



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

GEF ID:	9158		
Country/Region:	Mozambique		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Conservation of Globally Threatened Species in Mozambique through Improving Biodiversity Enforcement and Expanding Community Conservancies around Protected Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5474 (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; BD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-2; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$15,750,000
Co-financing:	\$64,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$80,850,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Paul Harrison

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 \$300K PPG for a \$15.7M 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?	6-20-15 Yes. This PPG is recommended for clearance.	
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?	1-12-17 The changes since PFD approval in June 2015 are properly justified on pages 5-8 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	1-12-17 Yes. The project is well structured with clear, tangible and measurable outcomes and outputs. GENERAL 1. Does the target area of 4.6 million hectares include the total area of NNR or only the Mecula-Marrupa Corridor? Please state the target areas for direct investment in Component 1 (and table E in CEO endorsement).	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>2. Please cut and paste the description of the Components, outcomes and outputs from the Project Document (p.17-24) to the CEO Endorsement. Council member likely to review CEO Endorsement first. With a robust description of the investments, some questions may be answered during the reading of the CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>3. The project should include a paragraph in the CEO Endorsement on how this project benefited from participating in the Global Wildlife Program and the activities organized by the World Bank with funding from the Coordination Grant.</p> <p>4. The role of baseline and cofinancing should be better described in the project document to demonstrate the added value of the GEF. Please, revise by adding a few lines under each of the components in the project document (p14-18) to be copied in the CEO endorsement as described under point 2.</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>1. Many aspects of this component seem a stand alone GEF investment. Please, describe better the role of</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>cofinancing and the added value of the GEF. It is notably difficult to believe that ANAC is putting \$22 million for office spaces, staff salaries, and operation expenses, as mentioned p51 of the project document (note that the cofinancing amounts per component in the project document are slightly different from those mentioned in the table B in the request for CEO endorsement).</p> <p>2. What elements of the National Strategy on Wildlife and Forest Crime and IWT are likely to be implemented? The language of outcome 1 calls for implementation but not clear if outcomes 1.2 to 1.5 are elements of the strategy.</p> <p>2. What institution will be in charge of the training of rangers if ANAC's National Training Center is no longer part of the project.</p> <p>3. Regarding CITES, the project would benefit from elaborating on how the proposed interventions (beyond output 1.5) relate to the CITES decisions at COP-17.</p> <p>4. Regarding CITES, the project does not make reference to the Mozambique "National Ivory Action</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Plan". Please elaborate.</p> <p>COMPONENT 3</p> <p>1. Please elaborate on the proposed methods to reduce HWC.</p> <p>2. Only \$1.25 million will be spent for local projects. It does not seem much to make them attractive and have a significant impact on reducing wildlife poaching, except if the cofinancing is contributing more to this output 3.4 (it is probably the case with the Gorongosa Restoration project?). Please, explain and if possible increase this amount.</p> <p>COMPONENT 4</p> <p>- We are taking note of all efforts to improve gender balance and have disaggregated data on gender. But the GEF gender policy also aims to consider how this project will help to reduce the inequalities between male and female in accessing resources and opportunities related to NRM (land, market, training, etc). We would like to see such study at inception. Such study should also influence the design and focus of some outputs and activities. Please, confirm at inception workshop.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>March 16, 2017 Addressed. Many Thanks for the comprehensive responses and clarifications.</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>1-12-17</p> <p>The financing and co-financing seem adequate for the implementation of the project and the delivery of the outputs and outcomes. However, please address the two following comments:</p> <p>1. For the component 1, please clarify the activities financed by cofinancing (\$23.8 million). see item 2.</p> <p>2. On components 2 & 3 in Table B (and UNDP Budget as appropriate), please separate the GEF investments and co-financing for Gorongosa NP and Niassa NR.</p> <p>March 16, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>1-12-17</p> <p>1. Please reconsider the risk, probability and mitigation measures on the Community Conservancies and the feasibility of proposed economic activities being underestimated.</p> <p>2. Please also elaborate on how the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>project plans on addressing the influx of people into the park and surrounding areas, especially considering that the proposed investments may become a magnet for even more people.</p> <p>March 16, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?