi. At the national level, the PAD clarifies that support will help GoM to participate actively in international meetings, support training in wildlife crime investigations, and prosecution case handling in collaboration with ICCWC and SADC partners.</p> <p>The project will also support activities to reduce Human Wildlife Conflicts, including those associated with elephants.</p> <p>2. Agreed. The project intends to undertake these activities. The text in the PAD for activities 1.3 and 1.4 will be adjusted to clarify the issue of surveillance and enforcement of forests and wildlife crime (see clarification below)</p> <p>3. The project will support nature-based tourism development at national level through marketing strategies and, at site level, by improving visitor attractions through improved conservation management and encouraging private sector linkages to local communities e.g. in the Elephant marsh.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>7. Elephant Marsh; a) What is the difference between the investments in Elephant Marsh between the GEF-5 project 'Shire Natural Ecosystems Management Project' and the proposed GEG-6 project 'SHIRE VALLEY TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM - I'? b) How does the project plan to "...build resilience of local livelihoods given the impacts of climate variability"?</p> <p>8. In the GEF PFD, the target species for this project are "Wild Dogs and Fisheries". In the PAD (page 114) it says: In the lower Shire, Majete Wildlife Reserve hosts impressive populations of Elephant (<i>Loxodonta africana</i>), Black Rhino (<i>Diceros bicornis</i>), Lion (<i>Panthera leo</i>), Leopard (<i>Panthera pardus</i>), and Kudu (<i>Tragelaphus strepsiceros</i>); while neighboring Lengwe National Park is home to the most northern naturally occurring populations of Nyala (<i>Tragelaphus angasii</i>). These species are more in line with the main objective of the GWP. Please address in GWP Monitoring and Communications material.</p> <p>9. In the GEF Data sheet there is</p>	<p>At site level, project interventions will be guided by the management planning processes and will build on the Tourism Strategy for the Shire River basin prepared under SRBMP1. This will be reflected more clearly in the PAD.</p> <p>4. This will be determined during implementation. (see additional information in table below)</p> <p>5. Specific measures will be identified as part of the management planning process for New Lengwe and are likely to include a combination of increasing water availability within the Parks to reduce the likelihood of wild animals leaving the park in search of water (an approach used successfully at Old lengwe), fencing and awareness raising. The African Parks Network is the concession holder for Majete Wildlife Reserve and plays the lead role in day-to-day development and management of the wildlife reserve.</p> <p>6. There is an ongoing analysis of nature-based tourism options for sites in the lower Shire (supported under SRBMP 1) including Matandwe and Mwabvi. Specific nature-based tourism development interventions will be determined on the basis of this analysis and the management planning process. Improving access and accommodation facilities should increase attractiveness of these sites for attracting tourists.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>reference to the use of GEF resources for CCM-1 Program 1 (Outcome 1A. Accelerated adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration). There is no information in the PAD (Annex 4) to support this. Please clarify or modify as appropriate.</p> <p>QUESTIONS DURING DECISION MEETING</p> <p>1. Page 16. "Increase effectiveness of trans-border....". Please modify the text of activities 1.3 and 1.4 as indicated in the response matrix. Please be as specific as possible regarding the proposed activities. Trans-boundary surveillance and enforcement as exceedingly difficult.</p> <p>2. Page 16. "access to geospatial applications for monitoring, analysis and mapping of enforcement data...." We need specifics here. We must be able to close the loop between Projects and the efforts GWP is doing in providing the necessary tools to move the individual projects forward</p> <p>3. . What role will African Parks play in Majete WR. I meant to say what</p>	<p>Under SRBMP 1, support to Matandwe was provided to complete the development of the forest co-management planning process and support co-management in specific villages. Support will enable full implementation of the plan in and around Matandwe FR.</p> <p>Village savings and loans schemes are one of the options under consideration as these have been used successfully as part of forest co-management work elsewhere in Malawi. Facilitation would be undertaken by DoF with Group Village and village heads are likely to play the key role in day-to-day management</p> <p>7. GEF 5 support focused on putting in place a solid analytical platform to guide management of the Elephant marsh, to undertake consultations with local stakeholders and to establish a network of village-based organizations within the marsh. This project will build on this platform to finalize the management plan and, support implementation of the management plan for the marsh. Investments to build resilience (the marshes experience extremes of prolonged droughts and severe flooding) are likely to include a strong focus on development of climate resilient agriculture, introduction of community fisheries management regimes and investments to improve uptake of flood early warning systems. Investments to build resilience (the marshes experience extremes of prolonged</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>will African Parks will do on the WB-GEF project we are discussing. The project makes reference to the outstanding results of African Parks but does not tell what is that they will do for us with funding from the GEF. Not using them would be difficult to understand when the proposed investments are centered in the mandate and expertise of AP.