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

GEF ID:	**4645**		
Country/Region:	**Zimbabwe**		
Project Title:	**Hwange-Sanyati Biological Corridor (HSBC) Environment Management and Conservation Project**		
GEF Agency:	**World Bank**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1; LD-3; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$5,645,000**
Co-financing:	**$23,165,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$28,810,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**November 09, 2011**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jean-Marc Sinnassamy**	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?	CBD: Zimbabwe is a party since 11/11/94. UNCCD: Zimbabwe became effectively a Party on December 22, 1997. UNFCCC: Zimbabwe ratified the UNFCCC on the 03 November 1992	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	There is a letter of endorsement in date of September 1, 2011, signed by I.D. Kunene, GEF operational focal point. The project title is "Hwange-Sanyati Biological Corridor Environment Management and Conservation Project". The total financing being requested is $6,429,500 with the following breakdown: $2,134,000 (BD), $1,980,000 (LD), $885,500 (CC), $1,430,000 (SFM).	
Agency's Comparative	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly	Yes (see section C and C2).	

	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?	The project is consistent with the interim strategy note for Zimbabwe (under development). The WB has an office in Harare where the task manager is located with fiduciary staff.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	- Please, be aware that the GEF5 BD allocation for Zimbabwe is $1,720,000, while $2,134,000 is requested. The request is however possible, as Zimbabwe is a flexible country. However, we have to know on which focal area the additional resources are taken. Please clarify or revise accordingly. - Please revise any consequence for the SFM incentive. - Both LD and CC amounts are under the limits of the STAR allocations (see further for the use of CC resources). 12 Sep 2011/LH: a) We note on page 11 of the PIF the statement that the government endorsed GEF5 resources to the tune of US$5million for this project. This is a bit confusing as the endorsement letter clearly states that a total of $6,429,500 is being requested. Please rephrase the sentence on page 11 for clarity. b) Also, Zimbabwe is a flexible country in terms of their GEF allocation	

		choosing to be flexible with their allocation. 18 Sept 2011/LH: a) and b) is addressed. September 19, 2011 Cleared.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Only the BD and LD allocations are used for a SFM project, while the CC allocation is devoted to enabling activities. Then, the SFM incentive should be calculated with the ratio of 3:1 only for the BD and LD allocations. Under these conditions, the SFM incentive cannot exceed $1,184,333. Sept. 19, 2011 Point taken.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	(RM 09/13/11): Up to US$500,000 is available for national communications to the UNFCCC. If additional resources are required, these resources should come from the STAR Allocation Sept. 19, 2011 All enabling activities have been removed. Cleared.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	- The outcomes and outputs are well aligned for the BD, LD, and SFM result framework. - (RM 09/13/11): The project is not	

		mitigation results framework. The output needs to be the development of a national communication and submission of the national communication to UNFCCC. Currently the activities in the project have not been designed to produce a national communication (LH, 09/12/11) a) Please include the relevant number for the outputs (see the GEF 5 Template Reference Guide, Sept 2010, at http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624 b) Also please note that SFM/REDD+ objectives must focus on forests, although these can be forests in the wider landscape. Please, confirm. 18 Sept 2011/LH: b) is addressed. A carbon monitoring system is listed as an output for component 2. This is output 5.1 C stock monitoring system established. Please add the output to the list in Table A if this is indeed to be an output. September 19, 2011 - The relevant number for the outputs were included. - The project will focus on 244 081.92 ha of forests.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Addressed.	
	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?	The project is consistent with the National Environmental Policy and Strategies (June 2009).	

	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Please develop the plan, if any, to develop capacities at national and local level, Develop the aspects of sustainability of project outcomes, notably linked to the management of protected areas and the improved land and forest management practices. September 19, 2011 Cleared.	
Project Design	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?	- Problems and key issues are broadly described. However, if we understand the willingness of the Bank to develop a multi-donor trust fund, the outlines of the baseline project are not crystal clear. Please develop (is the multi-donor trust fund active? what is the level of advancment of the mentioned project developed under this TF?) - Five factors are identified as posing problems for ecosystems in Zimbabwe. However, there is no further information to figure out what are the most relevant or the most urgent to address. It is then difficult to judge if the project is aimed well. For instance, wildlife poaching is mentioned a few times, but the issue is not quantified or evaluated and does not seem to be addressed in any of the components. - Same comment for invasive species. - 12 Sep 2011/LH: Please explain briefly what is missing in the current tools so that new tools and methodologies need to be developed, rather than adopting or modifying current tools.	

