



REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM SIZE PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Engaging policy makers and the judiciary to address poaching and illegal wildlife trade in Africa		
Country(ies):	Africa Region	GEF Project ID:	5821
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	01293
Other Executing Partner(s):	Conservation Council of Nations	Submission Date:	02/02/2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	BD	Project Duration(Months)	24
Name of parent programme (if applicable):		Agency Fee (US\$):	180,500

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Financing (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
BD-2	GEF TF	\$1,900,000	5,687,930
Total project costs		\$1,900,000	5,687,930

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To create the enabling environment to effectively address poaching and illegal wildlife trade (IWT) through new and enhanced laws, regulations, and policies.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
Component 1. Build Effective Policymaking Infrastructure and Create Political Will	TA	1. New and existing "Conservation Caucuses" with greater capacity and willingness to assess and address poaching and illegal wildlife trade at high levels of government ¹	1.1 Conservation leaders' mentorship and exchange program. (3 groups, one per region, in year 1). Additional individual/small group exchanges as opportunities arise (estimate 5-10 per year). 1.2 Existing (Kenya, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia) Conservation Caucuses strengthened numerically and representationally. 1.3 Creation (3 per year) of new	GEFTF	\$409,524	\$1,777,500

¹ The final list of selected countries for Conservation Caucuses includes: Kenya, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia (caucuses established), Mozambique, Republic of the Congo, Uganda, Malawi, Gabon, Botswana, and/or South Africa). Selection was based on criteria and consultations carried out during the project preparation phase.

			caucuses, in conjunction with other forms of high-level national strategic resource management council where necessary and appropriate.				
Component 2. Improving policy to address poaching and illegal wildlife trade	TA	2.a. Executive action and new or amended national laws, regulations, or policies to mitigate IWT. 2.b. Enhanced judicial investigation, arrest, seizure and prosecution of IWT in at least 7 of 10 priority countries	2.a.1. Caucuses have prioritized mitigation of IWT on their agenda and are engaged in building national support for legislative, policy, and/or regulatory change. 2.a.2 Laws, policies and/or regulations have been identified and developed (or amended) with consensus and expertise to achieve passage and/or enactment. 2.b.1 Capacity development for prosecutors, judges, and magistrates.	GEFTF	900,000	1,710,430	
Component 3. International and Sub-regional harmonization and cooperation	TA	3.1 Commitments secured and capacity increased for harmonization of policies, laws, and enforcement practices relevant to IWT in African range and transit states at the regional or sub-regional level.	3.1 Sub-regional engagement and technical exchanges among enforcement agencies of shared-border and transit countries. (2 per year). 3.3 Annual Inter-Parliamentary conference on IWT (1 per year).	GEFTF	500,000	2,000,000	
Sub-Total						1,809,524	5,487,930
Project management cost (5%)				GEFTF	90,476	200,000	
Total project costs					1,900,000	\$5,687,930	

C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, (\$)

Sources of Co-financing for baseline project	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
NGO	ICCF	Cash	1,015,430
NGO	ICCF	In kind	1,902,500
NGOs	Conservation Council	In kind	650,000
NGOS	Congressional Advisory Board	In kind	350,000
Private Sector	Arnold and Porter	In kind	270,000
Multilateral	UNEP	In kind	1,500,000
Total Co-financing			5,687,930

D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country Name/Global	Grant amount (\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b)	Total (\$) (a + b)
UNEP	GEF TF	BD	Global	\$1,900,000	\$180,500	\$2,080,500
Total Grant Resources				\$1,900,000	\$180,500	\$2,080,500

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International consultants	60,000	272,000	332,000
Local consultants	100,000	0	100,000
Total	160,000	272,000	432,000

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

A1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc

See Appendix 13: National policies and laws

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

NA

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

NA

A4. Describe the project baseline and the problem(s) that the intervention seeks to address:

See Appendix 15: Country-Specific Baseline Information

A.5. Incremental / Additional cost reasoning:

NA

A6. Risks, including climate change risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design:

