

# GEF -7 Global Wildlife Program -Addendum

**Review PIF and Make a recommendation**

## **Basic project information**

**GEF ID**

10561

**Countries**

Global (Bhutan, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa)

**Project Name**

GEF -7 Global Wildlife Program -Addendum

**Agencies**

World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, IUCN, WWF-US

**Date received by PM**

3/23/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/9/2020

**Program Manager**

Jaime Cavelier

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

PFD

## PIF

### Part I – Project Information

#### 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

Why the expected outcomes are the same for all BD Objectives?

#### A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements

Programming Directions	Expected Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1-1	Landscapes and marine habitat under improved management (excluding protected areas) Terrestrial habitat under improved conservation and sustainable use (million hectares)	GET	2,835,780	6,231,444
BD-1-2a	Landscapes and marine habitat under improved management (excluding protected areas) Terrestrial habitat under improved conservation and sustainable use (million hectares)	GET	4,079,111	37,042,640
BD-1-2b	Landscapes and marine habitat under improved management (excluding protected areas) Terrestrial habitat under improved conservation and sustainable use (million hectares)	GET	5,154,696	25,878,000
BD-2-7	Landscapes and marine habitat under improved management (excluding protected areas) Terrestrial habitat under improved conservation and sustainable use (million hectares)	GET	4,853,350	39,058,654
Total Program Cost (\$)			16,922,937	108,210,738

If using BD-1-1, please confirm that the country projects are using GEF \$2.8M in "*Mainstreaming BD .....in priority sectors....*"

BD-1-1 Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors

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

BD-1-2a Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through global wildlife program to prevent extinction of known threatened species

4-9-20

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

April 7, 2020:

As discussed bilaterally, the outcomes for Biodiversity remain the same as the approved GWP PFD and align with the outcomes defined. No further change made.

**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**

4-2-20

Yes. The structure of Table B is the same as the one of the PFD approved by Council in June 2029.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

**April 7, 2020:** Noted Thank you

**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**

4-2-20

Suggest changing this Investment Mobilized to Grant. Can be modified at CEO Endorsement of the corresponding country project.

CSO	WCS, Africa Nature Investors Foundation (ANI)	Unknown at this stage	Investment mobilized	800,000
-----	---	-----------------------	----------------------	---------

In the description of the description of “Investment Mobilized” suggest removing

“recurrent expenditures” “staff support”, “use of equipment”. These read as “Recurrent Investments:

**Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified**

The investments mobilized are potential leveraged resources based on engagement with partners and collaborators. And includes co-financing from various organizations such as civil society organizations, donor agencies, recipient governments, private sector and beneficiaries for both recurrent expenditures and investments mobilized through loans, staff support, use of equipment, corporate social responsibility, Public investments, etc. All the investment will be confirmed during the PPG phase. Co-financing sources and amounts are indicative at this stage.

4-9-20

Cleared

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON COFIANCING**

Co-financing: Co-financing from CSO (Pelindung Alam Malaysia) is classified as “public investment”. This type is only for national and sub-national government authorities. Please modify

4-14-20

Cleared

1.

### **Agency Response**

**April 7, 2020:**

As discussed bilaterally, the cofinancing descriptions are aligned with the language in the approved GWP PFD and reflect the nature of the various contributions. No further change made.

As per GEF recommendation the classification of the source has been changed. The nature of the CSO contribution reported by IA is classified unknown. The IA will be informed.

April 14, 2020:

Co-financing from CSO (Pelindung Alam Malaysia) has been re-classified as “grant”.

### **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**

4-2-20

Yes. The amounts, including Agency Fees, are in line with GEF Policies.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

April 7, 2020: Noted Thank you

The STAR allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

The focal area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?



**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**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**

4-2-20

PPG amounts are included in the LoE and in line with GEF Policies.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

**April 7, 2020:** Noted Thank you

**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

4-2-20

### Indicators

The Core Indicator of 1,131,100 should be under 1.2, not 1.1 Please relocate. The number is in the correct space in the Attached Annex.

Please also add the information requested under 1.2. The names of the PAs are in *Table 1*.

*Program/project map and geographic coordinates. Add ID and Hectares.*

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF) ⓘ	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at TE) ⓘ	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	---------	---------------	------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

4-9-20

Cleared

## Agency Response

**April 7, 2020:** Noted. Core indicator has been revised to change the sub indicator attribution.

However as agreed bilaterally and clarified, this level of detail was not provided for the countries in the original GWP at the PFD stage, as information is not available for all PAs individually in these early stages. Table 1 therefore only provides coordinates of those that were available and not the hectares. Therefore no further change has been made.