</p> <p>4. Page 17. What are the ongoing and upcoming activities of the EU in the Matandwe Forest Reserve?. The question was not answered.</p> <p>5. Page 18. The use of CCM-1 Program 1. Expecting to see the change in the revised documentation.</p> <p>6. Tracking Tool (Not discussed today). I assume the TT included in the email was prepared in the latest template. Please confirm that GWP is fine with it.</p> <p>7-07-17</p> <p>QUESTIONS</p> <p>1. African Parks: The question is in relation to the statement in the PAD: "...as well as for investments in improved Reserve management that</p>	<p>droughts and severe flooding) are likely to include a strong focus on development of climate resilient agriculture and introduction of community fisheries management regimes</p> <p>8. Noted. The threatened species listed will be included in project monitoring and communications materials. (NB: Wild dogs are not present in the lower Shire landscape - they are known to occur in Lukusuzi-Kasungu landscape but for the reasons outlined above, Kasungu NP is not included in project design).</p> <p>9. This will be corrected on the datasheet to include CCM-2 Program 4.</p> <p>ANSWER TO QUESTIONS AFTER DECISION MEETING</p> <p>1. Agreed. The text in the PAD for activities 1.3 and 1.4 and the GEF datasheet have been better aligned to address this issue and to clarify the issue of forest and wildlife crime surveillance and enforcement.</p> <p>2. This is now further elaborated in the PAD. The project will support the use of aerial (including the use of fixed wing and quadcopter drones) and remote sensing technologies. As these services will be contracted-in, the specifics of technologies selected will be proposed by services providers under the RFP. However, these may include, in addition to the technologies mentioned above,</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>go well beyond the impact mitigation requirements related to SVIP canal construction" (p. 113). Is African Parks aware that this project will invest in the management of the Park? Has this been discussed with them?</p>	<p>use of the European Space Agency's 'Sentinel' satellite data which provides high resolution satellite imagery interpretation and has recently been used by GoM as part of its climate resilience planning. This activity will be led by Department of Forestry in close coordination with Department of National Parks and Wildlife.</p> <p>For mapping and management of enforcement data, the project will explore the use of 'SMART' that enables the collection, storage, communication, and evaluation of data on: patrol efforts, results (e.g. snares removed, arrests made), and threat levels. When effectively employed to create and sustain information flow between ranger teams, analysts, and conservation managers, the SMART Approach can help to substantially improve protection of wildlife and their habitats.</p> <p>3. The African Parks Network is the concession holder for Majete Wildlife Reserve and plays the lead role in day-to-day development and management of the wildlife reserve. Support will be used by APN to support work with local communities around the Park and to share this experience with other conservation areas – for example in building local community capacity and agricultural value chains at local level; and for fence management to reduce Human Wildlife Conflicts.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>4. EC-funded IFSLM support ended in 2014. Under SRBMP 1, support to Matandwe was provided to sustain momentum on forest co-management at Matandwe following the cessation of EU support.</p> <p>There are no ongoing or anticipated upcoming activities to be supported by the EU at Matandwe FR.</p> <p>(GEF support under SRBMP 1 was used to complete the development of the forest co-management planning process and support co-management in specific villages. GEF support under SVTP will enable full implementation of the plan in and around Matandwe FR).</p> <p>5. This has now been corrected - on the datasheet to include CCM-2 Program 4 and reference in the PAD.</p> <p>6. Confirmed -the latest template of the GWP tracking tool has been completed in line with the requirements of the program.</p>
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	6-13-17 Yes. This is a fully blended project with a WB loan to Malawi (Shire Valley Transformation Program -1, P158805). Cleared	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of	6-13-17 Please see question on resilience under item 2.c	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	cleared	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	6-13-17 Please provide LoC from: 1) Government of Malawi, In-kind, \$4,000,000; 2) African Parks Network; In-kind \$5,000,000 Cleared	Confirmation of co-financing will be provided by the time of submission to the WB Board (as per Bank-GEF harmonized procedures).
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	6-13-17 Yes. Cleared	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	6-13-17 The outcome "Increased effectiveness of trans-border surveillance and enforcement of anti-poaching and trafficking laws through cross-border collaboration" listed in the GEF Data Sheet is not mentioned in the PAD. Why? (Same as point 2 under Item 2 above). cleared	The text in the GEF data sheet and PAD have been adjusted to ensure alignment on issues relating to the issue of forest and wildlife crime surveillance and enforcement.
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	6-13-17 Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge	6-13-17 This project is part of the GEF funded	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	management plan?	GWP and KM plans and products are being captured by the Coordination Grant. Cleared	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	6-13-17 No. Please address outstanding issues listed above. Thanks. 7-07-17 No. Please address question under item 2. Thanks. 7-27-17 PM recommended.	
Review Date	Review	June 13, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 30, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 06, 2017	

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.