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Our commitment to preserving habitats is vital, as healthy landscapes are crucial for reducing conflicts between humans and wildlife. Combating illegal trade and strengthening regulation of wildlife trade are also essential to minimize health risks and protect both human and wildlife populations. By addressing these issues, we can create a harmonious coexistence that benefits all.

The Global Wildlife Program (GWP), operating in 38 countries across Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean, exemplifies this proactive approach with its focus on preventing wildlife crime, preserving wildlife and habitats, and fostering wildlife-based economies. This not only ensures the health of ecosystems but also strengthens the economic foundations that benefit communities worldwide, especially the economically vulnerable who often depend the most on nature for their livelihoods.

The GWP is expanding its influence on wildlife conservation for development. With the addition of new projects under GEF-8, its reach will span over 87 million hectares, with 16 million hectares already under enhanced management for biodiversity and more than 500,000 hectares under restoration. The program is also reaching 100 sites with strengthened anti-poaching measures, with 20 already recording reductions in poaching. The GWP saw a surge in law enforcement over the past year, now exceeding 130 joint law enforcement operations, adopting more than 20 new or strengthened strategies and laws, and improving the capacity of nearly 60,000 government officials in wildlife crime prevention.

In Tanzania, the introduction of a new national anti-poaching strategy, the strengthening of the National Taskforce on Antipoaching, and the increased use of intelligence-led operations have contributed to an 85% decline in poaching at project sites.

The GWP’s cross-sectoral work and community engagement have amplified impact and durability. For example, Indonesia hosted workshops that brought together stakeholders from various sectors, leading to conservation commitments in the form of forest concessions from the private sector in Panama, collaborations with cattle ranches adjacent to jaguar habitats have led to sustainable management plans and anti-predation measures, reducing livestock attacks and retaliatory killings while aiding efficient livestock production.

The GWP’s efforts have not only protected critical habitats but also improved community livelihoods and fostered sustainable development. Small grants to over 140 cooperatives and community-based organizations so far are helping people living near wildlife to coexist peacefully and reap economic benefits from their proximity to nature. They are part of the 377,000 beneficiaries the GWP has impacted so far that rely on locally available resources for their needs and livelihoods.

GWP projects have enhanced the capabilities of local and national institutions, leading to more robust and effective conservation strategies. As some of the GWP’s earliest projects end, we are witnessing tangible outcomes of these investments. The GWP knowledge platform is capturing this information to foster peer learning and expertise within the growing GWP community. This knowledge platform is a backbone for program success through its responsiveness to capacity-building needs, facilitating collaboration between projects and disseminating best practices to accelerate wildlife conservation and sustainable development goals.

We wish to acknowledge the extraordinary dedication of the hundreds of project team members, partners, and supporters who have played a pivotal role in the GWP’s success. Your unwavering commitment to conservation is in the cornerstone of our progress. Through your efforts, we are broadening the scope of sustainable development to acknowledge the extensive benefits to people and planet that come from conserving wildlife and their habitats.

Together, we are forging a path toward a sustainable and biodiverse future.

Valerie Hickey
Global Director
Environment, Natural Resources and Blue Economy
The World Bank
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Since its inception in June 2015, the program has grown in size and scope, evolving through three phases of funding. In the GEF’s sixth replenishment (GEF-6), the program focused on combating wildlife poaching, trafficking, and demand for illegal wildlife products. In GEF-7, the GWP broadened its scope to include the promotion of wildlife-based economies, linking the creation of financial opportunities for communities to the conservation of surrounding natural resources, wildlife, and their habitats. With GEF-8, the GWP will focus on transforming systems that drive wildlife loss by enhancing efforts to mitigate unsustainable wildlife trade, reduce the risk of zoonotic disease spillover, and strengthen enabling conditions for the coexistence of humans and wildlife. The new GWP logo reflects the evolution of the program (box 1.1).

The GWP phases are structured around technical components reflecting these topics, with a cross-cutting component for programmatic knowledge exchange and learning (figure 1.1).

**SECTION 1:**

**GWP Overview**

The Global Wildlife Program (GWP), first launched as the “Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development,” is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and led by the World Bank. It is one of the most significant global partnerships on wildlife conservation, with 38 participating countries across Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean. The GWP facilitates collaboration on wildlife and landscape conservation and drives programmatic learning across participating countries and regions.

