



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

GEF ID:	9660		
Country/Region:	Zimbabwe		
Project Title:	Zimbabwe- Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5693 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-2 Program 3; LD-2 Program 3; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$130,000	Project Grant:	\$10,025,964
Co-financing:	\$47,411,000	Total Project Cost:	\$57,566,964
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Penny Stock

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental		

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> 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?		
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	1-25-18 The changes introduced in the CEO Endorsement since the submission of the Child Project with the PFD are all reasonable and properly explained in Annex D of the CEO Endo (p.67-68). Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	1-25-18 Yes. The project has components for Technical Assistance and Investment at the National- and local-levels (Protected Areas and Conservancies) that are most likely to deliver the proposed outputs and outcomes. Cleared	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	1-25-18  Yes. This GEF\$10M project has co-financing in the amount of \$47M for a total of \$57M. If the co-financing in Grants (99%) becomes available during project execution, this project is most likely to deliver the outputs and in the longer term, tangible and measurable results on the ground.  Please confirm that budget allocation to PAs in Component 2 is going to be sufficient to obtain the proposed results.	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		2-1-18 Issues properly addressed in the revised version and response matrix. Cleared	
	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)	1-25-18 There is a detailed Risk Analysis and Mitigation Measures on pages 46-50. Cleared	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	1-25-18 Yes. The 16 letters of co-financing from the Government, Private Sector and CSOs were submitted with the CEO Endorsement. Cleared	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	1-25-18 Yes. The following are observations made by the GWP Coordination grant in charge of the aggregation of TTs at the portfolio level. Please address as appropriate. Thanks.  1. Project ID to be added: 9727 (number included in the Endorsement request) 2. For the METT tabs for Mana Pools, Hurungwe, Sapi and Doma good if they review Data sheet 5 as it is not consistent (=REF!) with the information provided in data sheet 2 (and supposedly the indicator(s) will	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>automatically appear in this table once entered in Data Sheet 20)</p> <p>2-1-18 Issues properly addressed in the revised version and response matrix. Cleared</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>1-25-18 Yes. See p.55-57 of CEO Endorsement. Annex H listed in the Project Document, but Annex not included with submission. Please send all Annexes listed on p. 119 of Project Document (A to T).</p> <p>2-1-18 Issues properly addressed in the revised version and response matrix. Cleared</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>1-25-18 Yes. Pages 57-58 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>1-25-18 Yes. Component 4. See also p.55 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	1-25-18 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 3, 6 and 8. Thanks.  2-1-18 Yes. This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	January 26, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 01, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> 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.