## 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**

4-2-20

Please point to table G or upload if missing.

4-9-20

Cleared

**Agency Response**

**April 7, 2020:** Noted. This maybe an error in the template. There is no missing table in the PFD.

**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**

4-2-20

Justification

For the description of the SA project request including the alignment of the project with the Components of the PFD as done for the other 4 projects.

4-9-20

Cleared

**Agency Response**

**April 7, 2020:** Noted. The description for SA has been updated.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-2-20

Yes. The Addendum is aligned with the BD Strategies and GWP PFD approved by Council in June 2019.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

**April 7, 2020:** Noted Thank you

**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**

**Agency Response**

**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**

4-2-20

Contribution to GEBs

Yes. Review Core Indicator 1.1 and 1.2

4-9-20

Cleared

**Agency Response**

**April 7, 2020:** Noted and revised.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

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****Agency Response**

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**

4-2-20

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

Cleared

**Agency Response**

April 7, 2020: Noted Thank you

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**

4-2-20

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

Cleared

**Agency Response April 7, 2020:** Noted Thank you  
**Private Sector Engagement**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-2-20

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

Cleared

**Agency Response April 7, 2020:** Noted Thank you  
**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**

4-2-20

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

Cleared

**Agency Response April 7, 2020:** Noted Thank you  
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**

4-2-20

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

Cleared

**Agency Response April 7, 2020:** Noted Thank you  
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**

4-2-20



Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

Cleared

**Agency Response April 7, 2020:** Noted Thank you  
**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**

4-2-20

Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD

Cleared

**Agency Response April 7, 2020:** Noted Thank you

**Part 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**

4-2-20

The Letters of Endorsement were signed by the OFPs and in agreement with the figures in the Portal

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Nigeria	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	3,519,725	316,775	3,836,500
UNDP	GET	Bhutan	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	183,486	16,514	200,000
UNDP	GET	Malaysia	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	7,139,450	642,550	7,782,000
IUCN	GET	Pakistan	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	2,652,294	238,706	2,891,000
UNEP	GET	South Africa	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	3,427,982	308,518	3,736,500

Agency Fee is 9% for all 5 projects.

## Bhutan

In the case of Bhutan, the LoE reflects the total use of STAR resources after the addition of \$200,000. The structure of the project remains the same.

### Initial LoE

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFTF	UNDP	Biodiversity	100,000	4,670,642	429,358	5,200,000
Total GEF Resources			100,000	4,670,642	429,358	5,200,000

### Revised LoE

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFTF	UNDP	Biodiversity	100,000	4,854,128	445,872	5,400,000
Total GEF Resources			100,000	4,854,128	445,872	5,400,000

Continues in next window (no more space in this one)

4-9-20

Cleared

**Agency Response April 7, 2020:** Noted clearance. Thank you  
Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Continuation

Malaysia

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFTF	UNDP	Biodiversity	200,000	7,139,450	660,550	8,000,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>			<b>200,000</b>	<b>7,139,450</b>	<b>660,550</b>	<b>8,000,000</b>

Nigeria

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEF	UNDP	BD	150,000	3,519,725	330,275.00	4,000,000.00
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>			<b>150,000</b>	<b>3,519,725</b>	<b>330,275.00</b>	<b>4,000,000.00</b>

Pakistan

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount in USD			
			Project Preparation Grant	Project Cost	Agency Fee	Total
GEF STAR	IUCN	BD	100,000	2,652,294	247,706	3,000,000

South Africa

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEF TF	UNEP	Biodiversity	150,000	3,427,982	322,018	3,900,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>			<b>150,000</b>	<b>3,427,982</b>	<b>322,018</b>	<b>3,900,000</b>

Agency Response

GEFSEC 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**

4-2-20

No. Please address outstanding issues listed above. Please note "Additional Comments" below. Thanks.

4-9-20

Yes. This PFD is recommended for Technical Clearance.

Cleared

4-14-20

Please address issue under co-financing. Thanks

4-14-20

This PFD Addendum 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**

4-2-20

Recommendations to Child Projects

The GEF Secretariat requests that in the preparation of the CEO Endorsements of the Child Projects in this Addendum, the Agencies and Governments consider the following requirements.