Since its inception in June 2015, the program has grown in size and scope, evolving through three phases of funding. In the GEF’s sixth replenishment (GEF-6), the program focused on combating wildlife poaching, trafficking, and demand for illegal wildlife products. In GEF-7, the GWP broadened its scope to include the promotion of wildlife-based economies, linking the creation of financial opportunities for communities to the conservation of surrounding natural resources, wildlife, and their habitats. With GEF-8, the GWP will focus on transforming systems that drive wildlife loss by enhancing efforts to mitigate unsustainable wildlife trade, reduce the risk of zoonotic disease spillover, and strengthen enabling conditions for the coexistence of humans and wildlife. The new GWP logo reflects the evolution of the program (box 1.1).

The GWP phases are structured around technical components reflecting these topics, with a cross-cutting component for programmatic knowledge exchange and learning (figure 1.1).

**Box 1.1. Introducing a New GWP Logo**

The GWP has redesigned its logo twice to reflect its evolution and growth. To capture the GWP’s expansion in GEF-8 to focus on people and development, the program added a new quadrant—illustrating two people side by side—to the logo’s elephant, big cat, and pangolin. The new icon’s blue background acknowledges the inclusion of marine wildlife in the new phase while complementing the existing color palette of red, orange, and green.
This third phase of the GWP, GEF-8, will invest an additional $135 million and generate $892 million in cofinancing, bringing the program total to $359 million1 in GEF financing and over $2.2 billion in cofinancing. GEF-8 will add 15 new national projects and increase the total number of countries under the GWP from 31 to 38 (map 1.1). Together, these countries are taking decisive action to conserve terrestrial, freshwater, and marine wildlife and habitats by tackling the drivers of species loss and ensuring that countries and communities benefit from these natural assets.

Collectively, the GWP projects aim to achieve the following conservation impacts through on-the-ground activities in participating countries:

- Improve the management of 87 million hectares of land globally by creating new protected areas, improving the management effectiveness of existing protected areas, improving the management of landscapes, and restoring degraded ecosystems.
- Reduce global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 109 million tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e).
- Positively affect local communities and stakeholders, with 2.6 million expected beneficiaries, 49.2 percent of whom are women, across 38 countries.

GWP countries implement national projects to protect biodiversity and support development. Consideration of the local context is crucial. At the same time, countries across the world are dealing with similar threats to wildlife, many of which cross borders, and can achieve more as a global network than as stand-alone projects.

The World Bank serves as the lead agency to help facilitate the exchange of knowledge through the GWP global knowledge platform, encourage the sharing of lessons, and promote transnational cooperation. Government ministries, GEF Agencies, and local partners including nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) act as executing entities that steer the progress and ensure the successful delivery of GWP projects in each country.


The GWP global knowledge platform connects stakeholders, with 2.6 million expected beneficiaries, 49.2 percent of whom are women, across 38 countries.

1 GEF approved a total of $365 million across all three phases. The $359 million figure reflects the funding amounts returned to the GEF following the cancellations of two projects since CEO Endorsement.

Figure 1.1. Evolution of GWP Components Across Three GEF Phases
Map 1.1. Geographic Distribution of GWP Projects

38 countries across Africa, Asia, and Latin America in the GWP network
This section provides an overview of project accomplishments across the GWP through to June 2023. The GWP is making important impact in conserving wildlife and habitats while promoting benefits for local development. Countries are empowering agencies and stakeholders to conserve and sustainably manage natural resources—developing stronger laws and strategies, supporting communities to enhance coexistence with and benefit from wildlife, and promoting awareness of the value and benefits of conservation, among other measures. Figure 2.1 highlights selected cumulative results across the GWP technical themes.
**Figure 2.1. Cumulative GWP Project Results through the end of FY23**

### REDUCE POACHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROTECT WILDLIFE</th>
<th>CONSERVE HABITATS</th>
<th>REDUCE TRAFFICKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Project sites recording a decline in poaching of key species</td>
<td>34 Protected areas reporting improved management effectiveness</td>
<td>16 New or revised wildlife-related legal or regulatory instruments supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Project sites with strengthened antipoaching measures</td>
<td>31 Protected or conserved area management plans developed or revised and 27 being prepared</td>
<td>5 New or revised strategies drafted to enhance national abilities to fight wildlife crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Wildlife and biodiversity surveys and assessments completed</td>
<td>56 Integrated landscape management plans developed and 54 being prepared</td>
<td>14 Trade seaports with assessed or strengthened counter-wildlife trafficking capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Projects (in 12 countries) with community rangers and wildlife monitoring</td>
<td>12 Community conservation areas and 1 Ramsar site established</td>
<td>58,793 Law enforcement, criminal justice, and wildlife management staff trained in wildlife crime prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Countries implementing integrated measures to protect human, animal, and ecosystem health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROMOTE WILDLIFE-BASED & RESILIENT ECONOMIES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Countries implementing nature-based tourism initiatives</td>
<td>16 Human-wildlife conflict strategies and management plans prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 Small cooperatives and community-based organizations receiving small grants</td>
<td>11 Countries using interventions such as barriers and deterrents to prevent or mitigate human-wildlife conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346 Community-based natural resource management groups created or supported</td>
<td>5 Human-wildlife conflict incident reporting and registry systems, apps, or databases developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.8 MILLION in small grants awarded to diversify livelihood options</td>
<td>2,316 Community members trained in human-wildlife conflict prevention or mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaborative management partnerships for protected areas supported</td>
<td>6 Human-wildlife conflict response teams created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Community agreements on sustainable use of resources formalized</td>
<td>4 Countries that carried out research to improve human-wildlife conflict understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REDUCE DEMAND

