

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10200
Project Title		Global Wildlife Program
Date of Screening		23-May-19
STAP member Screener		Rosie Cooney
STAP secretariat screener		Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment		Concur
		<p>STAP welcomes the Global Wildlife Program submission by the World Bank for this comprehensive and wide-ranging program. Overall STAP finds this PFD very clear and sound. The program is logically designed and the different sections on the problem statement, objective, components, global environmental benefits, and the incremental cost reasoning are coherently linked. In addition, while much of the GWP activities support 'business as usual' (albeit urgently needed) interventions, for example, improved protected area management, this new phase of the GWP is innovative in that it supports efforts to turn wildlife into an asset, and adopts a value-chain approach from poacher to market.</p> <p>Notably, STAP finds that the newly expanded GWP proposal has gained valuable insight from the GEF-6 program and that these lessons have been well integrated into the GEF-7 program. The GWP would benefit further by delving deeper into the experiences of the prior program to share insights gleaned from working with current partners and experts with the new countries planning to join.</p> <p>The risks are realistic and clearly articulated and the PFD proponents clearly understands the challenges associated with the implementation of such a complex program. STAP appreciates that the program will develop clear and concrete indicators that can be monitored easily.</p> <p>Given the magnitude and the complexity of the program, the role of the coordinating body will be of utmost importance. In this respect, it will be important to go beyond existing activities such as webinars, yearly meetings, site visits, etc. to develop a truly innovative and interactive platform that is easily accessible by all partners with information and data can be readily updated and shared. In this way, it will not be as necessary to wait for mid term and final evaluations to undertake necessary corrections at which time it may already be too late. This will only work if management is nimble and can utilize the information to adapt accordingly.</p> <p>Overall, it is clear that much thought and effort has gone into the development of the Global Wildlife Program PFD and has minor comments and suggestions that should be considered during PPG phase.</p>
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes, this is good.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, they are clear and well justified.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes

Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	The TOC narrative and diagram is good and clear. The text makes very clear the interrelated nature of these outcomes. It could be helpful to convey this more clearly in Fig 2 by adding a few arrows e.g. the Activities/Outputs of components 2, 3 (and probably 4) will directly contribute to the Short-term Outcomes of Component 1. Adding these arrows would help highlight the integrated nature of the program.
1. Project description. Briefly describe:		
1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes, with one exception. It is important to note that Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) is <i>not</i> one of the key drivers of species decline, as described in the program proposal. Rather, it is overexploitation in all its forms (including legal, including fisheries/forestry) that is a key driver alongside habitat loss, climate change etc. (See e.g. Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the IPBES, May 2019 and WWF. 2018. Living Planet Report - 2018: Aiming Higher. Grooten, M. and Almond, R.E.A.(Eds). WWF, Gland, Switzerland). Only a small fraction of products of overexploitation enters the illegal wildlife trade, but the latter is indeed a key driver for many iconic wild species. Fig 1 is excellent - very well thought through, and makes the relationships between the root causes/drivers etc very clear.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. The root causes are very well articulated, and likewise the barriers are really clear and well thought through.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	Yes
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Planned and current interventions and actions are clearly identified, but the actual baseline situation of habitat loss/IWT is not particularly clearly described, if this is what is intended here.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Baseline information is about what the programs, agencies and countries are doing to address wildlife issues - not scientific baselines re species, etc.; with the exception of Table 2 which lists percentage of PAs within each participating country and Table 3 which lists priority species. So if the objective is to increase total area of PA or increase in specific priority species, for example, then a baseline percentage has indeed been established.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	This is country and context specific and would need to be determined by carefully reviewing each Child Project which is beyond the scope of this screen.
	For multiple focal area projects:	

