



Global Wildlife Program

Basic Information

GEF ID

10200

Countries

Global (Angola, Belize, Bhutan, Cambodia, Chad, Congo DR, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Namibia, Panama, South Africa)

Project Title

Global Wildlife Program

GEF Agency(ies)

World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, WWF-US

Agency ID

World Bank: World Bank, UNEP: UN Environment

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

Yes. The Program is aligned with the relevant Biodiversity Focal Area objectives under the GEFTF and the objectives of the LDCF. BD-1-1. Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors; BD-1-2a. Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through global wildlife program to prevent extinction of known threatened species; BD-1-2b. Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through Global wildlife program for sustainable development; BD-2-7. Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and Improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate; CCA-1. Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation; CCA-2. Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact.

Questions & Requests:

1. Program Commitment deadline: December 14, 2020
2. In the listing of countries, Angola was duplicated. Delete one.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Commitment deadline corrected.

Duplication has been deleted

Duplication has been deleted.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

Yes. The Components (Conserve Wildlife and Enhance Habitat Resilience, Promote Wildlife-based and Resilient Economies, Combat Wildlife Crime and Reduce Demand and Disrupt Markets), as well as the outcomes described in the PFD, are sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators. The Results Framework was built on the consultations with the GEF Agencies and the members of the PSC over several months and using the experiences of the GWP in GEF-6 as the starting point.

Questions and requests;

Component 4 - Reduce Demand and Disrupt Markets. Since Vietnam is not going to participate in the first round of projects (communicated to the GEF Secretariat after submission of PFD in Portal), and it is the only country with funding allocated for this component, the GEF Secretariat suggests using funds from the Global Project to carry out activities on Demand Reduction and Behavioral Change. This would be an opportunity to engage with some of the organizations that are specialized in this subject and based in Asia and SE Asia. Some of these organizations participated in the IWT Roundtable at the GEF Assembly in Vietnam. On a footnote please enter the names of the countries in the regional that are likely to enter the GWP at a later Work Program and with investments in this component.

GWP may consider organizing events to address the issue of IWT of groups of mammals and other charismatic species (i.e. pangolins, primates, parrots) that are being illegally but not necessarily the target species in any of the participating countries. In the Global Project, Table 1 can be eliminated.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you for the suggestion to use funds from the Global Project to carry out activities on Demand Reduction and Behavior Change. The GWP has incorporated activities under this component in the Global Project and has referenced it in the PFD, see section "Component 4: Reduce Demand" paragraph 63 – 64. The Global Project will collaborate with organizations that are specialized in this subject through partnerships as suggested.

The GWP has entered the names of the countries in the region that are likely to enter the GWP at a later work program. (Footnote 1 on page 4 and paragraph 63 of PFD)

The GWP will consider regional events on issues of IWT that affect species such as pangolins, primates, etc. This is referenced towards the end of paragraph 64 of the PFD.

In the Global Project, Table 1 has been eliminated as suggested.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

Yes. Co-financing is in the amount of \$530,134,060 with \$392,774,800 in Investment Mobilized (\$137,359,260 in Recurrent Cost). With a request of GEF \$91,053,611, the co-financing ratio is 5.8 to 1.0 for all resources and 4.3 to 1 for Investment Mobilized. (NOTE: Numbers including LDCF funds). In GEF-6, the co-financing ratio was 5.4 to 1. The co-financing was sorted out between these two types and the totals presented for several groups including Recipient Governments, Agencies, NGOs, etc. The two types of co-financing will be confirmed for each child project during project preparation.

Cleared

Agency Response No response required.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

The Agency Fee for the program and for the individual child projects is 9.0%. All countries are using BD resources within their STAR allocation and only Chad and Namibia used marginal adjustment.

Questions and requests

Please address the outstanding issues with the entries in Table D of the Portal or LoE of the following countries: Angola: A revised LoE is needed with the correct Focal Area for LDCF. Namibia: Please make the correct entries in Table D for Project and Fees. Chad: Request new LoE to ensure PPG, Project and Fee amounts add-up to the total. Panama: The correct agency for this child project is UN Environment. DRC: Please upload the correct LoE and remove the one currently in the system.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

All outstanding issues with the entries in Table D of the portal and revised LoEs have been addressed. Panama child project lead agency is now corrected.