1. Focus on the most critical interventions. When selecting the activities to be funded by the project, make sure that only a few get selected, they are relevant to the problem in hand, the results are tangible and measurable, and the proposed interventions are doable within time and budget.
2. Allocate the necessary funds to tackle Illegal Wildlife Trade (live and dead animals). While the GEF is cognizant that the realities and needs on the ground are variable and that the type of support to address these threats will vary from country to country, it is imperative that these activities receive serious attention during project preparation and execution.
3. Ensure that the activities that will be carried out in the headquarters of the Government Agencies, are designed to directly benefit the operations of those on the ground tackling habitat degradation and Illegal Wildlife Trade.
4. Engage with the local communities. It is imperative for them to understand the project, and see the direct and indirect benefits that they can derive. While receiving direct benefits is usually the first and most common request from local communities, projects need to make emphasis in the medium- and long-term benefits in securing the target geographies, including Protected Areas, and the conservation of the threaten species. Additionally this is critical to the sustained impact of project activities.

#### Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### PIF Recommendation to CEO



## **Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

**CONTEXT:** Habitat destruction and illegal wildlife trade have devastating impacts on the populations of numerous wildlife species around the world. Illegal wildlife trade is associated with the demand for wildlife and wildlife products from markets around the globe but primarily from Asia and SE Asia. While IWT is usually associated with large and iconic species like the African elephants and rhinos, Asian tigers and snow leopards, and jaguars of Latin America, it is also affecting myriad of smaller species. For example, pangolins, the most poached animal in the world, are traded for its scales and meat, parrots and amphibians are exploited for the illegal pet trade, and reptiles for their skins. The Global Wildlife Program (GWP) aims to reverse the decline in wildlife populations due to illegal trade and promote wildlife conservation for sustainable development. To achieve these objectives, the program is investing financial and technical resources on three fronts: i) Conservation of Habitats and Wildlife; ii) Promotion of a Wildlife-based Economy; and iii) Combating Wildlife Trafficking. The GWP builds on lessons learned of the GEF-6 GWP and introduces innovative features in GEF-7 that aim to protect the assets of the “Green Infrastructure” (habitats and wildlife) and leverage them as “engines of economic growth and inclusive development”. This addendum updates the information provided in the GWP Program Framework Document (PFD) approved by the GEF Council in June 2019.

**PROJECTS:** This Addendum presents 5 projects in Africa (Nigeria and South Africa) and 2 in Asia (Bhutan, Malaysia and Pakistan). The project in Nigeria “Improved Management Effectiveness of Gashaka-Gumti and Yankari Protected Areas” aims at conserving threatened wildlife species, build a wildlife economy and enhance community benefits. The project in South Africa “Reducing Human Wildlife Conflict through an Evidence-based and Integrated Approach in Southern Africa” aims at creating an enabling environment and evidence-based approach on mitigating the effects of human-wildlife conflict in the SADC region. The project in Bhutan, “Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the tourism sector in Bhutan” aims at mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into tourism development and promote Bhutan as a model ecotourism destination. This strengthens knowledge exchange opportunities on human-wildlife conflict mitigation and on nature-based ecotourism development. The project in Malaysia “Building institutional and local capacities to reduce wildlife crime and enhance protection of iconic wildlife in Malaysia” aims at enhancing the protection of iconic wildlife species and their habitats in Peninsular Malaysia, Sarawak and Sabah. The project in Pakistan “Strengthening Governance and Capacity for Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade in Pakistan”.

**SELECTION CRITERIA:** The criteria used for a national project to be included under the program was the inclusion of activities that were categorized either under Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species and/or on Wildlife for Sustainable Development as per the GEF-7 Programming Direction document, and alignment with the approved GEF-7 GWP PFD results framework. This framework included the following components: (i) Conserve Wildlife and Enhance Habitat Resilience; (ii) Promote Wildlife-based and Resilient Economies; (iii) Combat Wildlife Trafficking; (iv) Reduce Demand and Disrupt Markets; and (v) Coordination and Enhance Learning. Country-based projects focused on designing and implementing national strategies and approaches to improve wildlife and protected area management, enhance community livelihood benefits, reduce poaching, and curtail illegal wildlife trade and reduce demand. Individual country projects may address a single component or include activities that address more than one.

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS:** The child projects of the GWP Addendum will contribute to increase the management effectiveness of 3.1 million hectares and protect a number of threaten species including the Malayan tiger, Bornean Orangutan and Bornean banteng in Malaysia, tiger, leopard, musk deer and

Himalayan black bear in Bhutan, Nigeria-Cameroon Chimpanzee as well as leopard in Nigeria, Indian pangolin, Common leopard and Snow leopard in Pakistan, and African elephants in South Africa.

CO-FINANCING: The Co-financing of this GEF \$16.0 million addition to the GWP is \$108.2 million. The co-finance, provided by Government's Ministries and Agencies, International and Local NGOs and the GEF Agencies, is \$59.9 million in Investment Mobilized and \$167.6 million in recurrent expenditures.