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Demand-reduction campaigns completed to reduce purchase and consumption of illegal wildlife products</td>
<td>24 Interagency coordination mechanisms established and 10 strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Consumer research studies completed to inform demand-reduction campaigns for wildlife species and products</td>
<td>6 Countries with improved transboundary collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Projects completing awareness, outreach, and education campaigns on illegal wildlife trade and wildlife conservation</td>
<td>133 Joint law enforcement operations and 4 investigations conducted (subnational, national, or transnational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Countries equipped with specialized technologies and tools (databases, apps, forensic labs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Original figure based on aggregate results as of the end of June 2023.

Note: Results are based on cumulative data from the start of GWP until the end of June 2023. Data were collated from several sources, including the annual project implementation reports submitted by projects to the Global Environment Facility Secretariat; mid-term reviews, and terminal evaluations completed by June 2023.
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PROJECT IMPACTS
Reduce Poaching, Protect Wildlife, and Conserve Habitats

GWP projects are reducing wildlife poaching and protecting wildlife from local threats through expanded monitoring of wildlife populations, stronger site-based law enforcement and surveillance, and increased engagement of communities. Cumulatively, 92 project sites strengthened their antipoaching measures, with 20 sites already recording a decline in poaching of key species, from the desert-adapted elephants of Mali to Sumatran elephants in Indonesia’s forested Leuser landscape. Highlights to protect wildlife and protecting wildlife from local threats over the reporting period include the following:

Reduce Poaching and Protect Wildlife

In Tanzania, the project strengthened the antipoaching capacities of the newly established multiagency Task Coordination Groups, created under the new National Anti-Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade Strategy. Across the 10 ecosystems, patrols completed 11,039 person-days compared with 9,600 the previous year, leading to an 85 percent decline in poaching since the start of the project. Interventions have contributed to an increase in the elephant population from 43,330 in 2014 to 60,000 in 2023, giving Tanzania the third-largest elephant population in Africa.

In Indonesia, five of six flagship species met the targeted 40 percent reduction in poaching since the project began, including Sumatran elephants, tigers, and rhinoceros in Leuser as well as black-crested macaques and anoa in North Sulawesi. The poaching levels of the remaining species, the babirusa, are yet to be determined.

Zimbabwe also reported a decline in poaching, with only one elephant killed this year in the Zambezi Valley compared with six last year. The project increased the capacity and coverage of patrol efforts by adopting wildlife monitoring technologies such as GPS collars, camera traps, and conservation drones and by developing a Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART) strategy and implementation plan.

To track jaguar movement across wildlife corridors, Belize expanded its camera trap network coverage by 12,000 hectares within the Sibun River Watershed Landscape. Partners Panthera and WCS provided specialized training (on managing radio tracking, GPS, and other instruments) to national and local technicians operating the camera trap network. Improved monitoring capacity will contribute to better management of these jaguar conservation units.

In Bhutan, monthly SMART patrolling and long-range patrolling were completed in the Bumdeling and Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuaries to reduce wildlife loss through snares. In addition, the project prepared conservation action plans with supporting habitat enrichment plans and initiated the conservation of species of interest for nature-based ecotourism, including Ludlow’s Bhutan Glory butterfly, the red panda, the black-necked crane, and the golden langur.

To protect the critically endangered Gourma elephant, the project in Mali carried out a baseline population assessment. A team of 96 community eco-guards—trained and mobilized in the field with the technical and methodological support of the WILD Foundation—counted 316 elephants in the biosphere reserve.

The Wild Cats Project in India began collecting on-the-ground primary data to assess small cat distribution, prey base, habitats, and threats, including landscape-specific climate change vulnerability. The findings will inform the development of species conservation plans in the three tiger reserves covered by the project.