NA

A7. Coordination with other GEF financed initiatives

To ensure coordination with ongoing and to be programmed GEF financed initiatives which address illegal wildlife trade, a Project Steering Committee comprised of the Project Coordinator and Senior Advisor, and representatives from: GEF Secretariat (Gustavo Fonseca or his designee), UNDP (Nik Sekhran or designee), World Bank (Magda Lovei or designee/TBD), UNEP Headquarters, and the UNEP Task Manager will be established and meet quarterly.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

B.1 How stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

See section 2.5 on page 18 on stakeholder mapping and analysis which delineates roles of stakeholders. See Sections 3.8 and 3.9 on Sustainability and Replication (pages 42-45) which lay out a clear strategy of engagement with stakeholders in order to underpin and ensure these important factors.

To grow awareness and engender replication efforts, CCN will broadly disseminate results of the project's approach together with the tools, and materials developed for its execution. Materials and modules on particular themes can be made available for key groups, including the conservation community. Through CCN's website, interested parties will be able to access materials, information about the project, together with project progress reports. The project team will be complemented by CCN communications experts who have a rich experience in awareness building through networks to maximize exposure of project products. CCN's communications experts will electronically communicate project updates on a regular basis to its extensive network of email subscribers. CCN will work broadly with the press and media channels at large.

B2. Socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF). As a background information, read [Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF.](#)":

The project is expected to create positive environmental and social impacts in the target countries and surrounding regions (in terms of biodiversity and habitat preservation, conflict avoidance, economic development, increased tourism revenues, reduction of human-wildlife conflict, etc.). Furthermore, the project will ensure inclusiveness of both men and women in project formulation and implementation and will involve multi-racial and multi-ethnic stakeholder groups. The project itself is designed to be inclusive of all stakeholders, political parties, socio-economic groups, etc. in order to ensure that the effects of the project are far reaching and that project results are sustainable.

Local communities (and the indigenous people thereof) will be greatly affected by the outcomes of this project in terms of improved economies, revenues, stability, and other factors; similarly, the cooperation and involvement of local communities is key to the success of this project. Because of the important role of communities within this project, CCN will ensure that indigenous people and community leaders have the opportunity and encouraged to participate in project activities and engage with other stakeholders. The project will be consistent with UNEP and GEF gender policies. Women will also play a key role in this project at many levels: parliamentary, judicial, stakeholder, etc. Some of the

most prominent figures in existing caucuses (co-chairs and Ministers) are, in fact, women, and CCN will be proactive to ensure their inclusion in all activities.

B3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Human capital empowerment is a critical component of cost effective capacity building. Alternative approaches to this multi country, Africa Region approach.... would be costly country by country approaches or diffused training programs. Transferring and connecting existing capacity and knowledge to build human capital is a direct cost effective approach.

C. BUDGETED M&E PLAN

The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are summarized in Appendix 7, the Costed M & E Plan. Reporting requirements and templates are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument to be signed by the executing agency and UNEP.

The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework presented in Appendix 4 includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in Appendix 6 will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. The means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators are summarized in the Costed M&E Plan at Appendix 7 and are fully integrated in the overall project budget.

The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Indicators and their means of verification will also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the Project Coordinator. It is the responsibility of the Project Coordinator to inform UNEP of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion.

The Project Steering Committee will receive periodic reports on progress and will make recommendations to UNEP concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Results Framework or the M&E plan. Project oversight to ensure that the project meets UNEP and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility to the Task Manager in UNEP-GEF. The Task Manager will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of scientific and technical outputs and publications.

Project supervision will take an adaptive management approach. Overall, UNEP supervision of the project is to be carried out by UNEP/DEPI-GEF staff posted in UNEP's Regional Office for North America (UNEP/RONA) in Washington DC. UNEP supervision will be further enhanced by technical staff located in UNEP's Regional Office for Africa and UNEP's headquarters staff in Nairobi, Kenya, including the Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELC) and Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI).

