



GEF -7 Global Wildlife Program -Addendum

Part I: Program Information

GEF ID

Program Type

PFD

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

CBIT

NGI

Program Title

GEF -7 Global Wildlife Program -Addendum

Countries

Global, Bhutan, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa

Agency(ies)

World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, IUCN, WWF-US

Other Executing Partner(s)

Governments of participating countries and other institutions

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Biodiversity

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Stakeholders, Private Sector, SMEs, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Capital providers, Large corporations, Beneficiaries, Local Communities, Civil Society, Non-Governmental Organization, Academia, Community Based Organization, Communications, Behavior change, Awareness Raising, Type of Engagement, Information Dissemination, Partnership, Participation, Consultation, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender-sensitive indicators, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Enabling Activities, Knowledge Generation, Course, Training, Workshop, Capacity Development, Knowledge Exchange, Peer-to-Peer, Field Visit, South-South, North-South, Conference, Learning, Theory of change, Adaptive management, Biodiversity, Mainstreaming, Tourism, Species, Threatened Species, Illegal Wildlife Trade, Wildlife for Sustainable Development, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Forest, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 2

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Duration

84 In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

1,523,063

Program Commitment Deadline

6/2/2021

Submission Date

3/23/2020

Impact Program

IP-Food-Land-Restoration **No**

IP-Sustainable Cities **No**

IP-Sustainable Forest Management Amazon **No**

IP-Sustainable Forest Management Congo **No**

IP-Sustainable Forest Management Drylands **No**

Other Program **Yes**

A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements

| Programming Directions | Expected Outcomes | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|--------------------------------|--|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| BD-1-1 | Landscapes and marine habitat under improved management (excluding protected areas) Terrestrial habitat under improved conservation and sustainable use (million hectares) | GET | 2,835,780 | 6,231,444 |
| BD-1-2a | Landscapes and marine habitat under improved management (excluding protected areas) Terrestrial habitat under improved conservation and sustainable use (million hectares) | GET | 4,079,111 | 37,042,640 |
| BD-1-2b | Landscapes and marine habitat under improved management (excluding protected areas) Terrestrial habitat under improved conservation and sustainable use (million hectares) | GET | 5,154,696 | 25,878,000 |
| BD-2-7 | Landscapes and marine habitat under improved management (excluding protected areas) Terrestrial habitat under improved conservation and sustainable use (million hectares) | GET | 4,853,350 | 39,058,654 |
| Total Program Cost (\$) | | | 16,922,937 | 108,210,738 |

B. Indicative Project description summary

Program Objective

Promote wildlife conservation and crime prevention for sustainable and resilient development.

| Program Component | Financing Type | Program Outcomes | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|--|----------------|---|------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Component 1 - Conserve Wildlife and Enhance Habitat Resilience | Investment | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Stabilization or increase in populations of, and area occupied by, wildlife at program sitesAreas of landscapes and terrestrial/marine protected areas under improved practices and management effectiveness (METT for PAs)Formal agreements signed to increase connectivity of landscapes and establish transnational conservation areasStrengthened long-term partnerships, governance, and finance frameworks for PAs Increased revenues for protected areas and landscapes | GET | 4,130,068 | 25,737,273 |

| Program Component | Financing Type | Program Outcomes | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|--|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Component 2 - Promote Wildlife-based and Resilient Economies | Investment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="584 331 1137 395">• Enhanced policies, legislations, and strategies to foster wildlife-based economy <li data-bbox="584 427 1122 491">• Increased access to finance for enterprises that support wildlife-based economy (WBE) <li data-bbox="584 523 1144 587">• Strengthened capacity of stakeholders to develop WBE and sustainable use activities <li data-bbox="584 619 1167 683">• Increased concession agreements and nature- based tourism investments <li data-bbox="584 715 1137 810">• Increased participation of communities in conservation compatible rural enterprises and WBE jobs <li data-bbox="584 842 1077 866">• Additional livelihood activities established <li data-bbox="584 898 1088 963">• Increased Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) strategies and site interventions deployed | GET | 3,888,451 | 17,311,902 |

