



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

GEF ID:	4669		
Country/Region:	Namibia		
Project Title:	Namibian Coast Conservation and Management Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	128511 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,925,000
Co-financing:	\$5,872,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,797,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavelier	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?	9-16-11 Yes. Namibia is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	9-16-11 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP dated August 1th, for \$4,072,200 Cleared NOTE: Due to significant changes in the project design, particularly in CC, the GEF Secretariat had to re-asses ssome of the review criteria that had been cleared before (9/16/11). 13 Mar 2012/LH: The LoE indicates that no LD funding and therefore no LD activities will be requested for the PPG. Please confirm that no LD activities will be requested for the PPG, or please update the LoE.	

		Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. See clarification of the use of LD funding in PPG in Responses to GEF Comments (attached to revised PIF). Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	9-16-11 Yes. Cleared 13 Mar 2012/LH: the comparative advantage for the carbon stock related activities is not described, and the base projects do not include work on carbon stock monitoring. Please clearly describe the agency's advantage and background in this country on this topic. 3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	9-16-11 There is reference to a previous project but not the current capacity in-country Please provide information on the WB's staff in Namibia for BD, LD and CC. There is only reference to an Economist recently placed in Namibia. 3-12-11 A response was provided in the revised PIF. As stated in the revised PIF, "The project will be managed by staff from AFTEN, specifically, Claudia Sobrevila as biodiversity specialist, that will also cover land degradation, Jean Christophe Carret as climate change specialist and Glenn Marie Lange as an environmental economist".	

		<p>change mitigation, not adaptation. Please describe the capacity for mitigation and especially inventories for carbon stocks or CO2 sequestration or CO2e exchange. Also please describe capacity that specializes in mitigating GHG emissions from increased tourism due to project, as well as other tradeoffs expected from a multi-benefit project.</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared</p>	
Resource Availability	6. 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? 	<p>9-16-11 Yes. Namibia is requesting funding from BD, LD and CC. All within the allocations. Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>9-16-11 Yes. Namibia is requesting funding from BD (\$1,277,100), LD (\$840,000) and CC (\$1,817,200). All within the allocations (6.28, 5.69, 2.0, respectively) Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>9-18-11 Yes. BD-1, BD-2, CCM-3, LD-3. Cleared</p>	

		<p>CCM-3. Please address corresponding issues added throughout the review sheet.</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>9-18-11 Yes. BD-1, BD-2, CCM-3, LD-3. Cleared</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH: Now it is CCM-5 instead of CCM-3. Please address corresponding issues added throughout the review sheet.</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared</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>9-18-11 Relevant plans for the three conventions mentioned in the PIF (p. 8). Cleared</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH: The most recent National Communications (2011) lists the LULUCF priority as scientific information on expanding brushlands. The project does not appear consistent with that. Please ensure and explain consistency of the CCM-5 objectives with the National Communication.</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>9-18-11 No. Although individual and institutional capacities will be build in the project, it is not clear how they will be maintained to contribute to the sustainability of the project</p>	

		<p>3-12-12 As stated in the revised PIF, "The project will set under component 1 a permanent institutional structure for the National Coastal Policy and will provide for the long-term budgeting from government funds".</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH: The responses indicate component 1 will set up a permanent institutional structure focused on the National Park. Since 85% of the funding in component 1 is for CCM carbon stock monitoring, please explain how carbon stock monitoring is planned to be included in such an institution. Are other institutions for carbon stock monitoring envisioned for other vegetation types in the country, or will this be the major center for carbon monitoring?</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared</p>	
Project Design	<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>9-18-11 The Results Framework (2-4) and the baseline project (p.11) have a similar same architecture. Nevertheless, it is not easy to understand how this project fits with the results of the NACOMA project.</p> <p>CC/DZ, Sep 19, 2011: The only clear baseline CCM activity that is identified is the work of the MME and the MET to mainstream renewable energy issues in their Environmental Management Plans and Policies (US\$0.95 million). This amount of funding seems adequate for the needed CCM regulatory development activities. There are no clear CCM baseline project activities linked with the components 2 and 3.</p> <p>3-12-12</p>	

