



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

GEF ID:	9426		
Country/Region:	Namibia		
Project Title:	Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty (NILALEG)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5640 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-2; SFM-3;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$10,823,744
Co-financing:	\$65,169,105	Total Project Cost:	\$75,992,849
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Alice Ruhweza,

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	BD: The activities proposed under the BD Program 3 seem well aligned with the GEF6 strategies notably to enhance monitoring and enforcement capacities on wildlife poaching and especially the Black Rhino. However, please explain the extent of the illegal activities in the conservancies that merit these investments, and how these activities will fit into a	

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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>coordinated and national strategy. Coordination with other initiatives and partners (bilateral, NGOs) should also be explained.</p> <p>BD: Please, include the Aichi targets that the project can help to contribute, as well as the corresponding indicators. The Aichi targets may help in this case to simplify the result framework and proposed a better focused project.</p> <p>May 31, 2016 Addressed</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>- Section 11: as mentioned on the top of p11, this current proposal is built on successes from past projects and initiatives. The idea of this project is notably to take lessons from these initiatives. We would like to see at PIF level an analysis of these multiple projects and the guiding lessons, in particular the GEF projects developed under the CPP (#3355, #3356, 2439, and 2915) and following projects (#3737). The project mentions also the conservancy mode. Please, refer to older projects related to the implementation of the conservancy model and closed relatively recently in 2011/2012 ((#1505, #1590).</p> <p>May 31, 2016</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design		Addressed	
	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>- In the proposed approach, bush encroachment is considered as a form of land degradation and a part of the project is aiming to remove bushes from farmland. Please, provide the scientific evidences to support this assertion and justify the interventions.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>- Please include risks related to the way to design and implement this project (integration). Don't you expect potentially some resistance or conflict between institutions?</p> <p>- Risks related to project management (staffing, procurement, procedures, etc.) are missing.</p> <p>- In the PPG, please, include the preparation of a comprehensive risk assessment and report on it.</p> <p>May 31, 2016 Addressed</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	-There are no baseline projects for the majority of the proposed interventions. The project needs to first, focus thematically and geographically, and then point to the "baseline projects", that is, the projects that will be implemented whether or not the GEF grants is	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>awarded. In other words, the projects on which the GEF investments will stand on to deliver Global Environmental Benefits. Without a thematic and geographic focus of the project and a clear description of the baseline projects, it is not possible to elaborate on the incremental reasoning.</p> <p>- We would like to see a theory of change explaining the logics that the project is based on.</p> <p>- GEB: The calculation or estimation of GHG emission reductions is requested to justify the CCM and SFM resources. You should not present them as a foot note (p16), but include this information either in the main body or an annex presenting the calculation and the detailed parameters that were used in the FAO EX-ACT model (soils, vegetation cover).</p> <p>Cofinancing: we welcome a project developed in good coordination and cofinancing with EU and German Cooperation. Please, explain the level of dialogue that is taking place with these partners.</p> <p>May 31, 2016</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- Please check the numbers in the table F (204,500 ha under SLM, 421,100 tons of carbons) and the section 28 (100,000 ha under protection, 200,000 ha under SLM, 631,500 tCO₂ equ over 20 years). Please, clarify.</p> <p>July 12, 2016 There are still discrepancies between the table F and the section 28 (p19) and a possible confusion between Corporate Results 1 and 2 (CR1 and CR2):</p> <p>- In the table F: The CR1 is to maintain a biodiversity of global importance. We read "15,000 ha" of improved managed landscapes, and there is a foot note explaining these ha are for the new regional forests and the community forests. Please, confirm these 15,000 ha, with a better management, have a global interest for biodiversity (because they are KBA for instance).</p> <p>- Please, also confirm the calculation of 204,500 ha under SLM, with 631,450 tCO₂ over 20 years.</p> <p>- In the Section 28: we read 100,000 ha of protected landscapes for the rhino; 10,000 ha in new community forests and 5,000 ha in new community forests, with the gain in</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		carbon of 631,500tCO ₂ ; and 200,000 ha under SLM. Please, make these indicators coherent with the table F. October 11, 2017 The CR1 and CR2 have been revised due to the adjustments of the project. Please, confirm at CEO endorsement.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	- This project has no thematic focus whatsoever. The numerous outputs are a real mix bag, including issues related to: 1) Government Capacity Building, 2) Environmental Crime, 3) Forestry, 4) Agro-forestry, 5) Land Use Plans, 6) Climate-Smart Agriculture, 7) restoration, 8) Ecotourism, 9) Ecosystem Services, 10) cooperatives, 11) micro-credit, 12) eradication of poverty, 13) mapping, 14) methodologies for measuring carbon, 15) community monitoring, and 15) web portal design. It is very difficult to see what is going to come-out of this project after a massive investment of GEF's \$15 million. The Agency and Government need to go back to the drawing board and design a project that has a thematic and geographic focus with a finite number of outputs that relate to each other. The PIF requires a complete overhaul before resubmitting to the GEF Secretariat.	