| Program Component | Financing Type | Program Outcomes | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|---|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Component 3 - Combat Wildlife Trafficking | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened policy and regulatory frameworks to prevent, detect and penalize wildlife crime Improved access to and use of actionable information, data, and intelligence through secure sharing mechanisms Improved enforcement, judicial, and prosecutorial institutional capacity to combat wildlife crime (site-based law enforcement). Increased use of financial investigations and specialized techniques applied to other serious crime Decreased number of target species poached (i.e. use of SMART tools) | GET | 6,000,601 | 45,699,371 |
| Component 4 - Reduce Demand | Investment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced demand of illegal wildlife and wildlife products from key consumer countries Improved awareness of wildlife crime through campaigns and advocacy Increased number of tools used to advocate against consumption of illicit wildlife products and promote ethical behavior | GET | 250,000 | 751,045 |

| Program Component | Financing Type | Program Outcomes | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|--|----------------------|--|------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Component 5: Coordinate and Enhance Learning | Technical Assistance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhanced understanding of wildlife as an economic asset Strengthened Public-private partnerships for promoting wildlife-based economies Enhanced upstream sector engagement (governance, fiscal, finance, and trade) Improved coordination among countries, donors, and other key stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the GWP Increased global policy dialogue and engagement on IWT and wildlife for sustainable development <p>Enhanced GWP management and monitoring platform</p> | GET | 1,856,701 | 16,418,806 |
| Sub Total (\$) | | | | 16,125,821 | 105,918,397 |
| Program Management Cost (PMC) | | | | | |
| | | | GET | 797,116 | 2,292,341 |
| Sub Total(\$) | | | | 797,116 | 2,292,341 |
| Total Program Cost(\$) | | | | 16,922,937 | 108,210,738 |

C. Co-Financing for the Program by Source, by Name and by Type

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financier | Type of Co-financing | Investment Mobilized | Amount(\$) |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| GEF Agency | UNDP | Grant | Investment mobilized | 700,000 |
| GEF Agency | UNDP | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 525,550 |
| Government | Wildlife and Fisheries Department of Punjab, Provincial Forest and Wildlife Department of Gilgit-Baltistan, Provincial Forest, Wildlife and Park Departments of AJ & K, Ministry of Water, Land and Natural Resources, Sabah Wildlife Department, Sarawak Forestry Corporation, National Park Service, Ministry of Information and Culture (Department of Tourism) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 32,871,462 |
| Government | National Park Service, Ministry of Information and Culture (Department of Tourism), DEFF, SanParks | Grant | Investment mobilized | 3,700,000 |
| Government | Ministry of Water, Land and Natural Resources, Sabah Wildlife Department, Sarawak Forestry Corporation | Public Investment | Investment mobilized | 35,750,000 |
| CSO | Pelindung Alam Malaysia, WCS-Malaysia, WWF-Malaysia, Africa Nature Investors Foundation (ANI) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 11,546,726 |
| CSO | WCS, Africa Nature Investors Foundation (ANI) | Unknown at this stage | Investment mobilized | 800,000 |
| CSO | Pelindung Alam Malaysia | Public Investment | Recurrent expenditures | 2,189,000 |

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financier | Type of Co-financing | Investment Mobilized | Amount(\$) |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Others | SADC Secretariat | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 1,000,000 |
| Others | Dutch Postcode Lottery | Grant | Investment mobilized | 18,928,000 |
| Others | UNWTO | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 200,000 |
| Total Program Cost(\$) | | | | 108,210,738 |

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

The investments mobilized are potential leveraged resources based on engagement with partners and collaborators. And includes co-financing from various organizations such as civil society organizations, donor agencies, recipient governments, private sector and beneficiaries for both recurrent expenditures and investments mobilized through loans, staff support, use of equipment, corporate social responsibility, Public investments, etc. All the investment will be confirmed during the PPG phase. Co-financing sources and amounts are indicative at this stage.