		<p>between this project and the ongoing NACOMA project.</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH:</p> <p>a) The response suggests that GEFSEC suggested the use of CCM-5 funding in this project, but as written the CCM-5 objective does not seem well-suited for this project. The baseline project does not well describe how carbon stock monitoring fits into the coastal and marine systems, especially given the concerns of the National Communications on brushland. Please more clearly describe the baseline regarding this aspect.</p> <p>b) Also, please more clearly explain how this objective fits into the proposed project, what are the barriers, threats, etc. If it is only focused on a few sq kilometers of wetlands, in a coastal area, then the potential for replicability would seem to be very low. This amount of CC funding is also low to for CCM-5 too. If the CCM-5 were targeted at monitoring forests, it would be quite logical to combine the CCM-5 with a project oriented at forests and potentially be eligible for the SFM/REDD+ incentive funding.</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared</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>9-18-11 Although this is not part of the PIF template, it is not clear that this investment is cost-effective. This is a massive investment with very opaque GEBs.</p> <p>3-12-12 The GEBs are still difficult to</p>

			Protected Areas. The following clarifications will facilitate understanding the GEBs to be delivered by the project: i) Please clarify the geographic scope of the project. How far inland and along the coast is this project aiming at impacting with the proposed activities, ii) what forests is this project aim at impacting?
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>9-18-11 No. The incrementality of the GEF investments is not clear. Indeed, the relationship between the outputs of the baseline project and GEF alternative is not easy to understand. Outputs in Component 2 and 3 of the GEF Alternative are the same (cut-and-past). This requires significant work.</p> <p>3-12-12 Comments from first submission addressed in the revised PIF.</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH: a) 85% of the funding in component 1 is for carbon stock monitoring and yet most of the explanation of incremental reasoning is about coastal and marine management. Please be very clear how the activities for CCM-5 activities are based on additional reasoning. b) Biodiversity monitoring funding should come from BD funds not CCM funding. When BD monitoring is listed please be clear this is an objective of BD, or please describe the situation more clearly. c) The description of a component 3, when there is no component 3 is confusing. If there is no component 3 in the table, it should not be described in the text. Please further clarify the incremental reasoning in these aspects.</p>	

		Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>9-18-11</p> <p>Global Environmental Benefits. It is not possible to visualize the GEB associated with this project. If the CEO were going to come and visit Namibia, what would this project show after investing \$5.1 million and leveraging \$22 million in co-financing?</p> <p>Component 1.</p> <p>The National Coastal Policy (NCP) was drafted as part of the NACOMA project (started 2005). Also, several strategic studies have been developed by the Ministry of Mines and Energy for the RE sector. It is not clear if the GEF funded project (incremental) will start implementation from scratch or if there are some activities and results on which the project will build on.</p> <p>Component 2.</p> <p>The component is on Institutional Strengthening, Knowledge ad Research for ICM. The outputs in the Results Framework are: training, committees, surveys, research projects, information centers, M&E and decision-support systems developed, awareness raising. The outputs in the GEF Alternative (p.12) are infrastructure and equipment for Dorob, National Park, sustainable finance plans for marine and coastal PA system, certified coastal production landscapes and seascapes, rehabilitation of lands, renewable energy technologies.</p> <p>Component 3.</p>	

		<p>Alternative are the same (cut-and-paste) as in Component 2.</p> <p>Please clarify in the Results Framework and GEF Alternative the actual, tangible and measurable outputs for this project. Please make reference to the actual Protected Areas (including hectares) that will benefit from these investments (in addition to DNP).</p> <p>03-12-12</p> <p>There are issues that require clarification:</p> <p>The first question regarding GEBs was not addressed in the Response to GEF Comments (first review). Please clearly state the GEBs associates with the project, particularly at the pilot sites (200,000 ha) in particular.</p> <p>Component 1.</p> <p>The ICZM. There is continued reference to the "Integrated Coastal Zone Management Approach" (ICZM) but not much more. i) Please clarify what the development of the ICZM actually entails. Is this plan a "report" that will await for political will and funding for implementation? What are the chances of this ICM not making an impact on the ground? i) Please clarify the relationship between the ICZM and the threats and pressures on coastal resources including "burgeoning coastal development and industry". How is the ICZM planning on addressing these pressures? iii) Does the ICZM have the "teeth" to steer the placement and behavior of the productive sectors affected by the findings and proposed solutions, away from environmental degradation? iv) There is reference to "at least two regional or local gov land use plans that incorporate the ICZM approach". What are</p>	
--	--	--	--

driving them to engage in the ICZM?

