



**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	9439		
Country/Region:	Global (Afghanistan, Botswana, Congo, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, India, Kenya, Mali, Malawi, Mozambique, Philippines, Thailand, Tanzania, Vietnam, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe)		
Program Title:	Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development (Resubmission of 9071)		
GEF Agency:	World Bank, UNEP and ADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	155395 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; BD-2 Program 3; BD-3 Program 7; BD-3 Program 8; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Program Grant:	\$40,199,414
Co-financing:	\$190,686,679	Total Program Cost:	\$230,886,093
PIF Approval:	May 04, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2016
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Program Consistency	1. Is the program aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	3-23-16 This PFD is aligned with a number of GEF's Focal Area Strategies, Objectives and programs, but mainly with BD-1 Program 3, BD-1 Program 2, LD-2 Program 3, CCM-Program 4. and SFM-3. This program will contribute to the achievements of the CBD Aichi 2020	

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)?

		Biodiversity targets, particularly Target 12. Cleared	
Program Design	2. Is the description of the baseline scenario reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions? Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	3-23-16 Yes. There is an ample description of the baseline scenario on pages 11-14 and in Annexes B and C of the PFD. The activities that will be financed by GEF are based on incremental reasoning (page 22 of the PFD). In addition, each of the child projects has a description of the incremental reasoning for the country-base interventions. Cleared	
	3. Is the program framework (Table B) sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve program objectives and the GEBs?	3-23-16 Table B is sound and clear, and it should allow to achieve the program's objectives. Nonetheless, there are some issues that need to be taken care of. 1) Spell-out the acronyms the first time they are used. Consider providing a list at the beginning of the PFD. 2) Paragraph 41. Describe "controlled deliveries". 3) Paragraph 55. Suggest adding a paragraph describing the Knowledge, Policy Dialogue and Coordination activities carried out since the approval of the PFD in June 2015. The paragraph can start saying something like: Since the approval of the PFD in June 2015, the Program has carried a series of activities including	

		<p>4) Paragraph 55b. I suggest including a paragraph describing the "Portfolio Review of International Funding to Tackle Illicit Trafficking in Wildlife". The GEF suggests including the list of participating institutions, the activities carried out so far (i.e. First meeting in NY and virtual meeting April 2016). This is a great opportunity to show to the GEF Council how much the program has done since approval in June 2015.</p> <p>5) Paragraph 59. Innovation. Suggest mentioning that this is Multifocal Area Project, bringing financial resources from BD, LD, CC and SFM in support of activities leading to the conservation of endangered species. Suggest adding that this is the first time that the GEF engages for the first time with partners addressing issues of trafficking and demand reduction. May want to mention the founding members of ICCWC.</p> <p>6) Paragraph 61. Suggest mentioning the possibility of expanding the program in GEF-7 to add new species and new geographies not included yet in the GWP.</p> <p>7) Item 7, P.27. Knowledge Management. Suggest adding the list of events carried out since the approval of the Program in June 2015 and those scheduled already for 2016 calendar year.</p> <p>5-2-16 Cleared</p>	
	<p>4. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people,</p>	<p>3-21-16 Yes. This is addressed on pages 22 and 23 of the PFD.</p>	

	and CSOs considered?	Cleared	
	5. Does the program 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)	3-21-16 Yes. Risks are discussed on pages 24-25 Cleared	
	6. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	NA	
	7. Is the program coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	3-21-16 Yes. Addressed on pages 25-26 of PFD. Cleared	
	8. Is the program implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	3-21-16 Yes. Cleared	
	9. Does the program include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	3-21-16 Yes. There is a coordination grant associated with the PFD that will take care of the M&E of the Program. Cleared	
	10. Does the program have description of knowledge management plan?	3-21-16 Yes. Addressed in Component 4. There is also a coordination grant associated with the PFD that will take care of the KM of the Program. Cleared	
Resource Availability	11. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3-23-16 Yes. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle		

	of equitable access?		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
PFD Clearance	Is the PFD recommended for clearance to include in the work program?	<p>3-23-16</p> <p>No. Please address the outstanding issues listed in the review.</p> <p>In addition, when resubmitting the PFD please take care of the following additional points by the GEF Secretariat and GEF Council Members. (NOTE: Responses to STAP comments were incorporated into the PFD approved by Council in June 2015).</p> <p>GEF SECRETARIAT</p> <p>1) Add "(Resubmission of 9701)". Thus, the title should read: GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP ON WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND CRIME PREVENTION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (Resubmission of 9071).</p> <p>2) On Table A, change GEF Program ID from 9071 to 9439.</p> <p>3) On Table D, the new participating countries were highlighted. Is it still possible to highlight the parts of the text that were added or significantly modified since the approval of the PFD in June 2015? That would greatly facilitate the reading of the revised PFD by the GEF</p>	

		<p>Council.</p> <p>GEF COUNCIL MEMBERS</p> <p>The WB provided a Response Matrix addressing all the points raised by GEF Council members. There are nonetheless, some items that could be improved in the PFD in response to the comments and some precisions that need to be made in the responses. The numbers below Germany and USA correspond to those in the document "Response to Council Comments" included with the resubmission of the PFD.</p> <p>GERMANY</p> <p>3. In the response, there is reference to P. 108 of the revised PFD. That page is part of the Congo project. While the text is in line with the comment and the response. This should be located somewhere else. Perhaps in the PFD, rather than in an Annex.</p> <p>4. Could you provide the pages in the PFD where this has been addressed? Thanks.</p> <p>5. To complement the response, the GEF suggests citing paragraph 51 of the PFD.</p> <p>7. To complement the response, the GEF suggests citing the German partner that will providing the information on Germany's investments. There is information in</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>http://www.bmub.bund.de/fileadmin/Daten_BMU/Pool/Broschueren/bio_vielfalt_verantwortung_broschuere_en_bf.pdf</p> <p>https://www.giz.de/expertise/downloads/giz2015-en-tackling_transnational_organized_crime.pdf</p> <p>http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=DCD/DAC/GOVNET(2014)10&docLanguage=En</p> <p>9. In the response, the GEF suggests making reference to Annex B, page 35, and Annex C, p.41. Paragraph 37 in PFD could be beefed-up and cite in the responses.</p> <p>11. Suggest citing that the comment has been incorporated into Annex B, p. 35 and Annex 1, p. 173.</p> <p>12. Is there a formal definition of "illegal trade in wildlife" in the PFD? May want to cite this CITES page as reference: https://cites.org/prog/iccwc.php/Wildlife-Crime</p> <p>14. Perhaps it is worth including the reference to the CITES Strategic Vision 2008-2020 on p. 174</p> <p>https://cites.org/eng/res/16/16-03.php</p> <p>USA</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>24. The GEF IEO Evaluation is already published. Consider citing the evaluation in the PFD and make reference in the response matrix. That can be included in paragraph 35.</p> <p>https://www.thegef.org/gef/Impact%20Evaluation%3A%20GEF%20Support%20to%20Protected%20Areas%20and%20Protected%20Area%20Systems</p> <p>27. Suggest mentioning the new and existing projects (countries) where GEF funds will be used for demand reduction (i.e. Vietnam)</p> <p>5-1-16 Yes. The PFD is recommended for inclusion in a WP.</p>	
Review Date (s)	Review*	March 23, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 29, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 02, 2016	

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.**