D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

| Agency | Trust Fund | Country | Focal Area | Programming of Funds | Amount(\$) | Fee(\$) | Total(\$) |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| UNDP | GET | Nigeria | Biodiversity | BD STAR Allocation | 3,519,725 | 316,775 | 3,836,500 |
| UNDP | GET | Bhutan | Biodiversity | BD STAR Allocation | 183,486 | 16,514 | 200,000 |
| UNDP | GET | Malaysia | Biodiversity | BD STAR Allocation | 7,139,450 | 642,550 | 7,782,000 |
| IUCN | GET | Pakistan | Biodiversity | BD STAR Allocation | 2,652,294 | 238,706 | 2,891,000 |
| UNEP | GET | South Africa | Biodiversity | BD STAR Allocation | 3,427,982 | 308,518 | 3,736,500 |
| Total GEF Resources(\$) | | | | | 16,922,937 | 1,523,063 | 18,446,000 |

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 3,131,100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 3,131,100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| Name of the Protected Area | WDPA ID | IUCN Category | Total Ha (Expected at PIF) | Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|----------------------------|---------|---------------|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Akula National Park | 125689 | Select | 3,131,100.00 | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| Name of the Protected Area | WDPA ID | IUCN Category | Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) | METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement) | METT score (Achieved at MTR) | METT score (Achieved at TE) |
|----------------------------|---------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|----------------------------|---------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| 733762.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| 733,762.00 | | | |

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| | | | |

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| | | | |

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| | | | |

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

| Title | Submitted | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Number (Expected at PIF) | Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Number (Achieved at MTR) | Number (Achieved at TE) |
| Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment | | | | |
| Female | 165,350 | | | |
| Male | 165,350 | | | |
| Total | 330700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

The Program GEF-7 Core Indicators were calculated by adding the values of the National Projects. The National Projects had indicator worksheets. This Program, open to GEF eligible countries and parties to the Convention of Biological Diversity, will support Target 11 of the Aichi Biodiversity Target by 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes. It also supports Target 12 of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets: “by 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.” Many countries participating in this Program have identified poaching and the illegal wildlife trade as a significant threat in their National Biodiversity Strategies (NBSAPs).

Part II. Programmatic Justification

1a. Program Description

Addendum Context

This addendum updates the information provided in the GWP Program Framework Document (PFD) approved by the GEF Council in June 2019. The supplemental PFD is requesting approval of the additional Country Child Projects selected for the GWP and reflects the increase in GEF-7 resources to be programmed and reports on incremental information (financial and core indicator targets) in the context of the new participating countries. The design, component structure and the objective of GWP in this addendum remains the same as that of the approved PFD. The objective is “to promote wildlife conservation and crime prevention for sustainable and resilient development”.

1. New Countries

Three new countries (5 new projects) were selected to join the GWP based on the same set of criteria used in the earlier selection, with an emphasis on alignment with the approved PFD results framework. South Africa, which is an existing GWP country added a new national project under the program and Bhutan added funds to its existing national project. Concepts from the following countries as below were selected. Countries have developed concept notes that are attached to this submission.

| Country | Project Name and Objective |
|-----------------|---|
| Bhutan | Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the tourism sector in Bhutan <i>Objective: To mainstream biodiversity conservation into tourism development and promote Bhutan as a model ecotourism destination.</i> |
| Malaysia | Building institutional and local capacities to reduce wildlife crime and enhance protection of iconic wildlife in Malaysia <i>Objective: To enhance the protection of three^[1] iconic wildlife species and their habitats in Peninsular Malaysia, Sarawak and Sabah</i> |
| Nigeria | Improved Management Effectiveness of Gashaka-Gumti and Yankari Protected Areas to conserve threatened wildlife species, build a wildlife economy and enhance community benefits <i>Objective: To improve the management effectiveness of Nigeria’s protected area estate and enable the development of a nature-based tourism product that enhances wildlife protection and supports local livelihoods</i> |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Pakistan | Strengthening Governance and Capacity for Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade in Pakistan <i>Objective: To curb poaching and illegal wildlife trade in Pakistan</i> |
| South Africa | Reducing Human Wildlife Conflict through an Evidence-based and Integrated Approach in Southern Africa <i>Objective: To create an enabling environment and evidence-based approach on mitigating the effects of human-wildlife conflict in the SADC region</i> |