		needed about the existing tools under consideration. A number of agencies, including WWF, have received overall notable sums of funding from GEF projects for tool development. The tools that are needed here may already exist. Please be more specific. (RM 09/13/11): The project activities identified will not lead to the production of a national communication, as the activities are not in line with UNFCCC guidance , in particular decision 17/CP.8. September 19, 2011 - The point on the Multi-Donor Trust Fund is cleared. - The point on the problem analysis is taken. We understand that a deeper analysis will also be included in the project preparation. - Cleared.	
	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	We do not clearly understand what will be done by the baseline project and then how the GEF will be incremental. The very broad nature of the project mixing protected area management, SLM, SFM, and CC tools appears opportunistic to maximize the project amount. But we have difficulties to understand the business-as-usual scenario, the role of the baseline project, and the	

		revise the rationale (section B2) and reinforce the coherence of the whole project under the SFM strategy. - From what we understand on this SFM project, some carbon benefit has to be identified, and somehow estimated. - The pilot efforts in the component 2 are welcome. However, we need more clarity on waht types of services will be enhanced through SFM efforts. - More information and framework are requested about the pilot restoration projects: what kind of restoration, activities, and what sustainability. September 19, 2011 Most of the points are cleared. We understand that carbon benefits will be measured during project preparation. However, an estimation has to be included at PIF level. Please, revise.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	- Under the BD component, please explain what will be done by the cofinancing on livelihood alternatives, and how the GEF resources will be used. Under a BD1 objective project, it is not expected for the GEF to be the predominant player on activities and sub-projects on livelihoods in the buffer zone. Moreover, the sustainability aspects of this approach have to be explained. - Under the SFM/SLM component, many outputs seem linked to research activities (modeling, economic tools, monitoring tools). Please clearly explain	

		by the baseline project (cofinancing), and develop outputs that fit well with the GEF5 LD and SFM strategy. Develop the part between research/tool definition and the application on the ground. It might be difficult to justify the use of US$2,100,000 only to develop tools. We remind that we are mainly looking for impacts on the ground in terms of ecosystem services from STAR allocations and the SFM incentive. We will appreciate that a significant part of the GEF resources (i.e. more than 50 percent) are used for impacts on the ground rather than tools, studies, or research. (RM 09/13/11): Under the climate change component the project framework is not sound or clear. The expected output is a national climate change strategy and communication submitted to the UNFCCC. The activities outlined in section B2-Component three will not need to the development of a national communication. These activities currently do not include a greenhouse gas inventory or make any reference to UNFCCC Decision 17/CP.8, which provide the guidelines to prepare a national communication. Overalll it does not currently appear to be appropriate to include the national communications as component of this project. (RM September 13. 2011) 18 Sept 2011/LH: Based on the response to the second comment to this question in the first review, here are more	

		a) Afforestation is now listed as an activity in the text. CC5 funds are used for afforestation. Please estimate area to be afforested, and list any species under consideration to be planted, and note that invasive or exotic species will not be used. b) More specifics are needed on tool development at the PIF stage to understand what is being proposed for the funding request. As indicated in the response to #11, the GEF has given out major funding for tools in the past, including to WWF. We expect the PIF to say that the GEF reserves our rights to the tools developed because we expect them to be available for use by others, without having to pay for tool use or access. Also please address the sustainability of tool use, because tools usually have maintenance costs and need to be updated too. September 19, 2011 - All points addressed, but the question on afforestation. Please address the point (remind that deep changes in lands and land uses are potentially not eligible). - Note, that additional information on tools (sustainability, access, updating, storage) are expected at CEO endorsement. see cell. 31.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Even without a robust reasoning, we understand that the project may have significant global environment benefits since the HSBC area is a high Biodiversity hotspot with globally threatened species, protected areas, IBAs, etc.	