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- The PIF is very ambitious, the table B highlighting four technical components and 33 outputs. It would be advisable to improve the focus and better explain the coherence of the project, and how the different outcomes and outputs are interrelated (if they are).</p> <p>- Result framework: please, pay attention to the formulation of outcomes and outputs (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 2.5, 2.6,...). Outputs should be SMART as far as possible, meaning specific, measurable, reflecting the expected result of activities, and achievable on time. Some formulation ("strengthening", "monitoring", "facilitating") do not fit into this category. In some cases, the proposed indicators in the column "outcomes" help to better understand the expected results. However, please, simplify the result framework, revise the formulation, and transfer some information in the text.</p> <p>- The GEF finances incremental activities. Some outputs can be accepted only if the demonstration is made on the added value of the GEF resources, and the sustainability of the proposed results. Some business as usual activities may be financed by</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>cofinancing (outputs 1.7, 2.9!, 3.3, 4.5, 4.7, 4.9).</p> <p>- Again, the GEF finances additional activities for producing GEB. GEF resources SHOULD NOT be used to finance the implementation of EIA legislation. The GEF does not finance Environmental Impact Assessments (2.3).</p> <p>- In the component 1, 2 and 4, there is no distinction between TA and INV. While it may be difficult to make the distinction at PIF level for the first two components, it should be possible to do it for the fourth one: all activities described in the page 15 seem TA related.</p> <p>- The notion of Investment (INV) of the project is not clear. In Component 4 in Table B on page 5, it seems to me that all tasks there are TAs, not really INV. Please, clarify and revise the last paragraph on page 15 accordingly. Maybe the agency should split TA/INV tasks and budgets for TA and INV.</p> <p>May 31, 2016 Addressed</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects,	Gender	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Thanks for the section on gender. Be clear on the need to identify the obstacles related to inequality, and how this project will help to tackle these obstacles. May 31, 2016 Addressed	
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? 	<p>The proposed grant is within the resources available in STAR allocations for Namibia. Only \$219,000 was programmed for the NDI, so, the proposed budget is under the remaining STAR resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BD: \$4,831,000 (project grant + fees) and \$109,000 of PPG and PPG fees. - CCM: \$2,000,000; - LD: \$5,795,000 (project grant + fees) and \$109,000 of PPG and PPG fees. <p>Addressed.</p> <p>October 10, 2017 The project grant has been reduced down to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BD: \$3,761,326 (project grant + fees) and \$109,000 of PPG and fees. - CCM: \$1,989,530 (project grant + fees). 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- LD: \$3,866,725 (project grant + fees) + \$109,000 of PPG and fees. With the \$2 million from SFM, the GEF project grant is now of \$10,823,744 + \$974,137 of fees for a total of \$11,797,881.</p> <p>The letter of endorsement which is available in the PMIS reflect the initial amounts. It is ok to move forward with the existing letter. However, a letter with the revised amounts will help to reflect the good understanding from the country and the dialogue between UNDP and the country. We received an informal feedback that the letter will be submitted in the next days.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	Addressed.	
	<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"> Focal area set-aside? 	<p>The project is asking or \$5,795,000 from the SFM programme.</p> <p>May 31, 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SFM contribution has been reduced down to \$4,500,000 (\$4,905,000 with fees. - The availability of SFM resources will be re-checked at time of actual 	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>work program inclusion.</p> <p>July 12, 2016 As mentioned in the last review, we have to adjust the SFM resources before considering Work Programme Inclusion: Please revise the SFM budget down to \$2 million in the project grant (\$2,180,000 with fees, no SFM in the PPG).</p> <p>July 20, 2016 Adjustments have been made.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>May 31, 2016 Minor details remain. Please, address the comments above. Also consider the two following comments: - Table E on the PPG: the requested PPG is \$200,000 + \$18,000 of fees (9% for projects beyond \$10 million). Please remove the mention of \$210,000 and \$18,900 of fees. - The availability of SFM resources will be re-checked at time of actual work program inclusion.</p> <p>July, 12 2016 The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the items 4 and 7</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(coherence of GEB, and level of SFM resources).</p> <p>July 20, 2016 Adjustments have been made as requested.</p> <p>The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance.</p> <p>August 18, 2017 While this project was technically cleared, please note that Council decision GEF/C.51/04 - Update on GEF-6 Resource Availability requests the Secretariat to effectively and proactively manage the projected shortfall in GEF-6. At this juncture we anticipate that sufficient resources may not be available in GEF-6 for Namibia. As mandated, the Secretariat will keep the issue under review and will advise of any changes that may arise. We invite your project team to contact the Secretariat for further details.</p> <p>October 11, 2017 The adjustments have been made. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 20, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 02, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 11, 2016	

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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
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?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.