Criteria for Selection of new countries: The criteria used for a national project to be included under the program was the inclusion of activities that were categorized either under Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species and/or on Wildlife for Sustainable Development as per the GEF-7 Programming Direction document, and also alignment with the approved GEF-7 GWP PFD results framework. This framework included the following components: (i) Conserve Wildlife and Enhance Habitat Resilience; (ii) Promote Wildlife-based and Resilient Economies; (iii) Combat Wildlife Trafficking; (iv) Reduce Demand and Disrupt Markets; and (v) Coordination and Enhance Learning. Country-based projects focused on designing and implementing national strategies and approaches to improve wildlife and protected area management, enhance community livelihood benefits, reduce poaching, and curtail illegal wildlife trade and reduce demand. Individual country projects may address a single component or include activities that address more than one.

More specifically, going forward as before the new selected country projects are expected to:

- Secure significant co-financing from Governments to apply the GEF incremental funding as a nudge to their investments towards disallowing wildlife crime. Co-financing will also include all grants and investments made by other donors, including bilateral, foundations, NGOs and CSOs that together strengthen the effectiveness, breadth and sustainability of the GEF investment.
- Agree to partake in sharing lessons and testing approaches for replication based on learning in other projects. Each IA will work through the PSC to share lessons and coordinate reporting.
- Apply indicators from an agreed suite of GWP indicators against which the Program will be measured. National projects will include linkages to the Program's theory of change.

2. Contribution of the new Child Projects to the Program's objective and results

The three new GWP countries (5 projects) represent an expansion in the type of threatened species targeted, and diversification in thematic investments in demand reduction, human wildlife conflict, and regional collaboration to support transfrontier conservation areas. In total, the GWP now includes 32 participating countries (37 national projects) in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Map highlighting the new countries is available in Annex A1 of the Addendum.

Bhutan

With such a high level of forest connectivity and a population that is almost 70% rural and heavily dependent on natural resource use, human-wildlife conflict in Bhutan is a substantial challenge and a threat to wildlife and livelihoods. Since HWC causes substantial economic and social costs to rural communities, it also results in retaliatory killings, resentment against policies, and lack of support towards conservation initiatives. Poaching and trafficking of wildlife is an increasing threat, in part due to Bhutan's geographic proximity to major Asian markets for illegal wildlife products. The Bhutan GWP project addresses these threats by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into tourism development as a long-term strategy for mitigating human-wildlife conflict and to generate sustainable conservation financing. In doing so, it will particularly contribute to GWP Component 1 conserving habitats and wildlife, including enhanced PA financing; and GWP Component 2 to mitigate human-wildlife conflict. The project was included in the first PFD submission of GWP for GEF-7, and is included in this resubmission to include additional funds that will be used to further enhance landscape-level capacity to develop and deliver local ecotourism products and services, and create awareness on biodiversity values among local communities to build positive attitudes towards human-wildlife coexistence and engage communities in practical measures to reduce HWC, poaching, forest offences and other threats to biodiversity conservation. Bhutan's involvement in the GWP strengthens knowledge exchange opportunities on human-wildlife conflict mitigation and on nature-based ecotourism development, which are common technical themes and interests among countries in the GWP.

Malaysia

Malaysia's entry to the GWP brings in an important source and transit country for internationally trafficked wildlife products. As a transit country, Malaysia plays a pivotal role in the international trafficking of ivory, testudines (turtles, tortoises and terrapins) and pangolins. As a source country, Malaysia has several iconic species that are trafficked both domestically and internationally, including the Malayan tiger and Bornean Orangutan. This dual market demand places additional pressure on these species and requires a multi-faceted law enforcement approach, including anti-poaching and anti-trafficking initiatives. Domestically, wildlife crime is being driven by the demands of an illegal market for traditional medicine, pets and bush meat, spread throughout the three regions of Peninsular Malaysia, Sabah and Sarawak. Of particular concern is the poaching of tigers, whose population in Malaysia has plummeted to less than 200 in 2019 (from an estimated 3,000 in the 1950's). The country is faced with similar challenges to those confronting other ASEAN countries, trying with scarce economic and human resources to protect the remaining populations of wildlife species in fragmented protected areas that are under increasing pressure from human encroachment and poaching. Focusing on three threatened and endangered species (Malayan tiger, Bornean Orangutan and Bornean banteng) the

GWP child project in Malaysia will seek to strengthen the effectiveness of domestic efforts to reduce poaching and trafficking and protect the habitats of the country's iconic wildlife. With this focus it has particular alignment to GWP Component 1 on protecting habitats and GWP Component 3 on combating wildlife crime.