		For the SLM/SFM components, the Global Environment Benefits are less obvious. Please justify the reasoning and the GEB. In the existing conditions of capacities and resource availability, carbon benefits should be estimated for SFM/REDD+ projects. A simple Tier 1 approach can be used, with default factors, with brief text describing the source of the default factors (LH, 09/11/11). Please add these. Also, the GEF Carbon Benefits tool may prove useful. 18 Sept 2011/LH: Enough information should be available at this stage to provide these estimates. Approximate areas to be afforested, or reforested, areas of avoided deforestation multiplied by default emission or sequestration factors are what is needed. Updated refined estimates are expected by CEO endorsement.	
	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?	- The description is broad and lack specific elements to the Hwange-Sanyati area. However, socio-economic benefits are mentioned, as well as the particular situation of women. We understand that the improvement of the protected area management will contribute to increase employment opportunities. The project will also finance alternative livelihood sub-projects.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	partially addressed (see section B5). - Please, add some information on the role of local communities, especially the communal land.	

		sector, especially if some form of PES is being proposed. September 19, 2011 Addressed.	
	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)	A broad range of risks is proposed. A deeper analysis is expected at CEO endorsement.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Please, revise the section B6 and describe how this project will be properly coordinated with other initiatives in the country and the region. September 19, 2011 Cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project will be executed by WWF and implemented by the legitimate national and local partners, with various coordination and consultation mechanisms. However, develop the role of local communities, traditional authorities, and the private sector (see comment cell 17). 12 Sep 2011/LH: Please clarify who will be executing/conducting the work on the tools and methodologies. 18 Sept 2011/LH: My comment is addressed, thank you.	
	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?		
	23. Is funding level for project	Please, maintain the management costs	

Project Financing		Maintain at least the same cofinancing ratio for management costs than for the whole project. Sept. 19, 2011 Cleared.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Difficult to review without a revision of the reasoning and a better understanding of the baseline situation and the use of GEF resources. see comments above. cleared.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	From a general point of view, the cofinancing ratio is relatively low (1:2.33). However, we can understand the difficulty to raise a higher ratio in current conditions where partners are just coming back. At CEO endorsement, please confirm a cofinancing ratio of minimu 1:3 or even 1:4, if possible. September 19, 2011 Addressed and included in the cell. 31.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes, the WB is mainly bringing cofinancing from a multi-donor trust fund. Please confirm the existence of this trust fund and the amount. September 19, 2011 Addressed.	
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?		
	29. Has the Agency responded		

	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	This project is highly welcome and we thank the Agency to provide an appropriate support to Zimbabwe to make it happen. However, the PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address comments raised above. September 19, 2011 Thanks for the revised document. Most of the points are now addressed. However, please see cell. 13, 14, and 15 (the cell 15 actually repeats the comments made in cells 13 and 14). The PIF does not address the carbon estimation that is needed at PIF level. Afforestation activities have been included in the PIF and need clarifications. Please, note that some other points have been transferred into the cell. 31 and will be reviewed at CEO endorsement. September 19, 2011. - There is a preliminary estimation of carbon benefits and reference to afforestation has been removed from the PIF. The PIF is recommended for clearance. June 20, 2012 At the time of PIF approval by Council in November 2011, the country did not consider a PPG and the OFP therefore endorsed only the PIF amount. Now, the	

		WWF will assist in the preparation of project. In order to keep the same endorsed amount, the government resubmitted a revised PIF with an amount reduced of $200,000 (= the PPG amount). This change implies a PIF reduction that is under 5 percent and is considered as a minor change. Following OBS guidance, we understand that no Council decision has to be requested. However, we have to revise the letter of approval showing the project budget reduction. Of course, the project reduction is the only change brought to the PIF and we have reviewed the PPG. We found that both documents are ok and the amounts are within the country allocations. This new amount should be reflected in the CEO endorsement.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- Quantification of GEB, including carbon benefits. - Develop and prioritize the risk analysis. - Develop implementation arrangements, including the role of local communities (notably on communal lands), traditional authorities, NGO, and the private sector. - Improve the cofinancing ratio. - Incude a problem identification and prioritization analysis in the preparation phase, notably to reinforce the project reasoning and show that the project is addressing the root-problems. - Develop the reasoning on sustainability, notably on activities	

		experiences and the litterature show that this kind of approach has a few chances of success if they are only adressed under a project approach. How these activities will be maintainted once the financing support of the project will end? Are the capacities enough strong? - Develop aspects of sustainability for the different tools that are proposed (access, updating, data storage, etc.). June 20, 2012 Reflect the revised amount at CEO endorsement.	
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 08, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 19, 2011	
	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?	The PPG is well presented and the activities are conceived to provide baseline information and assessments that are necessary to document the thre technical components of the project: 1) improving PA management effectiveness, 2) promoting improved land and forest management practices, and 3) support to technical and institutional capacity improvement.

