



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	9845 9658		
Country/Region:	Philippines		
Project Title:	Combatting Environmental Organized Crime in the Philippines		
GEF Agency:	ADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$1,834,862
Co-financing:	\$1,325,757	Total Project Cost:	\$3,160,619
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Bruce Dunn

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	6-27-17 Yes. BD-2 Program 3. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	6-27-17 Yes. The project has been is driven by the country requirements and certainly has been well produced. Cleared	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	6-27-17 Yes. See information on pages 50-51 of MSP. Cleared	

<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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
<b>Project Design</b>	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	6-27-17 Yes. See pages 38-39 of MSP. Cleared	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	6-27-17 Yes. And there is a detail and extensive Baseline Scenario. Cleared	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	6-27-17  This is a very comprehensive MSP. Congratulations.  Please numerate the Components, Outcomes and Outputs using the following structure: Component 1, Outcome 1.1, Output 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, Outcome 1.2, Outputs 1.2.1 etc.  Component 1  1) Under Outcome 2, indicator 19 is the only one used. If the proposed outcome is to "Increased sharing of information and knowledge to facilitate multi-agency coordination and support adoption of enforcement tools and methods" please consider adding indicators 18, 20,21,22, and 23. By doing so, it would create a much more comprehensive approach to information sharing going beyond just data but also including the identification of targets, and	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>proactive investigations.</p> <p>2) Please further elaborate on the selection of CITES e-permitting systems and ELMIS. Will the project be in position to support (and sustain) all the necessary the deployment and maintenance of these systems? How? Is ELMIS the best information management system to handle the data as currently available? Is there an alternative system that was considered and rejected? If the plan is to implement 'intelligence led' policing it may be a good idea to identify whether ELEMIS is compatible with other software "tools". Please elaborate on this matter.</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>1) It is not clear what is meant by "3.2 Comprehensive IWT capacity development toolkit conceptualized, with selected modules developed and packaged for delivery with key institutional partners". It is not clear if the proposed "Capacity Building Program for Wildlife Crime Law Enforcement" is being structured in response to the results of the screening of the situation in Philippines using for instance ICCWC's Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit or if it is based on expert opinion. Please elaborate.</p> <p>2) Output 3.3. In respect of training it appears that a lot of training has</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>already been done. While the idea of Training the Trainers is a good one, it is not clear how the trainers will actually carry out their work if ".....the name (training of the trainers) suggests that they should be able to train others, but they cannot lead a ToT in their agencies due to lack of experience and resources". Please elaborate on how this project will overcome this barrier.</p> <p>3) The target groups for training are far too numerous. While the idea of the training along the supply chain is justifiable, the project needs to be careful of offering more than it can deliver within time and budget. Please seriously reconsider narrowing down the target groups. That would also facilitate the decision on the modules to be used. Please clarify if the training will be done in the three target areas only.</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>1) The cost seems excessively high especially for the two outcomes. The amount allocated here does not seem to balance well with Project Outcomes 1 and 2 which are very low amount. Please review allocation of funding among Components.</p> <p>2) This component relates to demand further along the supply. The project proponents should consider the level of investments on this set of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>activities in comparison with activities geared toward interdiction. Without it, it will never be possible to understand the full story, identify the key players and actually get results on the ground where the supply is coming from. To that end the balance of how the funds are currently allocated will not really achieve that. Perhaps more should be allocated to the information sharing idea and less to demand reduction.</p> <p>3) Regarding the questionnaire about what people know (page 35). Did the project proponents thought of doing something similar for law enforcement officers asking them to identify species when seized? This questionnaire could also be developed further as to whether the species were CITES appendix I, II, III and what the ramifications were on each.</p> <p>7-14-17 Cleared</p>	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	6-27-16 Cleared	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	6-27-17 The project is well structured and reflects country drivenness. One of the main concern of the GEF is that the financial resources allocated to this project may not be enough to cover all the proposed activities. Please reconsider resizing and reallocation of resources among components.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>Please provide a breakdown of the investments by output. This is needed by the World Bank and to better understand the investments when outputs in a given components are very different.</p> <p>7-14-17 Cleared</p>	
	<p>9. 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)</p>	<p>6-27-17 Cleared</p>	
	<p>10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?</p>	<p>6-27-17 Yes. All LoC included. Cleared</p>	
	<p>11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?</p>	<p>6-27-17 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?</p>	<p>NA</p>	
	<p>13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>6-27-17 Yes. This is part of the GWP. Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Does the project include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>	<p>6-27-17 Yes. Pages 51-52 of MSP. Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	6-27-17 Yes. Pages 48-50. Cleared	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	16. 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>	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	5-27-17 No. Please address outstanding issues listed under items 6 & 8. Thanks. The GEF remains available for consultation.  7-14-17 Cleared	
<b>Review Dates</b>	First Review	June 27, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 14, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

