



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

GEF ID:	9071		
Country/Region:	Global (Global, Botswana, Congo, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, India, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia, Congo DR)		
Program Title:	Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development (PROGRAM)		
GEF Agency:	World Bank, UNDP and UNEP	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-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Program Grant:	\$90,377,470
Co-financing:	\$513,137,060	Total Program Cost:	\$603,514,530
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Valerie Hickey

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments
Program Consistency	1. Is the program aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>The program is clearly aligned with the relevant biodiversity focal area programs and objectives and outcomes.</p> <p>However, please strengthen the description of the program's alignment with the objectives of the CC, LD, and SFM objectives and results frameworks under the description of the alternative scenario. Please also see reference under question three below.</p>

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)?

		<p>Please delete the phrase under BD Program 3 "this outcome will need fine tuning" as this is the outcome from the BD results framework. If you wish to note the fact that this indicator will be refined make that reference under Outcome 1 in Table B.</p> <p>April 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
<p>Program Design</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>The baseline section provides a comprehensive description of the baseline of political will as evidenced in political commitments, strategies developed, etc. In this part of the baseline section, please include a reference to the CBD Strategic Plan and the relevant Aichi Target (12).</p> <p>Please strengthen the last paragraph of this section with a synthesis of baseline conditions in the participating countries at this point in time, and more generally in the landscapes that the Program may eventually engage in. In short, what would happen in the absence of any GEF investment?</p> <p>Finally, please include a reference to the recently released strategy of the European Commission on wildlife management in Africa and the associated funding windows of the EU on illegal trade in wildlife.</p> <p>Alternative scenario and GEF funding is based on incremental reasoning. For the section under alternative scenario, after the global environmental objective and key performance indicators are presented, please present a description and a schematic that conveys the Theory of Change for the Program which frames why these four components, when implemented as described will have the desired outcomes we seek.</p> <p>Within Component 2, please clarify what are the "private and financial sectors" this program is going to include.</p> <p>Within Component 4 please make reference and connection with</p>

		<p>Coordination Grant.</p> <p>Finally, the program objective and the global environmental objective are different and this creates some internal dissonance in the PFD logic. It is not clear what the program hierarchy is in terms of the program goal, program objective and program global environmental objective. Please clarify in the revised PFD.</p> <p>April 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	3. Is the program framework (Table B) sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve program objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>Table B is well structured, very logical, and clear and provides reasonable indicators for measuring progress.</p> <p>Please note that for outcome three, please delete the words "program and" after supporting to make the sentence clearer.</p> <p>What is missing from Table B is a link to the non-BD focal area objectives, programs, and outcomes and the global benefits that the MFA projects under the program will generate. Please include an additional outcome under Component One as this is where the site based and landscape level work in sustainable natural resources management will take place through MFA investments and where additional benefits through SLM and SFM will be generated including GHG emission reduction.</p> <p>April 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	4. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>Yes, however, please explicitly reference indigenous people in this section on stakeholders and click the box yes under stakeholders (E2). It may be helpful to map the key stakeholders and their prospective roles per Program Component.</p> <p>With regards to benefits under Section E.4, the discussion on</p>

		<p>benefits to local communities is presented but the PFD would benefit by emphasizing this element more strongly here noting that the program will particularly seek to generate benefits-- tangible monetary and non-monetary-- that will accrue to local communities and those working on wildlife tourism.</p> <p>April 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>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)</p>	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>A very honest description of the risk inherent in the Program and its child project and mitigation measures proposed are reasonable and rationale. Successful implementation of the mitigation measures will require exceedingly engaged supervision by GEF agencies of the individual projects for which they serve as GEF implementing agency.</p> <p>Please include discussion of climate risk particularly given large landscapes that many species under the program require for their habitat.</p> <p>April 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>6. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?</p>	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
	<p>7. Is the program coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>The PFD outlines a strategy for coordination and notes the critical other donors involved in the issue. Please make the following changes to this section under coordination.</p> <p>First, please provide a simple graphic the demonstrates the institutional structure of the program including the elements of the coordination grant that cut across the supply-transit-demand nexus and that are critical to the Program implementation.</p>

		<p>Second, please note that in the document the Coordination Grant is also referred to as a capstone project. Please use one term.</p> <p>April 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	8. Is the program implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>Yes. As the program is rolled out, the PSC should further elucidate these arrangements at its first meeting.</p>
	9. Does the program include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>Yes, indicators are included and the ones that will require fine tuning have been correctly identified.</p>
	10. Does the program have description of knowledge management plan?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>Yes, and it is adequate at this stage. Please clarify an innovative element of the KM plan, that being to incentivize child projects to replicate and scale up best practice. Please clarify what the program can offer to incentivize uptake.</p> <p>April 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
Resource Availability	11. 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? 	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>Please note the following issues with the budget presentation:</p> <p>ERROR - Programming of FUNds missing in FInance Breakdown ERROR in PIF - FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust Funds Differ. ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants differ ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF</p>

		<p>Project Grants / Fees differ ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and Project Framework GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ ERROR in PIF - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance ERROR in PIF - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from PF's total cofinance</p> <p>Please ensure that in the final document, this is fully addressed.</p> <p>In addition, please ensure that the child projects listed have the correct endorsement letters when submitting the revised PFD. April 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	• the focal area allocation?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>NA.</p>
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>NA.</p>
	• focal area set-aside?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>Please reduce the focal area set aside request for the global coordination project to US\$7 million.</p> <p>April 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
PFD Clearance	Is the PFD recommended for clearance to include in the work program?	<p>March 18, 2015</p> <p>No, many issues have been identified above that require revisions.</p> <p>Please also note the following items that must also be addressed.</p>

Review Date (s)		<p>Under the Program Description, A) Global Environmental Problem, root causes, etc</p> <p>1) Elephants do not provide landscape "management services". Please rephrase.</p> <p>2) Rangers are being killed in the line of duty. Please rephrase.</p> <p>3) Please include in the discussion here that poaching is not all about losses. Indeed, it is the promise of short-term gains that are driving poaching, which is driven by poverty, lack of enforcement, lack of tenure, etc.</p> <p>4) The text should also referene in this section the issue of organized crime and money laundering</p> <p>5) Land-tenure and ownership of wildlife must also be fully discussed here as a root cause. Our hope is that some of the integrated MFA projects willll look at this issue and we must recognize this in the problem description.</p> <p>Under Section E. Sustainability: please emphasize how the project will seek to create stable situations on the ground where there is proper enforcement along with local communities engaged in wildlife activities (Tourism and Trophy hunting) that generates local benefits while generating global environmental benefits.</p> <p>April 24, 2015</p> <p>The PFD is recommended for technical clearance for a future work program.</p>
	Review*	March 18, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 30, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 24, 2015

*** 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.**