Mozambique surveyed the ranger labor situation in its central and northern conservation areas. The process will allow for harmonizing and paying social security compensation to rangers, with engagement of the National Institute of Social Security; the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security; and the Ministry of Public Works. Survey data will also inform the restructuring of the surveillance force according to capabilities and guide new recruitment and training needs.

Conserve Habitats

Wildlife habitat conservation efforts established and enhanced the management of protected and conserved areas, with 34 sites reporting improved management effectiveness. GWP projects also continued to support the establishment and better management of wildlife corridors as well as improved land-use planning. Fifty-six integrated landscape management plans are now finalized, with a further 54 at various stages of development. Highlights include:

• Panama progressed with the development of integrated landscape and geospatial plans to promote jaguar connectivity in the Chagres National Park–Darien National Park complex. The infrastructure sector intends to fund the plans via environmental offsetting. The project evaluated forest carbon stocks on 2,876,915 hectares of land to set a baseline for emission targets and facilitate this type of private investment. Additionally, plans will integrate geographic information system (GIS) and flow data to indicate jaguar habitat status—hence prioritizing restoration investments and designing specific measures to incorporate biodiversity conservation into the United Nations’ reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD+) strategy.
Botswana finalized integrated land-use management plans for the districts of Kgalagadi and Ghanzi in collaboration with the surrounding communities. Once the relevant authorities approve, the plans will allow for the establishment and gazetting of 599,000 hectares of wildlife management areas to prevent livestock encroachment into wildlife migratory corridors. The plans will also provide legal recognition of land uses within the Kalahari ecosystem to reduce land-use conflict and improve ecosystem integrity.

The Indonesia CONSERVE2 project supported the enhanced management of 282,563 hectares of land through other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) and the formal delineation and decree of wildlife corridors in the Ulu Masen (Aceh) and Seblat (Bengkulu) landscapes in Sumatra. The project facilitated multistakeholder workshops in both locations, attended by stakeholders from government agencies, NGOs, local communities, and private sector entities, including three private sector concessions and industrial plantations. The workshops allowed key companies to redefine their role in conservation outcomes, leading to several commitments. The project expects to secure more consistent financing for OECMs in the future and better integrate conservation outcomes into business plans for companies operating in the landscapes by using a collaborative approach.

In Ethiopia, the government approved the Babile Elephant Sanctuary Management Plan, increasing to five the total number of protected area management plans developed under this project. The management plans and other capacity-building efforts have supported improved management effectiveness scores in all five protected areas. Additionally, the project began exploring how to continue implementing the plan after the project closes with relevant partners and key stakeholders.

In Cambodia, the minister of environment endorsed management plans for the Phnom Aural Wildlife Sanctuary and Phnom Samkos Wildlife Sanctuary in June and August 2022, respectively. To ensure the effective monitoring of protected areas, the Ministry of Environment established a SMART Working Group consisting of representatives of the ministry’s Department of Inspection and Law Enforcement as well as relevant NGOs and international organizations.

The project in Zimbabwe developed management plans for seven protected areas in the Mid-Zambezi region. Additionally, with the project’s assistance, three community wildlife conservancies in Mbire were established and officially registered with the Deeds Office. The project is arranging for the new conservancies and local authorities to visit Namibia to learn from the experiences of similar conservancies.

The GWP continues to focus on promoting sustainable nature-based economies and reducing human-wildlife conflict. Cumulatively, 141 small cooperatives and community-based organizations have received small grants for economic and livelihood opportunities. To date, GWP projects have prepared 16 human-wildlife conflict strategies and management plans and trained 2,316 community members in human-wildlife conflict prevention. Highlights include the following:

**Promote Nature-Based Economies**

The India Wild Cats project prepared a strategy document to operationalize the National Green Business Platform and secure private sector support for community-based conservation. Over 25 business groups and industries contributed to the strategy through regional and national meetings that identified key investment portfolios in the three landscapes, established broad terms of operations for the platform, and formed an institutional governing architecture.

One of the project sites in Ethiopia, Chebera Churucha National Park, was selected for tourism development under a national-level initiative. The initiative will build four ecodocles and strengthen park access to support tourism. The development aims to stimulate diversified livelihoods and disincentivize engagement in illegal wildlife trade.

Bhutan is in the final stages of developing a long-term tourism plan that will incorporate ecotourism. Several supporting tourism guidelines have also been developed or revised, including guidelines for tourism product development, guidelines on the operation and monitoring of commercial rafting, procedures for registering village homestays, and a checklist for the green certification of accommodations.

