



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

GEF ID:	5065		
Country/Region:	Swaziland		
Project Title:	Strengthening the National Protected Areas System of Swaziland		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4932 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	BD
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,390,000
Co-financing:	\$25,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$30,390,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Veronica Muthui

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	8-21-12 Yes. Swaziland is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	8-21-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP dated 25th July for \$6,094,000 inclusive of PPG and Agency Fee. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	8-21-12 Yes. As stated in the PIF, "This project is aligned with one of UNDP's signature programs on biodiversity which focuses on unleashing the economic potential of Protected Areas. Currently, UNDP is	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		supporting GEF financed and other initiatives aimed at strengthening PA management effectiveness, and PA financial sustainability in some 1000 PAs globally". 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?	8-21-12 Yes. At country level, UNDP has a long standing environmental programme with the Government of Swaziland, which has strengthened capacity in national policy development with regards to multi-lateral environmental agreements. UNDP will provide support from the Regional Office in Pretoria. Cleared	
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? 	8-21-12 Yes. Swaziland is using \$6,094,000 of its STAR resources. It is in the "Flexible" category (under \$7M). Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	8-21-12 Yes. Swaziland is using \$6,094,000 of its STAR resources. It is the "Flexible" category (under \$7M) and using all BD, LD and CC financial resources. Cleared	
	<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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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?	8-21-12 Yes. Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	8-21-12 Yes. BD-1, Outcomes 1 & 2. Cleared	
	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?	8-21-12 Yes. The project was selected in a National Portfolio Prioritization consultation process held in 2011. The country decided to use the Flexibility Mechanism and allocate its entire GEF V resources to improving PA management. The project is in line with the country's NBSAP, the Ministry of Tourism 2010-2015 development strategy and the Swaziland Nature Conservation Trust (SNTC) restructuring and commercialization strategy, as well as its 2011-2015 implementation strategy. Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	8-21-12 Yes. See elements in Results Framework including: i) GIS based knowledge and information management system operationalized and supports systematic biodiversity planning, and ii) Training for managing the community-managed PA. Cleared	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the	8-21-12 There is ample description of the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	<p>baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>activities undertaken by Government and the Private Sector in support of the PAs. Nevertheless, there is no clarity on the finances of the PAs targeted by this project. Please clearly state what the baseline investments are (dollar figures) and the gap expected to be filled by activities under this project (i.e. Ecotourism).</p> <p>9-12-12 The outstanding issues were properly resolved in the revised PIF (see Responses to GEFSec's Review of August 2012). 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>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>8-21-12 Yes. Clared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>8-21-12</p> <p>Please address the following issues:</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>1. Please break Component 1 in two components, one for each Outcome. Please specify the financial allocation to each component and if the Grant Type/component is TA or INV (Second</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Outcome should be mostly INV and should use the most of the resources currently allocated to Component 1).</p> <p>2. Include new proposed PAs in Table 1, indicating expected classification, management type, status and approx. size. Modify table so increases in area (as stated in 2nd Outcome of Component 1) can be seen easily.</p> <p>3. Ecotourism has become the default proposed solution for community conservation areas. What makes the proponents believe that ecotourism is in fact going to deliver financial returns to the communities around the PAs in question? Please provide the names of the community-based ecotourism enterprises in Swaziland that serve as role models. See this comment in light of Risk associated with Tourism (B.4 p.12). What is the "Plan B" in case Ecotourism does not deliver the expected results? This question emerges from seeing numerous cases where Ecotourism was presented as a viable solution and turned out to be a disappointment for all in the communities.</p> <p>4. What are the "environmental" and "social safeguards" for ecotourism to be implemented in the project?</p> <p>5. What is the "private sector" partner of the Community Conservation Area to be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>created? Is it one or two areas?</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p> <p>Please also indicate the baseline (number of visitors) of domestic and international tourism for the PAs subject of this project. Are these numbers and projections sufficiently high to justify the development of tourism products listed under Component 2?</p> <p>9-12-12 The outstanding issues were properly resolved in the revised PIF (see Responses to GEFSec's Review of August 2012). Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>8-23-12</p> <p>Please clarify if communities have access to natural resources inside the PAs. Compare paragraph 40 (p.12) with second risk of table B.4.</p> <p>9-12-12 The outstanding issues were properly resolved in the revised PIF (see Responses to GEFSec's Review of August 2012). Cleared</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/</p>	<p>8-23-12 Yes. There is the potential of over promising and underdelivering benefits derived from tourism and the creation of new PAs. Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	additional benefits?		
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>8-21-12 Not clear if communities in areas to be created or improved in management effectiveness were consulted in preparation of the PIF. Please clarify.</p> <p>9-12-12 The outstanding issues were properly resolved in the revised PIF (see Responses to GEFSec's Review of August 2012). 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>8-23-12 The institutions (3 according to table B.4, only 1 in the cover page and 2 in parts of the body other PIF) responsible for the implementation of each of the components should be clearly stated at PIF stage need to be stated at PIF stage. Details at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Rank risk for "Increasing sustainability....".</p> <p>9-12-12 The outstanding issues were properly resolved in the revised PIF (see Responses to GEFSec's Review of August 2012). Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	8-21-12 Yes. See page 14 of PIF. Cleared	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	8-21-12 Please clarify who is going to execute the project. On cover page is SEA. In table B.5 are SNCT and the SEA. On Table 2 there are SEA, SNTC, and MOAC. Please clarify role per Component to avoid tensions and confusion during project preparation and implementation. 9-12-12 The outstanding issues were properly resolved in the revised PIF (see Responses to GEFSec's Review of August 2012). Cleared	
	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?	8-21-12 GEF Project Magement is 3.8% and co-financing Project Management is 4.9%. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	8-21-12 1) Please divide Component 1 in two (Policy vs. Creation of PAs). 2) Grant Type of Component 2 (Strengthening PA functions) needs to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>be INV. Technical Assistance will most likely result in little funding reaching the ground. Alternatively, divide GEF investment per Outcome (INV for 1.1, and TA for 1.2 and 1.3?).</p> <p>9-12-12 The outstanding issues were properly resolved in the revised PIF (see Responses to GEFSec's Review of August 2012). Cleared</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>8-21-12 Co-financing is in the amount of \$25M. All but \$5M are in cash. Co-financing ratio is 1:4.7. Cleared</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>8-21-12 UNDP is providing \$1M in cash. Cleared</p>	
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?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>8-23-12 No. Please address outstanding issues</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		under items 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 24. Thanks. 9-12-12 Yes. This PIF is technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming work program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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*	August 23, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 12, 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*	

	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.