Methodologies and Lessons Learned: i) Who is calling for the development and dissemination of these "methodologies and Lessons Learned on restoration, EIA and good management technologies of SLM/SFM of the coast"? Where are they going to be applied along the 1,570 Km of coast line? The themes are so vast (i.e. EIA of what? Road construction? Effluents of industries? What industries?) that it will be nearly impossible to cover them with sufficient depths to be of any practical use. And if only a report, unlikely to have an impact on the ground. Please clarify and narrow down the scope of these activities.

Component 2.

Pilot areas

The project calls for investment in pilot areas (ca. 200,000 ha) to rehabilitate land degradation and improve management. Where are these 200,000 ha located along the 1,570 Km of coast line? If not adjacent to PAs, this investment will most likely be diluted and lost in the long term. What are the degradation pressures in these 200,000 ha.? Have they been addressed and stopped? Need to provide more specifics specially considering that there is also a proposed LUCC modeling taking into account effects on BD and GHG emissions.

13 Mar 2012/LH: a) 85% of the funding for TA component 1 is from CCM-5 and yet the text of the PIF seems 95% focused on coastal/marine system and biodiversity benefits. Please clarify.
b) CCM5 activities seem directed at pilot sites in the text which are listed in component 2. However no CCM funding is listed for component 2 even though CCM5 is listed as part of one of the

		<p>c) There is no component 3 in the table so please do not discuss a component 3 in the text. The items in the table and text should be consistent.</p> <p>d) CCM5 funding is for carbon monitoring not biodiversity monitoring. Please use other funds for that.</p> <p>e) Please make clear in the project objective that climate mitigation is a major objective of this GEF project, considering its funding amount.</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Other issues addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>9-18-11 The rationale linking the outputs of the GEF Alternative with incremental benefits is not clear.</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH: For CCM-5 an estimate of carbon benefits compared to a baseline of no project is expected at PIF. A Tier 1 approach with brief but clear documentation is acceptable. For reporting later in the project, more site-specific or more accurate/precise estimates are expected.</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Other issues addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared</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>9-18-11 The socio-economic and GEBs are very generic. A proper description is required. This will be facilitated by providing the geographic scope of the project.</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH: a) The description does not indicate how carbon benefits are part of this project and who benefits. Please indicate what groups will</p>	

		<p>b) There can be tradeoffs from activities. For example, when tourism benefits economically often GHG emissions increase due to the increased travel of tourists, but decreases in GHG emissions from reduced deforestation or reduced wetland loss, and landscape may be what the tourists are coming to see. How will the increase in CO2 emissions from tourism activities, which are used to support BD benefits, be mitigated?</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>9-18-11 Please clarify if private sector (mining and minerals, tourism and fisheries) were involved in PIF preparation. Same for CSOs and Local Communities.</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH: Please explain what stakeholders interested in carbon management, monitoring, and benefits were consulted. Who will benefit from carbon projects?</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared</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>9-18-11 Risks and Mitigation measures are very generic. Please provide the specific risks and mitigation measures associated with the interventions in the three components.</p> <p>3-12-12</p> <p>Risks: i) Should not "Competing expectations and resource use conflicts" be considered "High"? What are the suggested "economic benefits of</p>	

		<p>competing land-uses, particularly industry? ii) Government priorities. Are there going to be National or regional elections during project implementation? What is the risk of changing Gov priorities under a different political scenario resulting from elections?</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH: Please include the risk of climate change impacts on carbon (or GHG) benefits, and briefly describe what will be done to mitigate these risks. Also include the risk that tourism impacts will increase GHG emissions overall, and briefly describe what will be done to mitigate that risk.</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Other issues addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>9-18-11 There is a long list of related projects, but no information of coordination with those projects. Please provide information regarding the coordination efforts made so far.</p> <p>3-12-12 Namibia recently submitted an LD project entitled "Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands" (PMIS 4832). Are any of the forests in that project also covered in this project? A map of the geographic scope of this project would help clarify this issue. Is the darker border in the Map submitted with the PIF the area of work?</p> <p>There is also the newly approved PIF "Strengthening the Capacity of the PA System to address new management challenges" (PMIS 4729). i) Are the protected areas in the proposed project going to benefit from the recently approved</p>	