Nigeria

Nigeria is a source country for illegal wildlife and forest products and an evolving transport hub for illegally trafficked products. Nigeria's wildlife and habitats are threatened by poaching, illegal timber extraction and unsustainable cattle herding practices. The most significant threat to the Yankari Game Reserve for example, which is the stronghold for the few remaining Nigerian populations of elephants, is the killing of elephants for their ivory and hunting of other large mammals for bushmeat for sale in specialized urban markets rather than for local subsistence. The GWP project will improve the management effectiveness of Nigeria's protected area estate and enable the development of a nature-based tourism product that enhances wildlife protection and supports local livelihoods. The project sites of Gashaka-Gumti National Park and Yankari Game Reserve are two of the prominent protected areas in Nigeria that remain the cornerstone for wildlife and wilderness conservation. The project will support GWP Components 1 and 2 with contributions to habitat protection, PA management and financing; creation of wildlife-based economy; and mitigation of human-wildlife conflict. The entry of Nigeria to the GWP will facilitate opportunities to link up with others within the continent/region for south-south learning and exchange with countries that have more experience in wildlife conservation and wildlife/wilderness tourism, including in Southern and Eastern Africa. By linking to the broader GWP community, connections will be enhanced with these countries and between Nigeria and Asian transit and destination countries, helping build overall collaboration on combating wildlife poaching, trafficking and demand.

Pakistan

Pakistan's strategic geographical location and abundance of rare and endemic species makes it a key source and transit country for illegal wildlife trade to cater to the demand for wildlife products in the South Asian region, in East Asia, as well as online trade to other parts of the world. This project supports national efforts to reverse the trend in terms of increased poaching and illegal wildlife trade in Pakistan. Component #1 is aligned with GWP's components 3 and 5 to improve multi-stakeholder coordination and governance by establishing and building the capacity of a National Wildlife Crime and Trade Monitoring Network (NWCTMN) through the Government of Pakistan's Ministry of Climate Change and Provincial Wildlife Departments. It also strengthens wildlife and trade related law, the role of the judiciary, and ensure effective implementation of a national plan of action to combat poaching and IWT. The project's second component aligns with GWP's component 3; it will focus on building capacity of key stakeholders, including staff of the provincial governments' forest and wildlife departments, Pakistan Customs, Border Security, and other LEAs, for effectively detecting and controlling wildlife crime through development of standardized curriculum and tailored training modules. Under its component 3, aligned with various outcomes under GWP's components 1, 2 and 3, the project will conduct comprehensive baseline studies at 5 priority sites across Pakistan to ascertain the scale and scope of illegal wildlife trade and establish a basis for developing site-specific Zero-Poaching Frameworks (ZPFs). The ZPF employs a six-pillar approach which integrates: assessments; community engagement; technology; prosecution; cooperation; and capacity enhancement. SMART will be deployed at all 5 priority sites to improve anti-poaching efforts and law enforcement. The project's component 4, aligned

with GWP's components 4 and 5, involves executing a multi-pronged awareness and communications strategy to not only enhance public awareness, but also engage them in citizen-based wildlife crime reporting, and to reduce demand for illegal wildlife products. The other main outcomes under this component include enhancing national, regional, and international coordination and cooperation, exchange of standardized data, lessons, and monitoring reports through knowledge sharing and exchange platforms in the region and with other GWP countries.

Southern Africa

Sub-Saharan Africa is a rapidly developing region with a growing human population. It also has the largest proportion of people living below the poverty line. The agriculture sector employs 65% of Africa's labor force. Human-wildlife conflict takes place when the boundaries of human activity and wildlife ranges overlap. In the SADC region, human-elephant conflict is particularly pronounced. The general drivers of HWC in the SADC region are increased settlement in wildlife range, habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation, land use transformation, increasing wildlife populations as a result of conservation programs and climatic factors. Under GWP, South Africa will strengthen its management of elephant population through endorsing and implementing the Policy of Management of Elephants as well as improve the human perceptions and tolerance of living with wildlife in priority areas. SADC member states containing elephant populations will be assisted to scientifically and holistically manage the populations.