</p>	<p>1-12-17</p> <p>The letters of cofinancing are available. However, please, clarify the following elements between the letters and the table C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How can ANAC propose a cofinancing of \$22 million while it is mentioned in the annex O that his annual budget varies between \$400,000 and \$500,000? - We do not see the justification to divide the cofinancing between \$5 million in kind and \$17 million in grants. - The letter from the Gorongosa project well mentions \$37 million, but how do you explain the breakdown between grants and in-kind (respectively \$30 million and \$7 million). - Same question for the cofinancing from WCS (\$5.1 million and the distinction between \$1.1 million in kind and \$4 million in grants). - \$500,000 is mentioned in the letter 	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>from UNDP while the table C reflects \$700,000.</p> <p>March 16, 2017 We take note of the new letter of cofinancing from UNDP. We thank the Agency for the explanations to justify the breakdown between in-kind and grant cofinancing. However, these explanations do not solve the lack of administrative evidences from the cofinancing partners: please provide revised letters of cofinancing including the breakdown between cash and in-kind cofinancing.</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>1-12-17 Yes Cleared</p> <p>March 16, 2017 During Council information period, we may have some questions on the tracking tools (# beneficiaries, carbon...).</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	<p>NA</p>	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>1-12-17 Yes. There is ample information on coordination with other initiatives and donors including USAID, KFW, EU and AFD.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	1-12-17 Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	1-12-17 Yes. Cleared	
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 	1-10-17 There is a response matrix for the comments made by STAP at PFD approval. Annex B of CEO Endorsement.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>Council members from Germany, Canada, the US, and UK made comments at PFD level. UNDP and the WB addressed them at PFD level. For this project, we are not seeing specific comments. However, we have repeated the comment related to CITES which is valid for this project.</p> <p>5-9-17</p> <p>U.S. Technical Comments: GEF Project #9158, Mozambique</p> <p>The United States is pleased that the GEF Project Strengthening the</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>Conservation of Globally threatened Species in Mozambique through Improving Biodiversity Enforcement and Expanding Community Conservancies around Protected Areas aligns well with Mozambique's CBD NBSAP (protecting species and key habitats, among other Aichi Targets) and CCD NAP (reducing slash and burn among other degrading land use practices). We commend the use of lessons learned to inform the project design and the proposal's emphasis on a solid "theory of change." We support plans to develop more sustainable land use practices, especially in the protected area buffer zones and in key habitat corridors.</p> <p>With regard to wildlife trafficking, it is not clear to us what role, if any, ANAC (the protected areas authority) will play in supporting community conservancies. If it does not exist already, we recommend that an organization take on the extension service needed to support community conservancies as they develop. If there is such an organization already, we request that the project implementers specify who will provide these services. While we expect WCS and the Gorongosa</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Restoration Project will play a central role in submitting the required documentation and standing up these conservancies, we also support the government playing a more active role in the project than simply approving plans and regulating. We thus believe that it is important that the project implementers seek to build government capacity in order that they can be more actively involved.</p> <p>We would like the project implementers to specify the kind of infrastructure projects envisioned on page 23, "The GEF funds are largely dedicated to improving infrastructure needs to facilitate the community development component" and how the GEF's social and environmental safeguards have been considered and adhered to. This area also seems to be encouraging resettlement of whole populations, and we would like to see this component discussed with greater detail to ensure Council is aware of these impacts.</p> <p>With regard to monitoring and evaluation, some indicators have been identified, but these seem to be final outcomes, rather than results that can be monitored in the near term. Please</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>add more appropriate short- and mid-term monitoring and evaluation indicators.</p> <p>Finally, we support the plans for gender mainstreaming and risk management.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>We thank the Agency for this very high quality work and documentation, but the project cannot be recommend yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>Request for CEO endorsement: please note that the right GEF ID is 9158.</p> <p>March 16, 2017 All points have been addressed, but one (the letters of cofinancing should include the breakdown between grants and in-kind contributions). We recommend this project for Council information. After the 4-week period, and responses to any additional questions from the Council Members, we will recommend this project for CEO endorsement upon receipt of revised letters of cofinancing.</p> <p>5-9-17 Please address comments by US Council. Thanks</p>	
Review Date	Review	January 12, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 16, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 09, 2017	