The Task Manager however, will develop a project supervision plan at the inception of the project which will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop. The emphasis of the Task Manager supervision will be on outcome monitoring but without neglecting project financial management and implementation monitoring. Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed with the Steering Committee at agreed intervals. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and UNEP. Risk assessment and rating is an integral part of the Project Implementation Review (PIR). The quality of project monitoring and evaluation will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost-effective use of financial resources.

If triggered, a mid-term management review or evaluation will take place on at the midpoint of project implementation as indicated in the project milestones. The review will include all parameters recommended by the GEF Evaluation Office

for terminal evaluations and will verify information gathered through the GEF tracking tools, as relevant. The review will be carried out using a participatory approach whereby parties that may benefit or be affected by the project will be consulted. Such parties were identified during the stakeholder analysis (see section above). The Project Steering Committee will participate in the mid-term review and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan.

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\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
NA			

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan Vandyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP		February 02, 2015	Kristin Mclaughlin Task Manager	+1-202-974-1312	Kristin.mclaughlin@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: To create the enabling environment to effectively address poaching and illegal wildlife trade (IWT) through new and enhanced laws, regulations, and policies.			
	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	VERIFICATION METHODS	ASSUMPTIONS
<p><u>PROJECT OBJECTIVE</u> Education and capacity development at the parliamentary and judiciary level for effectively addressing poaching and the illegal wildlife trade.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial collaboration of parliamentarians committed to a results-driven policy agenda (caucuses) in 10 countries • Prioritization of mitigation of IWT on legislative agendas and engagement in building national support for legislative, policy, and/or regulatory change • Identification and development (or amendment) of laws, policies, and/or regulations with consensus and expertise to achieve passage and/or enactment. • Establishment of a baseline measure of prosecutions, convictions, and penalties for wildlife crimes in 10 countries. • Increase in judicial action (cases brought, convictions, and severity of penalties) for wildlife crime in those countries in which legislation, policies, and/or laws related to IWT have been significantly improved in the prior year. • Regional or sub-regional commitments secured relating to regional wildlife trade and transit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual monitoring and evaluation reports detailing education and capacity development at the parliamentary and judiciary level for effectively addressing poaching and the illegal wildlife trade. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International conservation remains a priority internationally. • Political will is available for capacity development. • Sufficient stability of partner nations to allow for project continuity.

OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS			VERIFICATION METHODS	ASSUMPTIONS
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET		
<p>Component 1: Build Effective Policymaking Infrastructure and Create Political Will</p> <p>Outcomes: 1.a. New and existing “Conservation Caucuses” with greater capacity and willingness to assess and address poaching and illegal wildlife trade at high levels of government</p> <p><i>Outputs/milestones</i> 1.a.1 Conservation leaders' mentorship and exchange program. (3 groups, one per region, in year 1). Additional individual/small group “piggybacking” exchanges as opportunities arise (estimate 5-10 per year).</p> <p>1.a.2 Existing (Kenya, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia) Conservation Caucuses strengthened numerically and representationally.</p> <p>1.a.3 Creation (3 per year) of new caucuses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial collaboration of parliamentarians committed to a results-driven policy agenda (caucuses) in 10 countries Active leadership in pursuit of new and enhanced policies by legislators in 10 countries Increased membership and representation in existing conservation caucuses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functional Caucuses in four countries No IWT activities in pursuit of new and enhanced IWT policies on caucus agendas in 7 of the 10 target countries Current caucus membership: Kenya: 49 members Zambia: 80 members Tanzania: 40 Members Namibia: 15 members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functional caucuses in 10 countries. IWT activities in pursuit of new and enhanced IWT policies on caucus agendas in 7 of the 10 target countries Increased caucus membership as follows: Kenya: 20%, including committee chairs/vice chairs and party leaders Zambia: 10%, including potentially Ministers/deputy Ministers, committee and party leaders Tanzania: 20%, including potentially Ministers/deputy Ministers, committee and party leaders Namibia: 40%, including potentially Ministers/deputy Ministers, committee and party leaders 3 new national caucuses per year in GEF beneficiary countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-annual reports detailing progress toward establishment and growth of new national caucuses and conservation leaders' mentorship exchanges and process of drafting new legislation relating to IWT. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Willingness of conservation leaders and individuals to participate in mentorship exchanges. Will and cooperation of international parliamentarians to form caucuses within their parliaments and to join caucuses.

OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS			VERIFICATION METHODS	ASSUMPTIONS
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET		
<p>Component 2: Improving policy to address poaching and illegal wildlife trade</p> <p>Outcomes:</p> <p>2.a. Executive action and new or amended national laws, regulations, or policies to mitigate IWT.</p> <p>2.b. Enhanced judicial action (cases brought, convictions, and severity of penalties) for wildlife crime in those countries in which legislation, policies, and/or laws related to IWT have been significantly improved in the prior year.</p> <p><i>Outputs/milestones</i></p> <p>2.a.1. Caucuses have prioritized mitigation of IWT on their agenda and are engaged in building national support for legislative, policy, and/or regulatory change.</p> <p>2.a.2. National-level roundtables/consensus tables of stakeholders, policymakers, members of the judiciary, and/or conservation groups to discuss IWT policy</p> <p>2.a.3 Laws, policies and/or regulations have been identified and developed (or amended) with consensus and expertise to achieve passage and/or enactment.</p> <p>2.a.3 Regional workshops/conferences for judiciary capacity development.</p> <p>2.b.1 Capacity development for prosecutors, judges, and magistrates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritization of mitigation of IWT on legislative agendas and engagement in building national support for legislative, policy, and/or regulatory change • Identification and development (or amendment) of laws, policies, and/or regulations with consensus and expertise to achieve passage and/or enactment. • Establishment of a baseline measure of prosecutions, convictions, and penalties for wildlife crimes in 10 countries. • Increased will among members of the judiciary to prosecute, secure convictions, and apply severe penalties for wildlife crimes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low prioritization of mitigation of IWT on legislative agendas and engagement in building national support for legislative, policy, and/or regulatory change. • Limited identification and development (or amendment) of laws, policies, and/or regulations with consensus and expertise to achieve passage and/or enactment • No reliable baseline measure of prosecutions, convictions, and penalties for wildlife crime in target countries. • Low and/or inconsistent arrests, convictions, and strict sentences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased prioritization of mitigation of IWT on caucus agendas and engagement in building national support for legislative, policy, and/or regulatory change (as measured by caucus activities and agenda reviews). • Changes to laws, regulations, and/or policies related to IWT in at least 6 of 10 priority countries. • Baseline measure established of prosecutions, convictions, and penalties for wildlife crime in 10 target countries. • Increased judicial action (cases brought, convictions, and severity of penalties) for wildlife crime in those countries in which legislation, policies, and/or laws related to IWT have been significantly improved in the prior year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-annual reports detailing prioritization of mitigation of IWT on caucus agendas and engagement in building national support for legislative, policy, and/or regulatory change; • Semi-annual reporting of roundtables/consensus tables; identification and development (or amendment) of laws, policies, and/or regulations with consensus and expertise to achieve passage and/or enactment; and increased capacity for prosecutors, judges, and magistrates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest and participation of policymakers in prioritizing mitigation of IWT and identifying, developing, and/or amending laws, policies, and/or regulations. • Willingness of stakeholders, policymakers, members of the judiciary, and/or conservation groups to participate in roundtables/consensus tables. • Willingness of policymakers to achieve consensus. • Willingness of prosecutors, judges, and magistrates to participate in capacity development activities.

OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS			VERIFICATION METHODS	ASSUMPTIONS
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET		
<p><u>Component 3</u>: International and Sub-regional harmonization and cooperation</p> <p>Outcomes: 3.a. Commitments secured and capacity increased for harmonization of policies, laws, and enforcement practices relevant to IWT in African range and transit states at the regional or sub-regional level.</p> <p><i>Outputs/milestones</i> 3.a.1 Sub-regional engagement and technical exchanges among enforcement agencies of shared-border and transit countries. (2 per year). 3.a.2 Annual Inter-Parliamentary conference on IWT (1 per year).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional or sub-regional commitments secured relating to regional wildlife trade and transit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited regional or sub-regional commitments secured relating to regional wildlife trade and transit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 new regional or sub-regional commitments secured relating to regional wildlife trade and transit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-annual reports detailing progress toward sub-regional engagement and technical exchanges among enforcement agencies of shared-border and transit countries and of the Annual Inter-parliamentary conference on IWT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will and cooperation of enforcement agencies of shared-border and transit countries to participate in sub-regional engagement and technical exchanges. Willingness of parliamentarians to participate in Annual Inter-parliamentary conference on IWT.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comment	Response
GEF Secretariat Review 5-3-2014 (no further comments were received after re-submission of PIF)	
<p>5-3-14 See Annex 3. Please indicate if any of the target countries in this project are not signatories of the declarations listed in Annex 2. Please add the formal citation for the declarations and links as appropriate.</p>	<p>Signatory countries by declaration, are indicated in Annex 2 of the approved PIF. Formal citation to the declarations is provided.</p>
<p>5-3-14 The baseline projects listed in Annex 1 are mostly about existing GEF projects. The "baseline project" for this project needs to refer to the activities related to engaging policy makers and the judiciary in the target countries over the 24 months whether or not this GEF project gets funded. Please add the baseline projects (looking forward) under the existing text for each of the target countries in Annex 1.</p>	<p>Agreed, and financed UNEP baseline project has been elaborated in the baseline scenario and in more detail in Annex 1 of the approved PIF. More robust country focused baseline data is available at Annex 15 of the Project Document.</p>
<p>5-3-14 Objective. Need to include language indicating that the objective of this project will be achieved with more than "dialogue". Please add information related to new/enhance laws and regulations.</p> <p>Component 1. Output 1.1. There is no justification to convene leaders of target countries in DC to "define challenges to recent international commitments and create action plans, aligned among countries". There is plethora of Declarations and Action Plans to tackle poaching and IWT, to request using scarce financial resources to "define challenges.....". No need to bring African leaders to develop a plan of action aligned among countries". This can be done regionally or sub-regionally at a fraction of the cost. The proposed meeting during the second year makes even less sense. Please remove.</p>	<p>Objective has been revised in approved PIF. <i>To create the enabling environment to effectively address poaching and illegal wildlife trade (IWT) through new and enhanced laws, regulations, and policies.</i></p> <p>Component 1. Output 1.1 as per page 30 of the ProDoc includes the following activities:</p> <p><i>3.1.1.1 Partner organizations are consulted to encourage their participation in programs and to seek their input into program development.</i></p> <p><i>3.1.1.2 Program topics are identified, in consultation with UNEP/GEF and other partners.</i></p> <p><i>3.1.1.3 Lists of potential participants are created, and relationships developed during the project preparation phase are utilized, to contact these potential participants to invite and encourage their participation in programs.</i></p> <p><i>3.1.1.4 Regional programs are developed to engage African leaders in mentorship programs.</i></p> <p><i>3.1.1.5 Opportunities for smaller mentorship</i></p>

