



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

GEF ID:	5821		
Country/Region:	Regional		
Project Title:	Engaging Policy Makers and the Judiciary to Address Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade in Africa		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,900,000
Co-financing:	\$5,687,930	Total Project Cost:	\$7,587,930
PIF Approval:	May 21, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Kristin McLaughlin

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	5-3-14 This is a Global project. All target countries are eligible for funding. Cleared	2-11-15 Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	5-3-14 No LoE for this Global Project required. Cleared	2-11-15 Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	NA	NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	5-3-14 This Global project is to be funded by the BD FAS. Cleared	2-11-15 Cleared
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	5-03-14 BD-2 and Aichi Target 12 "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". Cleared	2-11-15 Cleared
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	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. 5-20-14 This has been properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	2-11-15 Cleared
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	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	2-11-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>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>5-20-14 This has been properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>5-3-14</p> <p>Objective.</p> <p>Need to include language indicating that the objective of this project will be achieves with more than "dialogue". Please add information related to new/enhance laws and regulations.</p> <p>Component 1.</p> <p>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 plants, 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.</p>	2-11-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please remove.</p> <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.</p> <p>There is no output associated with the outcome on "judicial investigation, arrest, seizure and prosecution of IWT....".</p> <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.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>or 1.2. This is a very "soft" output with very limited tangible and measurable deliverables.</p> <p>Component 3.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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>5-20-14 These issues have been properly</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	5-3-14 Incremental reasoning is very weak (non-existing) 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. 5-20-14 This has been properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	2-11-15 Cleared
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		2-11-15 Yes Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	5-3-14 This project is about engaging policy makers and the judiciary, rather the individual CSOs or local communities. Cleared	2-11-15 Cleared
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	5-3-14 It is difficult to believe that the risks associated with a project to address Poaching and IWT are all medium, particularly buying0in from legislators, sufficient numbers to form a caucus, turnover, passing legislation into law. Please address.	2-11-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>There is no reference to the risks associated with the judiciary. Please elaborate</p> <p>5-20-14 These issues have been properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</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>5-20-14 These issues have been properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	<p>2-11-15 Cleared</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<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>5-20-14 This issue has been properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	<p>2-11-15 Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		2-11-15 Yes Cleared
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		2-11-15 Yes Cleared
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	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. 5-20-14 This issue has been properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	2-11-15 Yes Cleared
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	5-3-14 Yes, assuming all co-financing becomes effective during project implementation. Co-financing is in the amount of \$4M and co-financing ratio of 1:2. Cleared	2-11-15 Co-financing in the amount of \$5.6M Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	5-3-14 It is 5%. Cleared	2-11-15 Cleared
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line	5-3-14 This project is requesting \$100K for PPG (the upper limit for projects up to \$3M). Cleared	2-11-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval,</u> if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		2-11-15 Yes Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		2-11-15 Yes Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	5-3-14 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 5,6,7,8,11,12,13 and 16. Thanks. 5-20-14 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		2-11-15 Yes. This MSP is recommended for approval

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Cleared
	First review*	May 03, 2014	February 10, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 20, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.