



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4937		
Country/Region:	South Africa		
Project Title:	Strengthening Wildlife Forensic Capabilities to Combat Wildlife Crime for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Species (target: Rhinoceros)		
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-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,690,455
Co-financing:	\$11,659,174	Total Project Cost:	\$14,349,629
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Edoardo Zandri

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	April 11, 2012 Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	April 11, 2012 Yes in a letter dated March 28, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	April 11, 2012 Text is provided that was cut and pasted from existing documents with no discussion on the comparative advantage of UNEP to serve as the GEF implementing agency. Please revise and provide specifics regarding UNEP's institutional and human resources capabilities to oversee a project on forensic-based technologies.	

		<p>This question is about the agency's comparative advantage to implement the project, not UNEP's mandate. Please delete all the text and the table that simply repeats text from other documents about UNEP's mandate and focus on the advantage of UNEP for the implementation of this project in particular. If you wish to talk about UNEP's mandate do so briefly in a few sentences.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<p>5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>No. The PIF describes the capacity of other agency's involved in the project but does not discuss UNEP's capacity in the country nor the technical capacity of staff within UNEP HQ that are specific to the activities identified (forensic-based technologies).</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate.</p> <p>By the time of CEO endorsement, please specifically address the issue of what UNEP entity (CITES or UNEP HQ) will provide the technical added value for supervising a project focused on strengthening forensic-based capacity.</p>	

Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
Project Consistency	<p>7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>No. Under FA outcomes, you are supposed to enter the outcome of the BD strategy which the project is aligned with. It appears that for this project it should be Outcome 1.1. For the core outputs please enter the number of protected areas and coverage in hectares of the threatened species.</p> <p>As currently structured, the project can not reduce the poaching of rhinos. Please adjust the project objective to show that the project will complete an existing chain of activities leading to proper enforcement and protection</p>	

		<p>something along these lines:</p> <p>"The project objective is to strengthen enforcement capacity in South Africa's protected area system through forensic-based technologies focused on the rhino."</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>Project objective has been reframed and focused in line with the scope of the project.</p> <p>The proper output would the hectare coverage of unprotected threatened species (the rhino). The project is not focused on management effectiveness of the 5 protected areas in South Africa or SADC as that requires a more comprehensive investment and program of activities. Therefore, correct this entry to reflect the hectares of protected areas in South Africa that will benefit from this increased investment in protection of Rhino through the use of the forensic methodologies to help control poaching.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE.</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>	

	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>No, please develop this description in a revised PIF.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>11. 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?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Please provide an account and a brief description of the existing activities in SA on which this project is building on and do not simply present the existing strategy agreed in 2010. Please describe the level of implementation that is ongoing of this strategy.</p> <p>Please clarify if SA has all the institutional capacity (including forensic labs and DNA equipment) to carry-out this project.</p> <p>Please also clearly identify which protected areas are the focus of the project, what activities related to combating poaching are in existence at these sites, and clarify more explicitly how this targeted investment is the missing link to stem the tide of rhino poaching.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>The new text provided is an improvement on the first draft, but must be more coherently presented in a synthetic manner. In short, this entire</p>	

		<p>edit so that the GEF increment can be better understood vis a vis the baseline investment of South African generally and in KNP specifically.</p> <p>Please also clarify if the focus of the project will be on KNP and to what degree. We note that other PAs are listed, but the text says that the focus will be on KNP.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>Because of the incomplete description of the baseline as noted in question 11, it is not possible to answer this question. Upon revision of the baseline description, please provide a more refined incremental reasoning presentation. Please also focus on what the project can really deliver with a focus on South Africa's rhino population.</p> <p>Does SA have all the information technology hardware needed for the GEF to simply support the establishment of a national coordination structure for information management? If not, there should be funding for investment and not only technical</p>	

		<p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>This is improved, but as noted above in question 11 please edit this text also and improve the presentation so that this is more clearly understood.</p> <p>Almost lost in the text is the fact that the project does wish to establish one functioning lab, however, it appears that this will be entirely paid for by cofinance. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>No. Please revise taking the following comments into account:</p> <p>Component 1. What are "sophisticated enforcement schemes" (output 1.1.1)? Shouldn't this output be under Component 2?</p> <p>Please clarify if the hardware for the information technology and forensic facilities for DNA analysis are already in place to deliver outputs 1.1.2.</p> <p>Do the penalties and mechanisms for prosecution (output 1.1.5) require changes in policies, laws and regulations? Related policy and regulatory development activities are not mentioned in the PIF.</p> <p>Component 2. What are the PAs that</p>	

		<p>conservation and management strategies (output 2.1.2). What is output 2.1.3? It is difficult to visualize.</p> <p>What Private Sector actors have expressed interest or is the target for PPPs (output 2.1.5)?</p> <p>This is a \$13 million technical assistance project in a country with widely acknowledge conservation capacity that is considered some of the best in the world. The project framework is decidedly focused on a variety of low-cost activities and outputs (information sharing, new penalty schemes, participation in regional conservation strategies, education, etc.), thus, it appears that the budget is very high for what is being delivered and particularly when considering the conservation capacity within the country. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanations provided. However, it does appear in Component One a part of the GEF grant will be used for investment in software etc, thus, please clarify if part of component one is TA and part is INV.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>No given that the baseline description of activities that the GEF project will</p>	