Comment	Response
<p>Output 1.3 This output should be about the creation of New Conservation Caucuses, where parliamentarians occupy center stage. In all these countries there are already "high level national strategic resource management bodies". Please adjust.</p> <p>Component 2. There is no output associated with the outcome on "judicial investigation, arrest, seizure and prosecution of IWT....".</p>	<p><i>exchanges/meetings are identified throughout the course of the project.</i></p> <p><i>3.1.1.6 Programs are implemented (3--one per region, as well as "piggyback" activities as opportunities arise).</i></p> <p><i>3.1.1.7 Follow-up activities are conducted with all participants, and program outputs are disseminated electronically to broaden the reach of the programs.</i></p> <p>Output 1.3 Agreed, on page 32 of the ProDoc, adjusted to: <i>Creation of new caucuses. The project will create six new caucuses (three per year) in countries where they do not currently exist (countries will include six of the following: Mozambique, Republic of the Congo, Uganda, Malawi, Gabon, Botswana, and/or South Africa). Selection was based on criteria and consultations carried out during the project preparation phase.</i></p> <p>Component 2. The outcome in the approved PIF was edited to stipulate "Enhanced capacity of judicial investigation, arrest, seizure and prosecution of IWT" and a corresponding activities associated with output 2.4 are reflected on page 36 of the ProDoc, inclusive of:</p> <p><i>3.2.4.1 Establish a communications link among judiciary officers in respective countries who are eligible to deal with wildlife crimes, including links with organizations such as Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Interpol, NGO investigation units, American Bar Association, and law firms with prosecutors</i></p> <p><i>3.2.4.2 Identify those involved in investigation and prosecution of wildlife crimes in each target country and include these representatives in educational programming conducted during the course of this program.</i></p> <p><i>3.2.4.3 Building upon these relationships, build a baseline of IWT arrests, convictions, and penalties so that progress toward project goals may be reliably measured.</i></p> <p><i>3.2.4.4 Establish a means/network to electronically communicate information (such as documents, statistical information, recommendations, scope, and importance of national IWT issues and activities, as well as what is being done in other countries to combat IWT) to identified members of the judiciary.</i></p>