		<p>"sustainable financing plan of Dorob NP" and Component 1 of PMIS 4729?</p> <p>3-27-12 Issues addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>9-18-11 There is no information on the implementation/execution arrangements. Please clarify the role of the different Ministries in addition to co-financing.</p> <p>3-12-12 Clarified in response to GEF comments. 13 Mar 2012/LH: Please explain which executing agencies are representing the carbon stock monitoring objectives.</p> <p>3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?	<p>9-18-11 It is 4% of the GEF funding. Cleared 13 Mar 2012/LH: The project management costs for co-financing are 35% of the co-financing. The percentages of the co-financing and GEF financing are expected to be somewhat similar. Please justify briefly now such a high rate. At CEO endorsement detailed information about these costs is expected.</p>	

		Issue addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>9-18-11</p> <p>Component 1. Because the baseline and alternative are not clearly defined, it is difficult to estimate if the funding is appropriate.</p> <p>Component 2. Funding and co-funding appear to be very high for the proposed outputs, except for the Coastal and Marine BD information center and upgrading of existing centers at Ugab and Cape Cross, and M&E and Decision Support Systems. Please provide % of the component's budget into these two outputs.</p> <p>Component 3.</p> <p>There is not enough information to determine if the funding and co-funding for the proposed outputs is enough. Need to determine: 1) Area of coastal and marine ecosystems and threaten species incorporated into the PA, 2) Number of financial plans for coastal and marine PA system, 3) Area and location of the coastal production landscapes and seascapes for certification, 4) area for rehabilitation of degraded lands. Please provide this information to properly evaluate funding.</p> <p>Also, more information is required regarding the proposed the RE pilot investment plan.</p> <p>13 Mar 2012/LH: There is some clarity about the carbon stock monitoring in component 1 in the response to the first review comments on this question. However, a monitoring system itself is an investment. Please be clear if these activities are capacity building for a monitoring system or pieces of the system or the system. Furthermore the system's output appear to indicate it is a land use or</p>	

		would need to pay for the BD monitoring. It is unclear what is going to be measured in the field so it is unclear if the financing is adequate. 3-27-12 Climate Change funds will not be used in this project. Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	9-18-11 Co-financing is provided by various Ministries of the Government of Namibia, Local Government, Private Sector, and a Bilateral. What are the private sector companies interested in investing \$3 million in this project? 13 March 2012/LH: please clarify who is providing the co-financing for the CCM objectives.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	9-18-11 The Agency is bringing no co-financing. Please clarify why. 3-12-12 The WB was selected as the GEF Agency primarily because it is the leading agency for the NACOMA project. Nonetheless, the WB is not bringing co-financing and the co-financing ratio is only 1:3 with all of Government's co-financing in-kind. 3-27-12 Issue addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

	adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>9-19-11 No. Please address issues under items 5,10,11,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,24,25, and 26. This PIF requires moderate to significant work to be considered for clearance. Thanks.</p> <p>14 Mar 2012: No. Because there was a major change in an objective (from CCM-3 to CCM-5), some questions that were cleared under CCM-3 need to be addressed in terms of CCM-5. Please address comments under 2,3,5,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,23,24,25, and 26.</p> <p>3-27-12 Yes. The PIF is recommended.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>3-12-12</p> <p>Please review the following items in the CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>1. Did the Government provide permanent funding for the institutional structure for the National Coastal Policy? See Response to Comments in Revised PIF.</p> <p>2. A map with the areas of the project (Namibian coast and areas inland), the Protected Areas, and Pilot Areas (200,000 ha) where LD investments will take place.</p> <p>3. Activities to be carried out in Dorob National Park (810,000 ha) and NIMBA (500 ha) including</p>	

		4. Details on methodologies and lessons learned on restoration, EIA (mining, tourism, aquaculture and coastal and infrastructural development), and good management and technologies of SLM for the coast developed.	
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 19, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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*	

* 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.