However do note that the GEF Portal has limited and prescribed drop-down option for selection of agency and UNEP is the only option possible, therefore Table D still reflects UNEP and not UN Environment in general

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

Cleared

Agency Response No response required.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

Cleared

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

The Global Project is requesting \$10,000,000 to come from the BD Set Aside.

Cleared

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response**Project Preparation Grant**

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

No PPG requested. Funds for the PPG were included for all Child Projects.

Cleared

Agency Response**Core indicators**

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF / WORK PROGRAM INCLUSION

4-18-19

The relevant core indicators for the Program were included.

Question

Please state how the numbers in the Table were calculated. If by adding the values of the Child Projects, please clarify if those had the worksheets or only the totals.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

The GEF-7 Core Indicators were calculated by adding the values of the National Projects. The National Projects had indicator worksheets. This is now mentioned in the text under Table E in PFD.

Project/Program taxonomy**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-18-19

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response No response required.**Part II – Project Justification**

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

Yes. There is a detailed description of the global environmental problems related to the Global Wildlife Program: Habitat Change, Illegal Wildlife Trade, Climate Change and Unrecognized wildlife value and lack of benefits by communities. Similarly, there is an account and description of the root causes (Consumer demand for illegally traded wildlife, corruption, Increased organized crime and transnational trading networks) and the barriers that must be overcome to resolve the problems (Lack of Enforcement, Inadequate Land use Planning, Lack of ownership/value of wildlife to the communities, lack of national and international coordination, Inadequacy of efforts at national and global scales to raise awareness and reduce consumer demand and Lack of a comprehensive tourism and conservation policy).

Questions and requests/suggestions

1. Could the lead agency depict the Problems, Root causes and Barriers in a graph so it is possible to understand the issues and how they relate to each other.
2. The GEF requests reviewing the the root causes, problems and barriers to see if there are other issues that need to be described and that are central to the understanding the problem (i.e. Incentives for land conversion, Governance and Economic/market failures as Root Causes, and shortcoming in the institutions charged with the management of protected areas, and limited access to information as Barriers).

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

1. A diagram depicting the problems, root causes and barriers in a chart format so that it is possible to understand the issues and how they relate to each other, is presented Figure 1. "*Global environmental problems of biodiversity loss, drivers and root causes*" on Page 11 and described in paragraph 21 of the PFD. This figure has been created taking into account feedback received from GEF STAP as well.
2. The problems, root causes and barriers have been revised following your suggestion as well as GEF STAP suggestions (see Paragraph 01 to 20). Figure 1 on Page 11 summarizes this information in a pictorial representation

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

There is a comprehensive account to the baseline scenario. This description includes a broad overview of the national, international commitments & strategies, as well as of the large programs providing funding for their implementation. There is also a detailed description of the specific baseline for the Global Wildlife Program. That is organized in three elements: what the implementing agencies are currently doing to address the wildlife crisis, what the countries presenting a child project are doing to address the wildlife issue and the co-financing coming from each of the child projects.

Questions and requests/suggestions

1. The description of the baseline scenario is very long (15 paragraphs) and it is difficult to follow the rationale of the text. Would be possible to move some elements to an Annex? Perhaps lists of minor commitments.
2. Would be possible to move some of the most important elements of the Specific Baseline from the Annexes to the body of the PFD? This is an important part of the PFD that deserves a space inside the PFD. Could retain the annexes for additional information.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

The baseline section was revised and shortened to include a broad baseline that consists of International Commitments, Strategies and Donor Investments and a specific baseline on the GWP (Paragraph 25 – 37). Important elements from the Annex including country baseline and implementing agency baseline are captured in Tables 2 and Table 3 of the PFD with additional information moved to Annexes D, E, and F.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

In the Alternative Scenario, there is the Theory of Change and the description of the components. The Theory of Change has four pillars: Conserve Wildlife and Enhance Habitat Resilience, Promote Wildlife-based and Resilient Economies, Combat Wildlife Crime and Reduce Demand and Disrupt Markets. Each of these pillars has Activities/Outputs, and short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes. It also has the Assumptions on which the TOC is build. After the TOC is the list of Components with a description. These are: Conserve Wildlife and enhance Habitat Resilience, Promote Wildlife-based and Resilient Economies, - Combat Wildlife Crime, Reduce Demand and Disrupt Markets, Coordinate and Enhance Learning.

