



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9525		
Country/Region:	South Africa		
Project Title:	Strengthening Institutions, Information Management and Monitoring to Reduce the Rate of Illegal Wildlife Trade in South 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:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,886,009
Co-financing:	\$7,420,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,456,009
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Jane Nimpanya

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

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.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response	
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?			
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?			
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?			
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?			
	Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 				
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>6-21-16</p> <p>This PPG in the amount of \$150,000 (+Agency Fees) is requested to develop the CEO Endorsement of the South Africa child project of the IWT program (9439).</p> <p>The amount is consistent with the LoE signed 27-10-2015, and below the ceiling for PPGs for FSP</p>		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(\$200,000).</p> <p>It is the understanding of the PM that the error messages that were sent by PMIS when opening the Review Sheet to process the PPG (see below) do not apply to the PPG. These error messages relate to the CEO Endorsement and will be address when the project is submitted for approval.</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - Focal Area Strategy Framework required but missing ERROR in PIF - Project Framework required but missing Warning - Executing Agency Missing Warning in PIF - Global Environment Benefits (GEB) Data missing</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	12-15-17 The small changes introduced in the CEO Endorsement are listed and explained in the CEO Endorsement, pages 4-6. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12-15-17 Component 1 Please elaborate on the nature of the "centralized system for monitoring wildlife in trade". Is this system web-based as suggested by the statement "monitoring system is expected to be curated and manage by SANBI, with servers and hardware provided at this institution? What is the relationship with the system to be developed in Component 2? What is the likelihood for the retention of the "wildlife professionals and interns"? What could be done to ensure (to the extent possible) that these trainees will be absorbed by the institutions? Component 2 There is a mix of concepts. In some places there is reference to an "e-permitting system for CITES-listed species" and in other places it is a	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>"CITES e-permitting system". Please clarify. At any rate, has CITES been consulted on this matter to ensure compatibility with their information systems? Would make very little sense to build two systems to serve the same purpose.</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>It is difficult to understand how the sum of the proposed activities and outputs can deliver the expected Outcome. How is the project planning on delivering ".....sustainable livelihoods and reduced rate of illegal wildlife trade" with activities that are hitting very soft targets: Appointment of a Task Force, and guidelines for Environmental Monitors and Community Governance Champions?</p> <p>The identification of appropriate projects to be placed in a project pipeline for funding development and future implementation is an interesting exercise but unlike to deliver results unless funding for implementation is not attached to this process. Unless funding is secure for implementation, this exercise is going to raise expectations among the local communities. How much of the co-</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>financing in cash can be allocated to implementation of the selected projects? According to Table 19 of the Project Document, there co-financing in cash is \$1.7 million.</p> <p>It is not easy to understand how the selection of Environmental Monitors and Community Governance Champions will assist in the delivery of the Component's Outcome and GEBs. What do these Monitors and Champions due with the information they gathered on the ground? What is the Enforcement Agency that will take action upon receiving the reports of the Monitors and Champions?</p> <p>Who is going to pay the salaries of the Environmental Monitors and Community Governance Champions?</p> <p>What does the following statement mean in reality? "Communities at these sites will follow a memorandum of understanding in which they agree to apply effective participatory governance of the wildlife economy and to high levels of monitoring of community adherence to the guidelines and delivery of their agreed outputs". What is this ".....effective participatory governance of the wildlife economy</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>wildlife economy"?</p> <p>3-19-18 Cleared</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>12-15-17</p> <p>Budget Please notice that the Total Project Cost in Table A (\$4,886,009) is different from that in Table B (\$4,875,509). Please review budget and recalculate.</p> <p>Overall</p> <p>What is the need for requesting salaries for two people to run this project: a Project Manager and a Project Coordinator? That consumes more than \$700,000.</p> <p>Component 1</p> <p>Is SANBI going to develop and support the "centralized system for monitoring wildlife in trade"? All funding requested for SANBI (\$1,000,000) but none for the system as in Component 2?.</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>The budget for this component (\$2.1M) is very high for the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>deliverables of these soft targets (see comment under item 2). Wonder how these activities are being budgeted when for instance, there is a request for \$700,000 for PPF to deliver a set of Guidelines under Activity 3.1.4 (p.88 of Project Document). And in co-financing, \$160,00 for a consultant to develop a Theory of Change for one WWF project sites? What is SANPARKS going to deliver for \$700,000? What is the justification for \$100,000 for SADC meetings</p> <p>3-19-18 Cleared</p>	
	4. 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>12-15-17</p> <p>The risk of "Inability to absorb young professionals and interns into participating organizations" is ranked High. This is because "when posts become vacant (through retirement or resignation), they are instantly 'frozen', i.e. no replacement staff are budgeted for or recruited". Shouldn't the project offer training to the institutions that agree on recruiting the trainees?</p> <p>3-19-18 Cleared</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>12-15-17</p> <p>The LoC from UNEP-WCMC states that the support is for \$20,000. In the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		CEO Endorsement (table C. it says \$200,000). Please change and recalculate. 3-19-18 Cleared	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	12-15-17 Yes Cleared	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	12-15-15 Please elaborate on the coordination with CITES data management. 3-19-18 Cleared	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	12-15-17 Yes. Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	12-15-17 Yes Cleared	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	12-15-17 No. Please address outstanding issues. Thanks 1-2-18 Please ensure all \$ figures add-up correctly 3-19-18 Yes. This CEO Endorsement is recommended.	
Review Date	Review	December 15, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 19, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		