



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Minutes of the 4th Project Board Meeting

Project Name: Reducing Maritime Trafficking of Wildlife between Africa and Asia
Project ID: 00109494
Output ID: 00108842
Venue: Virtual (Email)
Date: 28 May – 13 July 2020

1. List of Participants

| Name | Title |
|--|--|
| Project Board | |
| 1. Gerd Trogemann | Istanbul Regional Hub Manager, UNDP IRH, Chairperson |
| 2. Elisson M. Wright | Senior Natural Resources Management Specialist, World Bank |
| 3. Robert Campbell | Programme Manager - United for Wildlife Taskforces, The Royal Foundation |
| 4. Javier Montano Duran (on behalf of Ricarda Amberg) | Regional Coordinator, Programme Management Officer, Container Control Programme (CCP), UNODC |
| 5. Lisa Farroway | UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP |
| UNDP | |
| 6. Ekaterina Paniklova | Chief, Country Office Solutions & Regional Programme Coordination Team, UNDP |
| 7. Harun Guclusoy | Project Manager, UNDP |
| 8. Mikhail Paltsyn | Project Technical Advisor, UNDP |
| 9. Tamara Tschentscher | Knowledge Management Officer, UNDP |
| 10. Zuhre Guven | Project Associate, UNDP |

2. Agenda and discussion

Background

The UNDP-GEF Project “Reducing Maritime Trafficking of Wildlife between Africa and Asia” officially was started in May 2018 with the Objective *to reduce maritime trafficking of wildlife (including elephant, rhinoceros and pangolin) between Africa and Asia through strengthening of capacity at ports and improving South-South cooperation to control wildlife trafficking*. The project objective is planned to be achieved via achievements of three project Outcomes:

1. Stakeholders at ports and across the shipping sector work towards, and maintain, best practice in combating wildlife trafficking
2. Strengthened coordination and enhanced South-South cooperation on combating wildlife trafficking

3. Continuous learning and sharing of lessons and results ensures maximum success of the GWP and its wider longer-term impact.

The developments and the feedback sought since last PB meeting are summarized as follows:

COVID-19 impacts on the work plan

With the current COVID-19 pandemic and related restrictions, a number of project activities have been impacted and are expected to be impacted at least throughout 2020. The PMU is currently discussing with partners how to adapt activities to ensure progress throughout this period. This includes exploration of opportunities for virtual meetings and trainings, as well as close collaboration and coordination with UNDP Country Offices (COs) and partners on the ground. The PMU is elaborating and will share a detailed adapted work plan.

USAID grant

The PMU has submitted a grant proposal to USAID (\$2 million grant) to implement additional activities to combat maritime trafficking of wildlife at ports. The PB suggested to convene another virtual board meeting once this is approved to determine how exactly to move forward with the practical implementation.

The PMU shared the final draft USAID technical and financial proposals to the Project Board on 28 May 2020 for review and approval.

Furthermore, the PMU recommended that USAID be invited to be a member of this Project Board once the USAID grant has been approved and sought the Project Board's agreement on this.

Project extension request

In light of the COVID-19 related delays to project implementation and the additional USAID funds, the PMU proposed submission of a request to UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator for an 18-month project extension. The current project operational closure date is 03 May 2021, and with an 18-month extension the new operational closure date would be 03 November 2022. The PMU sought the PB's agreement to the proposed 18-month extension request.

3. Decisions of the Project Board

On 18 February 2020, the project had its third Project Board meeting through skype. The Project Board had approved 2019 project progress report and agreed with the 2020 Annual Work Plan.

For the fourth PB meeting, the Project Board members' comments were collected by 13 July 2020. The recommendations and comments made by the Board members have been addressed during the consultations. A detailed comments log is attached to this document in Annex 1 (see below).

Following the review of the project documentations and virtual discussion, the Project Board approved the following:

- Invitation and acceptance of USAID to be an additional member of the Project Board once the USAID granted additional project activities;
- Extension of project for 18-months (operational closure date of 03 November 2022);

The Project Management Costs will not exceed the originally approved PMC costs in the project budget for the 18-month extension request. We understand that any additional project management costs above the originally approved PMC will be covered from non-GEF resources. After this extension period, the project will be operationally and then financially closed.