Questions and requests/suggestions

1. In the description of the Components, there are several Sub-components for which there is also a description. In Table B (Indicative Program Description Summary), there are a few outcomes for each of the Components, but no sub-component. Is it possible to list the outcomes that are expected under each of the sub-components in the text, or are the outcomes listed in the Table expected as the results of all activities in all sub-components?
2. Please clearly articulate: (i) how the pathways (pillars) in the TOC tackle the root causes, and how they will overcome barriers, and (ii) the linkages between the different pillars pathways to ensure integration.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

1. The expected outcomes under each of the sub-components (see Paragraph 49 to 72 of the PFD) and a clarifying statement was added that the outcomes are expected as a result of various activities across sub-components and components (see paragraph 47).
2. The program activities are designed to overcome barriers which are linked to the root causes as discussed in the text (see Paragraph 45, 46 and 47 of the PFD). A graphic illustration of the links and the theory of change is represented in Figure 2 on Page 24. This depicts the barriers that will be addressed through specific activities that will result in desired outcomes.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-18-19

The GWP is aligned with the GEF biodiversity focal area strategy to help: (i) mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors; (ii) mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through global wildlife program to prevent extinction of known threatened species; (iii) mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through Global wildlife program for sustainable development; and (iv) address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and Improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate. The Angola Child Project is also aligned with two of objectives of the LCDF: Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation, and mainstream Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience for Systemic Impact.

Cleared

Agency Response No response required.**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-18-19

As described in the Guidance "*Incremental reasoning defines the role for the GEF in the context of the expected agreed global environmental benefits from a proposed project. It is based on an assessment of the value added by involving the GEF. The identification of GEF's role is of great importance for the design and implementation of a project, and therefore requires a recorded process of transparent dialogue and negotiation between key stakeholder groups such as the project proponent, the involved GEF Agency, the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Council*". Following on this definition"

Questions and requests/suggestions

Reorganizing the text to address the following: 1. What is the value added by GEF financial and technical contributions to address the problems and deliver the Global Environmental Benefits delivered. 2. A statement on the negotiations to develop the Results Framework guiding the Program and between the GEF Agencies and the participating countries on the objectives of the Child Projects and the proposed interventions. 3. A statement on the consultation with the GEF Secretariat. 4. The co-financing raised to achieve the proposed Global Environmental Benefits.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Text addressing the above suggestions are now included in the incremental reasoning section. (see Paragraph 74-77 of the PFD)

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

Global environmental benefits include 18,879,574.00 hectares of terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use; 100 hectares of land restored; 3,072,175.00 hectares of landscapes under improved practices, excluding protected areas; for a total of hectares of 21,951,849 ha under improved management; and 411,459 f direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment. Adaptation benefits will include integration of actions/measures into national, sectoral or subnational development strategies, plans and budgets and land under climate-resilient management. Specifically, the global environmental benefits of the Angola GWP Project include 35,000 hectares of land under climate-resilient management; 4 policies, plans and development frameworks that mainstream climate resilience, and 60,000 people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risk and/or engage in adaptation measures (30,000 female; 30,000 male).

Cleared

Agency Response The revised PFD reflects updated and upward revised target figures for the GEBs. LDCF targets remain the same.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

Innovation. The PFD states that the Program will innovate across technology, finance and governance pillars. On the sustainability angle, the project states that in the “long-term, sustainability of improved NRM that underlies successful prevention and deterrence will rest in the hands of the National Governments, the agencies in charge of the management of these areas, the local communities the private companies and NGOs that have partnered with the latter”. And in scale-up the PFD states that there is potential for scaling up on other threatened species and geographies.

Questions and requests/suggestions

Please elaborate on the innovations across the technology, finance and governance pillars. For sustainability please elaborate on the role of the International Donor Community bringing into the discussion some of the lessons learned from preparation and publication of the “*Analysis of International Funding to Tackle Illegal Wildlife Trade*”. For sustainability, please add a few lines on the Institutional (i.e. PA Agencies, Ministries involved) and Ecological sustainability (mainly connectivity).