		<p>noted above, the description of the incremental benefits is not as sound as required. Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>Yes, this is now much improved, however, please edit this section as well and make the presentation more concise and coherent.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>16. 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?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>Please revise as the text provided does not address the question adequately.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>No. Please provide in revised PIF.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>UNEP has provided a table that is 4.5 pages long but which adds little value. Please provide a content-rich and focused sentence or two on the "role" of each stakeholder in this actual project including CSOs and indigenou people.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	

	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>Please note that the text inserted here on April 12 was an error by the Secretariat.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>What are the ongoing PA projects and investments in SA and neighboring countries (source of rhino horns) that this project is complementing?</p> <p>As noted previously, the PIF is not clear on what PAs will be the focus of activity, thus once these are identified the PIF should detail the enforcement and anti-poaching and PA management activities ongoing in these areas and how the proposed project will be coordinated with these initiatives to ensure complementarity and added-value.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided elsewhere in the text, however, this additional text elsewhere requires considerable editing and synthesis.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>April 12, 2012</p> <p>Please provide a description of the project implementation arrangement.</p>	

		April 17, 2012 Adequate explanation provided.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	April 12, 2012 Yes.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	April 12, 2012 The two components and proposed outputs are modest in terms of their ambition, thus the total budget envelope is certainly adequate and was queried above as being very costly for the output delivery, please clarify. April 17, 2012 Adequate.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	April 12, 2012 There should be a better balance between the type of co-financing as currently it is all in-kind. What CSOs and Other Multilateral Agencies listed in Table C have been contacted and have actually committed to this project? Who pledged the \$600K and \$300K, respectively?	

		April 17, 2012 Adequate explanation provided.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	April 12, 2012 No. Please explain why no cofinance is being provided by UNEP and why such a modest amount is being provided by the CITES Secretariat. April 17, 2012 Adequate revisions provided.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	April 12, 2012 Please address all issues above and resubmit. Please spell check your document. Please use 12pt font. April 17, 2012	

		<p>over the original text but still requires an intellectually rigorous edit. Please see comments above and make the necessary revisions and resubmit.</p> <p>Please also note that the PIF is now 26 pages long. The content added from other documents (for example the long list of outputs, outcomes, etc from the baseline project presented in bullet format) should be synthesized into a coherent presentation and within the page limits of the PIF. Also, please eliminate all your additional headings in italics etc that are sprinkled throughout the text and only use the PIF format.</p> <p>Please do not include the 22-page appendix. If there is anything in the Appendix that is germane to the project presentation please include it in the actual document and remove references to the Appendix in the PIF.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided. PIF will be recommended for CEO clearance.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>By the time of CEO endorsement, please comprehensively address the following issues.</p> <p>1. Please clearly explain what "Rapid Response Mechanisms for prosecuting wildlife crimes" actually consist of. What are the parts, how they work, and what are the roles and responsibilities of the institutions participating in these</p>	

		<p>2. Please clearly state the goods and services that the GEF and co-financing will pay for to build the institutional and human capacity (i.e. labs and scientific capabilities), to strengthen the forensic capabilities in SA.</p> <p>3. Please clearly explain the nature of the "enforcement schemes" that will be used to reduce poaching to 50%. What are the components of these schemes, how will they work, and what are the roles and responsibilities of the institutions participating in these schemes.</p> <p>4. Please clearly state the nature of the PPPs to support rhino conservation. What are the incentives for the Private Sector to participate and what would be their role and responsibilities if the schemes are to become functional.</p> <p>5. Please clarify how the project will work with neighboring countries and technical specialists in these countries given the obvious regional reach and interaction that will be part of this project's implementation and success.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 11, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 18, 2012	
	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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>April 11, 2012</p> <p>Given the weakness of the PIF, no comments will be provided on the PPG until the revisions are made and adjustments made in the PPG. Please note that the current PPG has numerous math errors and budget presentation errors. Thus before resubmitting, please proofread the PPG and check the math.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p> <p>Until PIF is adequately revised and appropriate PPG corrections made in response to the revised PIF, PPG will not be reviewed.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Yes, activities are appropriate.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Yes, budget is justified with robust cofinance.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>April 11, 2012</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Given the weakness of the PIF, no comments will be provided on the PPG until the PIF revisions are made and adjustments made in the PPG. Please note that the current PPG has numerous math errors and budget presentation errors. Thus before resubmitting, please proofread the PPG and check the math.</p> <p>April 18, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	4. Other comments	<p>April 18, 2012</p>

		<p>Please ensure that during the PPG phase, all issues raised in the PIF review are fully addressed as noted below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please clearly explain what "Rapid Response Mechanisms for prosecuting wildlife crimes" actually consist of. What are the parts, how they work, and what are the roles and responsibilities of the institutions participating in these schemes. 2. Please clearly state the goods and services that the GEF and co-financing will pay for to build the institutional and human capacity (i.e. labs and scientific capabilities), to strengthen the forensic capabilities in SA. 3. Please clearly explain the nature of the "enforcement schemes" that will be used to reduce poaching to 50%. What are the components of these schemes, how will they work, and what are the roles and responsibilities of the institutions participating in these schemes. 4. Please clearly state the nature of the PPPs to support rhino conservation. What are the incentives for the Private Sector to participate and what would be their role and responsibilities if the schemes are to become functional. 5. Please clarify how the project will work with neighboring countries and technical specialists in these countries given the obvious regional reach and interaction that will be part of this project's implementation and success.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 11, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 18, 2012

* 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.