3. Alignment with National Priorities

The five selected countries demonstrated alignment of their national programs and commitments with the GWP objectives highlighting ownership and sustainability in the long term.

Bhutan : The Bhutan GWP national project is aligned to its NBSAP, especially efforts to mitigate human wildlife conflict which recognizes that livestock loss and crop damage are major problems caused by wildlife. Out of the 20 national targets, strategies and actions in Bhutan's NBSAP, seven directly relate to the interface between tourism as a source of revenue and as a tool for biodiversity conservation. National development policies and programs accord a high priority to environmental conservation that has facilitated: the Constitution with a full-fledged Article on Environmental Conservation and National Forest Policy (2012) recognizing the maintenance of 60% forest cover for all times; the establishment of five national parks, four wildlife sanctuaries, one strict nature reserve, one recreational park and nine biological corridors, protecting 51.42% of the country; a range of policies and Acts that provide a good foundation for the conservation and management of biodiversity; and the focus of the 11th Five-Year Plan (2013- 2018) on the concept of 'green' plan creating a 'green' mindset and attitude to prioritize environment management, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and pollution. The 11th Five-Year Development Plan allocates US\$16.83 million for biodiversity-related activity. In addition, the Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation (BTFEC) provides \$1.5 million and WWF around \$1.6 million annually. Sustainable tourism development is a national priority and is identified as a priority sector in the Economic Development Policy (2016) as it has the potential for export, revenue generation and employment creation.

Malaysia: The Malaysia GWP national project is aligned with and supports national policies, plans and commitments by further strengthening the effectiveness of the federal and regional wildlife agency's efforts in reducing the poaching of, and illegal trading in, selected iconic Malaysian wildlife species across the Malaysian Peninsula, Sabah and Sarawak. The project is aligned with and supports existing inter-agency collaboration, including the: National Blue Ocean Strategy, a joint policing strategy to handle cases and share resources; National Task Force on CITES, which mainly deals with management and scientific issues; Malaysia Wildlife Enforcement Network (MY-WEN); Sabah State Anti-Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade Task Force, which provides for collaboration between customs, agriculture and fisheries departments; and the National Tiger Task Force, which addresses poaching and trade of tigers in Peninsula Malaysia.

Nigeria: The Nigeria GWP national project is aligned with and supports the 2006 Nigeria Tourism Master Plan, including the clusters related to nature: Tropical Rainforest and Scenic Nature. The Tourism Master Plan also emphasizes the need to strengthen the management effectiveness of protected areas, as a key condition for developing and growing the nature-based tourism sub-sector. The project builds on recent efforts to promote public-private-partnerships in the wildlife sector, including a 10-year MOU signed between Bauchi State Government and WCS in June 2018. This MOU delegates all responsibility for management of the Gashaka-Gumti National Park to WCS.