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

The description of innovation across technology, finance and governance has been revised in different sections of the PFD (see Paragraphs 82 to 83 and Paragraphs 105-109 of the PFD).

Under the Financial Sustainability section, the role of the International Donor Community and the lessons learned from the publication “*Analysis of International Funding to Tackle Illegal Wildlife Trade*” have been elaborated (see Paragraph 85 of the PFD).

Information on the Institutional and ecological sustainability were added (see Paragraph 84 and 86, respectively of the PFD).

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

In Annex A1, there are two very useful maps of the Participating Countries and Agencies.

Questions and requests/suggestions

Please add, if at all possible, the list of targets protected areas and coordinates if available in the Child Projects.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

The list of project sites can be viewed in Table 3 *List of Project Sites and Priority Species* on page 25 of the PFD. The coordinates of the protected areas is included in Annex A1 of the PFD along with the map.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

The description of Stakeholder Engagement is very comprehensive. The PFD describes the engagement at the Local, National (i.e. PA Agencies, Ministries) and International Level (i.e. Development Agencies, MDBs), as well as with the private sector. There was also engagement with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities. Each Child Project has a set of stakeholders consulted during the preparation of the Concept Notes.

Stakeholder consultations: Given the nature of the Program, early stakeholder consultations and active engagement are key to guaranteeing the successful implementation of the Program. The proposal acknowledges this and describes that consultations have taken place with civil society, indigenous peoples and private sector.

Information on how Stakeholders will be engaged in the Program and means of engagement throughout the Program cycle: The proposal identifies the relevant stakeholders who should be engaged in the project. There are several outcomes and targets that include engagement, capacity development, and improved coordination with stakeholders. There is mention regarding the engagement of stakeholders, including communities, beyond consultation to engage them actively in the design of the child projects. The means in which the stakeholders will be engaged are identified

In general, at this stage the information provided regarding Stakeholder Engagement is adequate.

For requirements at CEO Endorsement, the Agency is advised to please check the approved [Policy on Stakeholder Engagement](#) as well as the corresponding [Guidelines](#) for more information.

Cleared

Agency Response

The Agency will check the approved [Policy on Stakeholder Engagement](#) as well as the corresponding [Guidelines](#) at the CEO Endorsement stage.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

The Program will focus on gender in two areas: firstly, in developing the pathways out of poaching for local communities and secondly, work with women and women's groups to reduce the demand for wildlife.

Questions and requests/suggestions

Please elaborate on the Gender issue by addressing the three gender gaps most relevant to GEF projects and programs: Unequal Access to and Control of Natural Resources, Unbalanced Participation and Decision Making in Environmental Planning and Governance at All and Uneven Access to Socio-Economic Benefits and Services. Please consult: *Guidance to Advance Gender Equality IN GEF PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS*.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

GEFSEC recommendation on addressing Gender issues has been well received and has been incorporated in the updated PFD (see Paragraph 104 of the PFD).

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

It is important to explain how the Program aims at engaging the Private Sector in the activities in Component 2 (Promote Wildlife-based and Resilient Economies) Component 3 (Combat Wildlife Crime) and Component 4 (Reduce Demand and Disrupt Markets). Please make entries into the description of each of these components using a heading to highlight the importance of this subject in the program. It is important to describe how the Private Sector will contribute delivering the expected results. Suggest opening a section to state how the Program will engage with the private sector on the different pillars of the program and the Private Sector companies or institutions that will be approached.

The Global Project and the Private Sector

The Global Project should engage with the Private Sector and other organizations at levels higher than those that the individual country-projects can reach.

When promoting a wildlife-based and resilient economies, the Program should think of partnering with organizations working on wildlife-based tourism and the biodiversity economy in general [i.e. World Tourism Organization, Hotel and Safari Lodges (giving continuity to the conversations that started with some of the private sector companies that attended the IWT Roundtable at the GEF Assembly), and Tourism Investment Forums by The Giants Club (like Uganda 2017 and Zimbabwe 2019)]. The Program can also engage with the Private Sector Companies that support the development and implementation of Biodiversity Economy Strategies as in the case of South Africa.