		However, there are rooms for improvement and a need to clarify the following points: - Please include in the PPG how you will address major comments expressed by the STAP and the German Council Member. We did not find mention of these comments and notably: how you will take lessons from other similiar initiatives in the region (Zambia, Botswana, Angola, etc); how you will develop a comprehensive risk analysis (including climate change risks); how you will evaluate and integrate the lessons from CAMPFIRE; how you will address the sustainability issue. - Many activities are mentioned to design the baseline for BD, LD, and SFM, but not for CC-M. Please, clarify. - In the annex A, most of the tasks to be performed are very operational and output oriented. However, we invite the Agency to remove any unclear task that cannot be evaluated by a concrete output or deliverable. For instance for the NRM and community Development Specialist, the task G "Discuss with the communities" is not enough clear and do not reflect a clear output. Please, correct. - For the International Land Management Specialist, the task "possibly support the development of a model in the dynamics of land degradation in the selected sub-catchment" is not clear. Please reformulate or remove it. - For the Local land use management specialist, the task of "coordination" is not welcome and not eligible under the PPG. Please, correct. - A Technical Advisor is not eligible in a PPG. All activities of "guidance", "coordination", and "management" are not eligible. We are also surprised to find a task of "reviewing reports and draft elements of the result framework" and another of "assisting the WWF Director". All these activities are either not eligible or not welcome in the PPG. Please correct. - We find the mention of the BD tracking tools, but please confirm that all tracking tools (BD, LD, and SFM) will be completed. June 19, 2012 All points have been addressed.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	- The PPG is completed by a new letter of endorsement in date of March 7, 2012 showing the breakdown between focal areas and between a PPG and the project

		date of September 1, 2011). The PIF was notably approved at the November Council for the maximum possible amount of $5,845,000 (+ fees). If the request for a PPG is confirmed, please send a PIF with a revised amount. The project grant should be $5,645,000 (plus fees of $564,500, GEF total: $6,429,500) and not $5,845,000. Table B: - The item 8 in the budget is not welcome. Actually, coordination, consolidation of results, and the finalization of the project document are not eligible under a PPG and should be covered by the cofinancing and/or the Agency. Please correct. - The item 2 is the only one to mention travel arrangements. Please, harmonize. We suggest to remove the mention of travel costs in this table. - However, the mention of "coordination" (again) is not welcome in the item 2. As previously mentioned, the PPG does not cover coordination costs. Please, correct. Table E - We do not understand the mention of operating costs. Please, confirm that the PPG is not used for any kinds of management costs. No management costs are eligible under a PPG. Please, correct. - Confirm and complete the number of person weeks: 50 for local consultants and 8 for international consultants. - The costs of consultants seem relatively high. Please, confirm these costs($3,500 per week for international consultants and $2,000 for local consultants). Please, confirm also they follow agency rules in the country. - The tasks performed by the Climate Change Specialist seems more in line with a Carbon/REDD+ specialist. Moreover, there is also a national forestry specialist. Don't you think a single expert on Carbon/REDD+ should be enough? Please, confirm the need for a Climate Change Specialist and confirm the need to have two experts. Some savings could be made. June 19, 2012 All points have been addressed. We notably take note that the Agency confirms that the consultant rate costs are in line with the agency guidelines.
Secretariat	**3.Is PPG approval being**	The PPG cannot be recommended yet.

		project grant of $5,845,000, and fees for $584,500. A PIF was then approved for the amount of $5,845,000 that does not let a room for a PPG. However, if a PPG is needed, the PIF amount has to be reduced of the PPG amount and the associated fees. Please, confirm and send a revised PIF with the right numbers. Then, address comments above. Without a technical coordinator ($27,000) and operating costs ($12,000), it seems that the PPG budget might significantly be reduced. Please, revise the PPG and see how you can reduce the budget. An amount of $200,000 is unusual for a single country project even in a complex country as Zimbabwe. June 19, 2012 All major points are considered addressed. However, we would like to get the Agency's attention on some specific points that we include in the cell. 4 "Other comments". Please include these points in the PPG. We will check them at CEO endorsement. Based on these considerations, the PPG can be recommended for clearance.
	4. Other comments	- In the GIS Specialist's terms of reference, it is mentioned that a system will be designed, including biodiversity, land degradation, and SFM aspects. Please, include Climate change mitigation. - Remind that in the final project document we will check the proposed methodology and the baseline proposed to monitor carbon benefits. Due to the use of CC allocations, we expect to find clear LULUCF and carbon monitoring activities.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 06, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 19, 2012

* 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.