Pakistan: Pakistan's strategic geographical location and abundance of rare and endemic species makes it a key source and transit country for illegal wildlife trade to cater to the demand for wildlife products in the South Asian region, in East Asia, as well as online trade to other parts of the world. This proposed child project will support Pakistan to reverse the trend in terms of increased poaching and illegal wildlife trade in Pakistan. Under its first component, aligned with GWP's components 3 and 5, the project will improve multi-stakeholder coordination and governance by establishing and building the capacity of a National Wildlife Crime and Trade Monitoring Network (NWCTMN) through the Government of Pakistan's Ministry of Climate Change and Provincial Wildlife Departments. It also strengthens wildlife and trade related law, the role of the judiciary, and ensure effective implementation of a national plan of action to combat poaching and IWT. The project's second component aligns with GWP's component 3; it will focus on building capacity of key stakeholders, including staff of the provincial governments' forest and wildlife departments, Pakistan Customs, Border Security, and other LEAs, for effectively detecting and controlling wildlife crime through development of standardized curriculum and tailored training modules. Under its component 3, aligned with various outcomes under GWP's components 1, 2 and 3, the project will conduct comprehensive baseline studies at 5 priority sites across Pakistan to ascertain the scale and scope of illegal wildlife trade and establish a basis for developing site-specific Zero-Poaching Frameworks (ZPFs). The ZPF employs a six-pillar approach which integrates: assessments; community engagement; technology; prosecution; cooperation; and capacity enhancement. SMART will be deployed at all 5 priority sites to improve anti-poaching efforts and law enforcement. The project's component 4, aligned with GWP's components 4 and 5, involves executing a multi-pronged awareness and communications strategy to not only enhance public awareness, but also engage them in citizen-based wildlife crime reporting, and to reduce demand for illegal wildlife products. The other main outcomes under this component include enhancing national, regional, and international coordination and cooperation, exchange of standardized data, lessons, and monitoring reports through knowledge sharing and exchange platforms in the region and with other GWP countries.

South Africa: South Africa's National Development Plan (NDP) 2030 demonstrates strong commitment to environmental and biodiversity protection as a vehicle to address its most crucial development challenge - accelerating growth while reducing inequality. In support of the NDP, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) 2015-2025 promotes the development of a Biodiversity Economy, to encompass businesses and economic activities that either directly depend on biodiversity for their core business or that contribute to conservation of biodiversity through their activities. The South Africa GWP national project focuses on human-wildlife conflict (HWC) that is enshrined in various national plans and policies, including the African Elephant Action Plan (developed and endorsed by all African elephant range States) and the Kruger National Park Management Plan. It also supports South Africa's draft policy on "National Norms and Standards for the Management of Elephants in South Africa" that will be considered for approval during the project period. HWC mitigation is essential for ensuring community support SA's wildlife economy and meeting biodiversity conservation goals.

4. Revised Program Targets

The proposed five new child projects are expected to increase the Program's core indicator targets for (i) Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (3,131,100 Ha); (ii) Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (733,762 Ha); and positively impact an additional 330,700 direct beneficiaries. See Table E of the PFD Addendum for further details.

5. Revised GEF-7 Financing

This supplemental PFD is requesting additional and incremental GEF-7 resources estimated at **US\$ 18,446,000** (GEF grant amount: **US\$16,922,937** and Agency fee: **US\$1,523,063**).

Cumulatively the total GEF financing for the GEF-7 GWP including the new financing is estimated to be: **US\$ 108,136,435** (GEF grant amount: **US\$99,207,741** and Agency fee: **US\$8,928,694**).

6. Cofinancing Leveraged

Additional cofinancing resources, in support of the Program objectives, proposed to be mobilized are estimated at **US\$108,210,738**.

Cumulatively, the total cofinancing leveraged for the GEF-7 GWP including the potential new resources is estimated at: **US\$ 591,501,798**.

7. GWP GEF IA Partnership

The overall agency partnership has increased with the inclusion of IUCN as a GEF Implementing Agency for one of the national projects, supporting the Pakistan national project.

[1] Malayan tiger, Bornean Orangutan and Bornean Banteng.

1b. Program Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the program interventions will take place.

See Map with new countries in Annex.

2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the program identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations Yes

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Yes

Private Sector Entities Yes

If none, please explain why:

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the program preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Are gender dimensions relevant to the success of program. Yes

If yes, please provide indicative information on these dimensions and how these will be addressed in the program. If no, please explain why

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

In addition, please also indicate whether the program the program will include gender sensitive indicators in its result framework

4. Private sector engagement

Will there be private sector engagement in the program?

Yes

Please briefly explain the rationale behind your answer.

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

5. Risks

Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the Program objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the Program design (table format acceptable)

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

6. Coordination

Outline the institutional structure of the program including monitoring and evaluation coordination at the program level. Describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed programs and other initiatives.

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Is the Program consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

8. Knowledge Management

Outline the Knowledge management approach for the Program, including, if any, plans for the Program to learn from other relevant Programs and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

9. Child Program Selection Criteria

Outline the criteria used or to be used for child program selection and the contribution of each child program to program impact.