When engaging on the issue of Combating Wildlife Crime, the Global Program should engage with the organizations addressing international illegal trade including the members of the United for Wildlife's "Transport Task Force" (over 30 airline and maritime companies), & the Financial Task Force, and the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC). The ICCWC offers a unique bridge to engage not only with its founding members, but with law enforcement regional and global organizations and institutions like the Wildlife Enforcement Networks (WENs) and the Eagle Network which in 2018 contributed to the arrest of 181 significant wildlife traffickers and other criminals in 10 countries collaborates with UNODC on various operational efforts.

When dealing with Demand Reduction and Behavioral Change, the Global project could engage with the organizations addressing this matter, especially with the Africa-Asia nexus (i.e. IFAW; WildAid; Freeland Foundation - an international NGO based in Bangkok, that works in Asia and intends to stop wildlife and human trafficking; ADM Capital Foundation based in Hong Kong and works to address environmental and social challenges across Asia). The Program should also engage with the organizations already working with the IWT of species of mammals, birds and reptiles from LAC to the markets around the world. The Global Project will work with the GEF and WB Communication Team to engage with specialized media to explore options like [Mongaby](#) series on Latin America Wildlife Trade.

In addition to these three fronts, the Global project will continue working on the coordination of the International Funding to Tackle Illegal Wildlife Trade. The GWP Donor Coordination group includes several multilateral- and, bilateral-organizations, international NGOs, UN Agencies and foundations (Vulcan Philanthropy, Wildcat Foundation and Oak Foundation). The Global project will lead a number of initiatives for coordinating action and will use the members of the group for assistance in the development and implementation of the initiatives.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

This section was revised to expand on the Private Sector Engagement to account for GEFSEC's suggestions as well as consulting child projects (see Stakeholder section Paragraph 93 – 103 as well as the Private Sector Engagement section- Paragraph 105- 109 of the PFD). Additional national project examples were also added to components 1 and 2 (see paragraphs 51 and 55).

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

The PFD recognizes several risk factors and present the description of the issues as well as the mitigation factors. The risks are: Stakeholder, Coordination, Social, Program Design and Climate Change. The PFD recognizes that the overall rating is Substantial. The complexity of the problem and coordinating key partners and at the same time delivering effective results in a timely manner makes the overall risk substantial and presents the suggested measures to address the potential issues during implementation.

Cleared

Agency Response No response required

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

This is one of the strongest elements of the GWP. The WB was the Lead Agency for the Global Wildlife Program in GEF-6 and will continue with that role in GEF-7. The WB will do the coordination and knowledge management activities with the support of the Program Steering Committee (PSC), chaired by the World Bank as lead agency, and composed of the Global Environmental Facility Secretariat and relevant Implementing/Project Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, IUCN, WWF, ADB), and key partners who are leaders in the field (CITES, TRAFFIC, WCS, and WildAid).

Cleared

Agency Response No response required

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

Yes. The child projects are aligned with their national strategies and plans as described in the National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plans (NBSAPs) of the Convention on Biodiversity. And for the African countries with the African Elephant Action Plan," signed at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES in 2010.

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

1. The PFD needs to have a section to introduce the two main tracks of the GWP in the GEF-7 Biodiversity Strategy (Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species, and Wildlife for Sustainable Development). This needs to be inserted early in the document, so the reader understands how the structure of the program reflects these two tracks that were agreed at the GEF Assembly

understands how the structure of the program reflects these two tracks that were agreed at the GEF Assembly.

2. Following on point No. 1, the structure of the Global Projects needs to be modified. The suggested changes need to be reflected both in the PFD (where this needs to be clearly position in the document and be the centerpiece of the attention) as well as in the Global Project. Understanding that the Global project will carry out some of the activities that delivered under GEF-6, it is important that in GEF-7 the Global Project raises the profile and generate a movement of change around the two themes of the GWP: Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species, and Wildlife for Sustainable Development. A third component of the Global Project could contain the complementary activities of Coordination, and M&E.

2.1. On Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species, the Program should sharpen focus on the illegal supply chain and bring into the discussion the stakeholders that can make a difference in disrupting the supply-transit and demand of illegally traded wildlife and wildlife products. The Global Project should be in position to engage with the different stakeholders along the chain, including private sector organizations, and bring to the front the institutions that are working and in position to make a difference. Instead of “integrating” the chains along the illegal wildlife trade, the Global Program should assist in “disintegrating” some of these links.

