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

GEF ID:	**9551**		
Country/Region:	**South Sudan**		
Project Title:	**Capacity Development in Reducing Illegal Wildlife Trade and Improving Protected Area Management Effectiveness in South Sudan**		
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:	**$5,329,452**
Co-financing:	**$15,950,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$21,279,452**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jane Nimpamya**

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]	7-18-16 No. This PIF is more in line with BD-2 Program 3. Please change. Make Target 12, (Reducing the loss of known threatened species, and possibly preventing their extinction across the landscapes) the main Aichi Target on p.16. 7-28-16 Cleared	

[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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	7-18-16 Yes. See details on p.20 of PIF. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	7-18-19 Yes. See pages 4-7 for threats, 17 for sustainability and scaling and innovation, and 12-15 for markets. Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	7-18-6 Yes. See Baseline scenario and incremental reasoning on pages 9 and 16. Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	7-18-19 Yes. A good balance between at the National level (Component 1) and at the site level (Component 2 and 3). Suggest changing TA for INV in Component 2 and 3. 7-28-16 Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	7-18-19 Yes. Seep.19 for Gender. Issues and engagement of local communities are dealt with throughout the PIF. Cleared	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	7-18-16	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		The $3M requested are currently available in South Sudan STAR. Cleared	
	• The focal area allocation?	7-18-16 The project is using the GEF-6 Flexibility mechanisms. $1,095,000 from LD transferred to BD. Cleared	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	7-18-16 No. Please address issues under items 1 and 5. Thanks. 7-28-16 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
Review Date	Review	July 18, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 25, 2016	
	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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[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.