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

Part III: Approval/Endorsement By GEF Operational Focal Point(S) And Gef Agency(ies)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter with this template).

| Name | Position | Ministry | Date |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------|
| Mr. Rinchen Wangdi | Director | Gross National Happiness Commission, BHUTAN | 2/28/2020 |
| DR. NAGULENDRAN KANGAYATKARASU | DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL | MINISTRY OF ENERGY, SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, MALAYSIA | 12/19/2019 |
| Dr. Bolatito Obisesan Mni | GEF Operational Focal Point | FEDERAL MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, NIGERIA | 3/12/2020 |
| Ms. Naheed S. Durrani | Secretary | MINISTRY OF CLIMATE CHANGE, ISLAMABAD, PAKISTAN | 3/18/2020 |
| Mr. Zaheer Fakir | GEF Operational Focal Point | DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS, SOUTH AFRICA | 2/3/2020 |

ANNEX A: LIST OF CHILD PROJECTS UNDER THE PROGRAM

List of national Projects under the Program

| National Projects under the Program_{a/} | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| <u>Country</u> | <u>Project Title</u> | <u>GEF Agency</u> | <u>GEF Amount (\$)</u> | | | <u>Agency Fee (\$)</u> | <u>Total (\$)</u> |
| | | | <u>Focal Area 1</u> | <u>Focal Area 2</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> | | |
| | | | <u>Project</u> | <u>Project</u> | <u>Project</u> | | |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - | <u>FSPs</u> | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bhutan | 1. Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the tourism sector in Bhutan | UNDP | 183,486 | | 183,486 | 16,514 | 200,000 |
| Malaysia | 2. Building institutional and local capacities to reduce wildlife crime and enhance protection of iconic wildlife in Malaysia | UNDP | 7,139,450 | | 7,139,450 | 642,550 | 7,782,000 |
| Nigeria | 3. Improved Management Effectiveness of Gashaka-Gumti and Yankari Protected Areas to conserve threatened wildlife species, build a wildlife economy and enhance community benefits | UNDP | 3,519,725 | | 3,519,725 | 316,775 | 3,836,500 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|------|------------|---|------------|-----------|------------|
| Pakistan | 4. Strengthening Governance and Capacity for Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade in Pakistan | IUCN | 2,652,294 | | 2,652,294 | 238,706 | 2,891,000 |
| South Africa | 5. Reducing Human Wildlife Conflict through an Evidence-based and Integrated Approach in Southern Africa | UNEP | 3,427,982 | | 3,427,982 | 308,518 | 3,736,500 |
| - | Subtotal | - | 16,922,937 | 0 | 16,922,937 | 1,523,063 | 18,446,000 |
| - | MSPs | - | | | | | |
| - | Subtotal | - | | | | | |
| - | Total | | 16,922,937 | 0 | 16,922,937 | 1,523,063 | 18,446,000 |

a/ Total amount of national project concepts should equal the GEF program financing requested and consistent with Tables A, B and D.

ANNEX A1: Project Map and Geographic Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project intervention takes place



Table 1. PROGRAM/PROJECT MAP AND GEOGRAPHIC COORDINATES

| National Project Protected Area Coordinates* | | | POINT_X (longitude) | POINT_Y (latitude) |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| # | Country | Sites | | |
| 1 | Bhutan (UNDP) | Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuary | 91.948881 E | 27.301228 N |
| | | Bumdeling Wildlife Sanctuary | 91.443338 E | 27.823594 N |
| | | Jomotsangkha Wildlife Sanctuary | 91° 26' 16.1" E | 27° 47' 49.9" N |
| 2 | Malaysia (UNDP) | Ulu Sebuyau National Park | 111°53'E | 1.4089° N |
| | | Sedilu National Park | 110° 44' 0" E | 1° 26' 0"N |
| 3 | Nigeria (UNDP) | Gashaka-Gumti National Park | 11.6158° E | 7.5424° N |
| | | Yankari Game Reserve | 10.3030° E | 9.8543° N |

*Note: This table only lists the protected areas where the GPS coordinates were available. It does not include all protected area sites listed by child projects.