2.2. On Wildlife for Sustainable Development, the Program should bring to the table the institutions that can turn the discourse from tackling IWT along the supply chain to making wildlife and natural habitats the sources of economic growth. In this part, the Global Program should be able to do develop methods to measure socio-economic impacts of parks and wildlife, engage with the appropriate agencies to carry out economic assessments of selected conservation areas as requested by the governments of participating countries with the explicit commitment to use and implement the findings of such studies, enhancing the capacity of institutions devoted to the economic analysis and governance of wildlife and protected areas, as well as building the capacity of the practitioners in these fields. The Global Project can also bring public and private stakeholders to the table regarding the various necessary investments and policy reforms to carry out analytical studies of the potential gains of protecting conservation area and wildlife, as well as the costs of not taking care of the “green infrastructure” that with enough maintenance can generate financial and non-financing resources for the local, regional and national economies. These analyses should be accompanied by action on the part of interested government to ensure that habitats and wildlife are properly protected so they can start generating revenue. The Global Project should also use its convening power to bring to the table Foundations working in the space, as well other for profit- and non-profit organizations (not necessarily associated with the execution of the country projects or as co-financiers) to explore ways to change the status quo on how to really put to work the assets contained in conservation areas (including wildlife) to the service of a sustainable economy.

2,3 On Coordination, and Monitoring & Evaluation. This could be the third pillar of the Global Program. Since the GEF Core Indicators that relate to this program are only hectares, the GEF Secretariat suggest adding (in a table or annex) the GWP Indicators that have been adopted and being used to collect the data in the GWP projects in GEF-6.

3. What is the total funding allocated by the country-based programs for the Component on *Knowledge Management Monitoring & Evaluation*? The GEF Secretariat suggest that each country project sets aside at least 10% of that budget (making it explicit at CEO Endorsement) for the participation of at least one project staff to a global or regional meeting (i.e. Annual Meeting or face-to-face event)

convened by the Lead Agency.

5-2-19

Cleared

Agency Response

1. Suggestions were addressed by inserting text to show the two main tracks of GEF 7 GWP (see Paragraph 22- 24 of the PFD)

2. The structure of the Global Project now consists of three components (i) Wildlife-based economies, (ii) Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade and (iii) Coordination. These are reflected in Component 5 of the PFD (see Paragraph 65 – 72 of the PFD)
 - 2.1 Further explanations on disintegrating the links along the IWT chain have been described in component 3 of the alternative scenario (see Paragraph 58 – 62 and Paragraph 67 of the PFD)

 - 2.2 The above text has been reflected and inserted into the WBE section of component 5 (see Paragraph 52 – 57 and Paragraph 66 of the PFD)

 - 2.3 Coordination and M&E is the third pillar of the Global Project (see 68-72 of the PFD). The list of GWP indicators were added to the M&E Section in Table 4, Page 34 of the PFD.

3. The participation of project staff in global activities will be funded by both the Global Project and the Child Project budgets (see Paragraph 65 of the PFD). The exact amount will be determined during preparation.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-18-19

The names of the OFPs of the participating countries in the Letters of Endorsement were checked against the names in the GEF Website and are in compliance: Angola, Belize, Bhutan, Chad, Congo DR, Ecuador, India, Madagascar, Namibia, South Africa. The LoE from Cambodia, Indonesia and Vietnam were not included. Please upload these letters or in their absence, remove the countries from the program and re-calculate all tables where there is reference to funds.

5-2-19

Please ensure that the numbers in the LoE of Angola and Chad are reflected in Table D in Portal.

Agency Response

LoE's from Cambodia and Indonesia have been received and attached to the PFD package. LoE from Vietnam has not been received and as a result, Vietnam has been removed from the country list. All tables have been recalculated to address these changes.

Response 5-2-2019

The new letters for Angola and Chad have been submitted and aligned with Table D of the PFD. Thank you for the clearance on all previous comments.

Response 5-6-2019

The error in agency name for Panama Child project is now corrected in Table D and listed as UNEP instead of UNDP (aligned with Table A)

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5-7-19

Yes. This PFD is recommended for Technical Clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

View Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/18/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		