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

GEF ID:	**9882**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Gabon, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia)**		
Project Title:	**Enhancing Legislative, Policy, and Criminal Justice Frameworks for Combating 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-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2 Program 3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	**$1,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$1,105,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,105,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Johan Robinson**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	8-15-17 Yes. BD-2 program 3, outcome 3.1 Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	8-15-17 Yes. Cleared	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	8-15-17 Yes Cleared	
	4. Does the project sufficiently	8-15-17	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Design	indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. See pages 24-25 of MSP. Cleared	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	8-15-17 Cleared	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	8-15-17 Outcome 1. On trans-boundary issues, the project proponents look at some of the available information on policy and legal instruments already available for trans-boundary corporation (i.e. Lusaka Agreement, bilateral MOUs for TFCA, etc.) Is the lack of trans-boundary cooperation and law enforcement a matter of laws and regulations, or a matter of operational models that need "political will" and some financial resources to make them work? Please reconsider this outcome or narrow it down to an specific situation that is likely to render tangible results. Would make sense to team up with African Parks or Peace Parks Foundation to do elaborate on something concrete on the ground in their areas of work in Malawi and Zambia? The GEFSEC is concerned about investing in laws and regulations when the reality on the ground call for action making use of the available laws and agreements.	

[1] 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)?
[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		8-28-17 Cleared	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	8-15-17 Cleared	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	8-15-17 Please re-confirmed that the financial resources ($1M) are going to be sufficient for the delivery of the proposed outcomes in 5 countries. Investment per country appears low for what is being proposed ($200K/country). Evaluate the possibility of reducing number of countries and/or outputs (GEF SEC consider them all important but remains concerned on the project overpromising and under delivering). CCN should have good benchmarks as a result of the implementation of the previous grant. Please elaborate. 8-28-17 Cleared	
	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)	8-15-17 Yes. Cleared	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	8-15-17 Yes. Assuming the co-financing becomes available during project implementation. Cleared	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools	8-15-17	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	completed?	Not required. The GEFSEC suggest linking with the GWP funded projects in the 5 target countries to record relevant deliverables on in the tab of Core Indicators of the GWP TTs making note that it is the result of coordination with the CCN project. 8-28-17 Cleared	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	8-15-17 This project is targeting 5 countries that are also part of the GEF Funded "Global Wildlife Program". Was the content of this project consulted with the Agencies leading these projects [WB for Gabon, Malawi and Zambia and UNDP for Kenya and Mozambique]? It is critical that these Agencies as well as the Lead Agency of the GWP are fully aware of the proposed activities in this project specially considering that they may be working or planning on working on the same activities (i.e. policies, laws, regulations, prosecutors and judges). This coordination needs to take place now and can not be postponed to project implementation. Please advice on how this consultation and coordination took place. 8-28-17 Cleared	
	14. Does the project include a	8-15-17	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes. Cleared	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	8-15-17 It is mention that the CCN Website will provide access to diverse materials and information about the project. In a visit to the website (http://councilofnations.org/) it was not possible to locate and download any of the publications that CCN has helped produced. Please upload them and make sure that the CCN website has all it has to offer in terms of publications. Good to hear the plans to use the GWP existing management platforms, used in the past to disseminate information on the GEF funded CCN project. The GEF suggest inviting the lead of the WB Coordination Grant of the GWP to sit as an observer in the PSC. That should facilitate proper coordination between the CCN project and the GWP. 8-28-17 Cleared	
Availability of Resources	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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	8-15-17 This MSP is to be funded by the BD set aside.	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	8-15-17 No. Please address outstanding issues and resubmit. The GEFSEC remains available for consultation. 8-28-17 Yes. This MSP is recommended for Approval.	
Review Dates	First Review	August 15, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 23, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 28, 2017	