Prepared by : Harun Guclusoy Project Manager, UNDP IRH
Zuhre Guven Project Associate, UNDP IRH
Tamara Tschentscher, Knowledge Management Officer

Harun Guclusoy *Zuhre Guven* *Tamara Tschentscher* 23-Sep-2020

Cleared by: Ekaterina Paniklova, Chief of Country Office Solutions & Regional Programme Coordination Team, UNDP IRH

Ekaterina Paniklova 23-Sep-2020

Approved by : Gerd Trogemann, Manager, UNDP IRH

Gerd Trogemann 23-Sep-2020

Annex 1. Comments Log during Project Board Consultations

| Comments from Board Members | Response from the Project Team |
|--|--|
| <p>World Bank: Comment: “Thank you for sharing the additional details. No objection from our side and great to have USAID join. Will it be someone from there HQ or Nairobi mission? Good to have an extension given everything else happening”.</p> | <p>USAID asked from us the ToR of the PB. They are still assessing internally whether they would like to become member of the PB. I believe someone from Nairobi mission will join.</p> |
| <p>UNODC: Comment: “Greetings from Nairobi, as it relates to the feedback requested in your earlier message from the part of UNODC kindly note the following: 1. We welcome the inclusion of USAID as an additional member of the Project Board, provided that the potential new contribution from their end does materialize; 2. We strongly support the proposal for an 18-month project extension as indicated in your message. 3. As it relates to the concept note, I would like to raise an initial concern on the need for strong consultation and possibly flexibility within the project on Activity 2.1.2. (financial investigations), there are various actors that are working actively on the ground on that topic, including UNODC with an existing mentor on financial investigations based in Uganda.”</p> | <p>Regarding your concern on the concept note (item 3); We agree with UNODC’s comment on FI and recognizing the existing efforts in this area and the need for consultations with existing UNODC and World Bank experts and others before implementation of this activity. Actually it was planned as a complimentary activity to UNODC efforts on FI capacity building in EAC to ensure all together we can cover high demand for this from law enforcement agencies via a coordinated system of repetitive training and mentoring sessions in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda and bring rich experience from different investigation experts to the region. We tried to reflect this in the proposal itself which includes consultations with UNODC, World Bank, TRAFFIC, UK Government, Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network Southern Africa (ARINSA), Eastern and Southern Africa Anti-Money Laundering Group (ESAAMLG), and Lusaka Agreement Task Force as an initial and absolutely necessary step for this activity. These consultations will take place just before a Responsible Party Agreement for this activity will be developed given fast current and other potential changes in FI field in the EAC. Based on the consultations the activity can be adjusted depending on the changing demand for FI skills. We should also mention that this activity received a strong support of US Homeland Security Investigation that recommended involvement of the Grace Farms Foundation for its delivery.</p> |
| <p>The Royal Foundation: Comment: “1. Agree on inviting USAID into the project board if the grant is approved and they become a partner to the project. Do we know who the representative might be? 2. I absolutely agree with the project extension in the circumstances, this would actually now nearly align with our own United for Wildlife timeline so perhaps there might be something we could do jointly nearer the time of exiting both projects. 3. Just to highlight on the back of Javier’s point around item 2.1.2, I have raised this before but with our (United for Wildlife) network of private sector institutions we have suggest one or two of them is approached to provide guidance on this topic from a financial services perspective. Many of these firms have extremely active financial investigation units within their own institutions. I previously put forward PwC Kenya, but Deloitte have recently also agreed to support us on activities like this so could also be of use. On top of these consulting firms, I know our banking partners would also be very interested in this area, I could pull up a shortlist of banks who might be able to assist if that would be helpful? We are in the process of establishing an East African Regional group for financial services that could have this as an agenda item to pursue?”</p> | <p>Sounds like we definitely need to have a discussion with Board members prior to moving forward on that activity (2.1.2) and before we develop the Responsible Party Agreement. We will adopt your response as part of the meeting minutes of this discussion.</p> |