	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	There is no question that this expanded GWP has strengthened and deepened its overall diagnosis of the root causes of the wildlife crisis and has developed its TOC accordingly. By shifting the focus to consider how wildlife can be viewed as a valuable resource to countries and communities, the program is broadening its scope and increasing likelihood of overall positive impact. Still, however, while recognising that the GWP covers a wide array of countries, contexts and species, it would strengthen this PFD to see some explicit lessons drawn from previous/other projects as to what has (and importantly, what hasn't) worked.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Clear and helpful
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	*These are really good and strong. *It is concerning to see the emphasis on treating <i>all</i> illegal wildlife use and trade as "serious wildlife crime", as so much informal/illegal hunting/gathering/trading of wildlife is done at a very small scale by local people for very little profit (and with no knowledge of the broader conservation context, or even in many cases the laws). The program is clearly aware of this issue and makes reference to it, but to give a clear message it would be preferable to distinguish what sort of illegal activity (e.g. "large-scale", "involving organised crime" etc) is to be treated as "serious wildlife crime". There are major concerns about human rights violations against indigenous/local people in several countries now in relation to IWT enforcement (e.g. Cameroon, South Africa, India, Mozambique, Malaysia), and this can (and has) backfire/d in conservation terms - really important to ensure enforcement is proportionate and well-targeted.
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes.
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	*yes, clearly articulated and justified

	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	The case for how these activities will build resilience to CC is not very clearly made. It is said in some places that it will (e.g. p42,) but not how. Para 80 makes a part explanation, but it is not very clear or general. Useful to add e.g. that well managed and healthy wildlife populations and ecosystems (which is the expected outcome from making them more valuable to people, under supportive governance conditions) are less fragile in the face of climate change, and that wildlife use will diversify livelihoods, making them more resilient to climate impacts on agriculture.
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	To varying degrees, depending on specific project and focus. For example, projects that prevent deforestation have a clear global benefit and can be measured in terms of carbon benefits or BD conservation due to reduction in habitat loss.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes in terms of GEF indicators
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Several of the projects are funded with LDCF funds and specific address resilience and there is a specific objective (p. 49) to "Enhance management and resilience of terrestrial, community, private and state reserves, wildlife corridors and OECMs." Would need to review individual child projects to determine the extent to which interventions are designed to achieve this objective.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	*The PFD perhaps undersells the innovative nature of this - some of it (e.g. PA management) is business-as-usual (albeit urgently needed), but the turning wildlife into an asset approach is innovative, and the value-chain approach from poacher to market is innovative.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	*Yes
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The project as a whole is quite transformational in its approach. Given the large number and wide ranging projects, it is likely that incremental adaptation will be required for specific projects and for the coordination mechanism.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		A map is provided that shows all of the countries participating in the GWP. Some coordinates are also given - appear to be points representing the centroid with the exception of Belize.

<p>2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>*Yes, this looks very solid.</p>
	<p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	<p>*Good.</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>*Yes, this well thought through and articulated.</p>
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>	<p>*Yes, the risks are clearly articulated and realistic. The complexity and uncertainty of the program is clearly recognised.</p>

	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	Yes
	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	
	· How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?	*Yes
	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	Climate change risk is discussed under the risks section and mitigation entails support for landscape planning tools. STAP recommends that the GWP look into the SPARC tool under development by Conservation International which uses climate and species data to help managers make informed planning decisions vis-a-vis protected area and OECM placement.
	· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	For some projects
	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	*Yes, clearly thought through
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes, though could be stronger. -This project has learned a lot from the first tranche of the GWP and hopefully lessons from these project (when they become available) will be incorporated into future work.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	See above
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	See above
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	Yes as the same core group will be involved in the transition from the GEF-6 GWP to GEF-7 GWP.
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	*Good

	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	This will be addressed through the coordination grant, led by the World Bank. To date this group has been very effective at bringing together a diverse group of countries and stakeholders together to discuss common issues (e.g. human-wildlife conflict). With the expansion of the program, it will be increasingly challenging and important to ramp up this aspect and move beyond webinars and Box sites with documents, to more dynamic and user friendly websites where countries can more effectively share data, information, lessons learned, etc.
STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed	
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.	“STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.”
	* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that	
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:	
	(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;	
	(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.	
	The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.	
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:	

	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>	
--	--	--