Comment	Response
<p>Output 2.3 (In Text p.11). "When requested by caucus leadership or other policymakers, CCN will provide technical expertise to assist in drafting legislation or regulations". This outcome of this component rest heavily on the capacity of this project to actively deliver new or amended laws and regulations. These outputs cannot become conditional to local leadership requesting assistance. If these countries are seriously interest in building National Conservation Caucuses, they should also be serious about addressing the legal frameworks heads-on. Please address this output to deliver the necessary changes in laws and regulations via technical assistance provided by the GEF Agency and/or members of the Executing Partner (CCN).</p> <p>Output 2.4. Please merge with output 1.1. or 1.2. This is a very "soft" output with very limited tangible and measurable</p>	<p><i>3.2.4.5 Conduct training sessions regarding the direct importance of natural resource management to national economies, including job creation, increased tourism revenues, and other economic benefits; the relationship between IWT and international crime syndicates that pose a serious criminal and security threat to their nations and people, and state-of-the-art techniques for intelligence gathering, evidence collection, and other criminal procedures and of the importance of community relations/cooperation.</i></p> <p><i>3.2.4.6 Identify individuals who have demonstrated the most response, interest, and cooperation in benefitting from programs and ongoing education, and include these individuals in a regional conference (see 3.2.5).</i></p> <p><i>3.2.4.7 Invite select members of the judiciary to participate in mentorship activities within the U.S. in order to build a network of judiciary/prosecutorial advisors in order to ensure sustainability</i></p> <p>Adjusted and fully developed output 2.3 on page 35 of ProDoc includes activities:</p> <p><i>3.2.3.1 Provide expertise to, and work with, caucus leadership, policymakers, partners, and other stakeholders to prioritize gaps to be addressed legislatively in each country;</i></p> <p><i>3.2.3.2 In collaboration with partners, provide legal expertise and understanding to caucus leaders and assist them in drafting proposed legislation/amendments/regulations;</i></p> <p><i>3.2.3.3 Engage stakeholders to encourage their support for proposed new legislation/ amendments/regulations;</i></p> <p><i>3.2.3.4 Support caucus leadership in presenting proposed legislation/amendments/ regulations to the larger caucus and/or legislative body/committee and assist, where possible, in providing educational materials to these bodies relating to IWT and the need for updated legislation;</i></p> <p><i>3.2.3.5 Support caucus leadership in presenting proposed legislation/amendments/ regulations to the executive branch and assist, where possible, in providing educational materials to the executive relating to IWT and the need for updated legislation;</i></p> <p><i>3.2.3.6 Provide updates on this process to a wide network of legislators and others around the world to seek their support for these countries' efforts and to educate and inspire other legislators to take similar actions.</i></p> <p>Output 2.4 has been merged with 1.2 of approved PIF and further elaborated, see page 36 of ProDoc.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>deliverables.</p> <p>Component 3. Please narrow-down the scope of this component. There is simply too much: leaders, parliamentarians, law enforcement agencies,...international, regional and sub-regional". Select among existing regional or sub-regional initiatives.</p> <p>In the body of PIF: 3) The proposed alternative scenario..... First paragraph: "During the project preparation and throughout the project....". Needs to say only during project preparation. It is necessary to clearly determine the final list of target countries and what deliverables will be pursued during the project. This cannot be left for project implementation.</p> <p>Bottom of page 11. It should say "The expected deliverables of this project will be determined during project preparation and included in the following table". This table is to be completed during PROJECT PREPARATION as a way to envision what this project will deliver. Investments need to be strategic from the get go.</p>	<p>Component 3. Refinement of these important activities to reflect more precisely the sub regional nature of the activities proposed under Component 3, see pages 37-39 of ProDoc.</p> <p>Language was satisfactorily adjusted in the approved PIF. The final list of target countries includes: Kenya, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia (caucuses established), Mozambique, Republic of the Congo, Uganda, Malawi, Gabon, Botswana, and/or South Africa). Selection was based on criteria and consultations carried out during the project preparation phase.</p> <p>Please refer to pages 29-39 of the ProDoc for a detailed description of activities and deliverables to be delivered under each output</p>
<p>5-3-14 Incremental reasoning is very weak (nonexisting) because there are no "baseline projects" (the set of activities that will take place whether or not this project gets funded) on which to build a case for incremental financing.</p>	<p>Incremental reasoning has been reformulated on the basis of the UNEP baseline initiatives in the approved PIF. UNEP stands by making a case for the safeguarding of the previous and ongoing GEF investments in protected areas by enhancing enabling conditions at the highest levels.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>5-3-14 It is difficult to believe that the risks associated with a project to address Poaching and IWT are all medium, particularly buying 0in from legislators, sufficient numbers to form a caucus, turnover, passing legislation into law. Please address.</p> <p>There is no reference to the risks associated with the judiciary. Please elaborate</p>	<p>A thorough review of the Risk Table has been carried out and risk levels and responses adjusted.</p> <p>Risks associated with the engagement of the judiciary has been added to the approved PIF and ProDoc. A response action will be the engagement and training of the judiciary specifically selected from areas associated with poaching and IWT and GEF investment areas.</p>
<p>5-3-14 Please elaborate on coordination with related initiatives addressing the legal framework in target countries. Include subtitle on Coordination under each of the countries in Annex 1.</p>	<p>CCN will be engaging national coordinators in at least 2 countries and engaging regionally based coordination staff to coordinate with relevant initiatives at the national and regional levels.</p> <p>Furthermore as a reflection of related GEF investments past and present, and future, representation from the GEFSEC, UNDP and the World Bank is agreed on the Project's Steering Committee.</p>
<p>5-3-14 Based on the previous grant, please elaborate on the needs for the Conservation Caucuses to become financial and institutional sustainable and what activities will be carried out by this project to achieve the sustainability of these CCs.</p>	<p>Based on the previous grant, sustainability assessments were carried out in 2 countries. The findings and recommendations of these have now been fully incorporated into the section on sustainability.</p>
<p>5-3-14 Are the co-financiers aware that their names are listed and associated with the co-financing amounts listed in Table C? Please confirm or remove those that are not.</p>	<p>Co-financiers at the CEO endorsement stage are confirmed.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW;

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 100,000 USD			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)100,000</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Local Consultants	57,086	57,086	
International & Regional Consultants	28,000	28,000	
Travel	12,000	12,000	
Meetings and Workshops	2,914	2,914	
Total	100,000	100,000	