**Promote Wildlife-Based Economies**

The South Africa wildlife-based economy project convened its third national biodiversity stewardship conference in May 2023 to discuss progress and outcomes for conservation and local livelihoods from.
stewardship. Further, the project engaged communities in developing biodiversity economy nodes for community stewardship in Greater iSimangaliso, Greater Kruger, and Greater Addo-Amathole. In the Greater iSimangaliso node, a leadership and capacity-building workshop brought together 35 Amakhosi and iNdunas traditional leadership members to discuss opportunities for traditional communities. Additionally, the South African National Parks (SANParks) management committee developed and approved a stewardship work plan and community inclusion guidelines for Gidjana and Bevhula in the Greater Kruger node.

In India, the SECURE Himalaya project supported various livelihood and income-generating opportunities, covering 2,266 households and increasing community incomes. Green value-chain initiatives, such as sheep and yak wool-based handloom and handicrafts, reported that incomes increased by an average of 25 percent. In contrast, the average household income increased by up to 50 percent for ecotourism initiatives.

In Malawi, the project established and registered five smallholder-owned commercial farming enterprises as cooperatives on more than 9,000 hectares of land, benefiting 7,258 landowners, including 3,707 women. The enterprises aim to increase agricultural productivity and commercialization for targeted households in the Shire Valley while improving the sustainable management of its natural resources.

In Cambodia, the project formed three bamboo groups in Phnom Toab Cheang, Anlong Svay, and Chambal to promote non-timber forest product value chains. The bamboo groups and community protected area management committees agreed on business ideas for the bamboo value chains and are now developing community business plans and sustainable planting and harvesting plans. The bamboo groups will work in partnership with a private company managing the bamboo processing facilities.

Address Human-Wildlife Conflict

Namibia convened a national human-wildlife conflict conference to profile this important issue affecting wildlife conservation and development. In hot-spot landscapes, the project constructed three predator-proof kraals at Shilongo Shuukule Village and another four at Anabeb Conservancy to provide a safe refuge for livestock at night. The project also built two early-warning towers to track satellite-collared animals across two villages within the northwest hot-spot landscape to inform communities of predators’ movements.

Belize established a specialized jaguar capture team to reduce the incidence of jaguar and cattle conflict. Team members underwent specialized training in field trapping techniques, GPS wildlife tracking, and remote drug delivery. A real-life conflict by the Belize Forest Department put the team’s skills to the test: They captured a pregnant female jaguar, transported it to the Belize Zoo for treatment, and eventually resettled the animal in the Chiquibul Forest Reserve.

The Indonesia CONSERVE project reduced human-wildlife conflict in the Ulu Masen and Seblat landscapes by 20 percent on average across incidences with both elephants and tigers. Solid coordination among stakeholders supported the establishment of a human-wildlife conflict task force and conservation response units intended to work closely with local communities to promote human-wildlife coexistence. The project established early warning systems by collaring wild elephants, installing camera traps, and constructing over 20,000 meters of barrier wall to prevent human-elephant conflict.

In Botswana, the cabinet approved the Parks and Wildlife (Amendment) Bill in June 2023. The amended Act provides for the creation of a Human-Wildlife Conflict Relief Fund, which will offer financial relief to community members affected by human-wildlife conflict.
PROJECT IMPACTS
Reduce Trafficking and Combat Wildlife Crime

GWP projects are reducing wildlife trafficking by strengthening capacity and enhancing collaboration. Cumulatively, countries have revised 16 wildlife-related legal and regulatory instruments and enhanced crime-fighting abilities by training 58,793 law enforcement, criminal justice, and wildlife management staff. Six countries have demonstrated improved transboundary collaboration and 133 joint law enforcement operations have been completed across agencies and boundaries to date. Highlights include the following:

- In Cambodia, CI supported preparation of a draft framework to complete the protected area Law Enforcement Strategy and Action Plan for stakeholder consultation. The operationalization of this enforcement strategy will contribute to effectively managing protected areas in the country.

- Ethiopia continued to report strong law enforcement effectiveness, with 97 percent (19 of 20) of the wildlife crime cases presented in national courts resulting in convictions and appropriate sentences. Better law enforcement operations, cooperation, and improved capacity have underpinned this success. The project has worked across the criminal justice chain and trained 50,000 officers from the police force, customs, security, defense forces, and prosecuting authorities, with 20,000 more graduates in training.

- The Indonesia CIWT* project established a formal interagency task force for handling alleged money laundering related to environmental and forestry crimes—the task force involving the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and the Indonesian Financial Transaction and Analysis Centre. The project also facilitated two formal interagency collaboration agreements, developing standard operating procedures on protocols for handling alleged money laundering cases and exchanging data related to wildlife crime as well as a memorandum of understanding (MoU) on technical expert support for customs checks.

- In Mozambique, increased use of intelligence to target patrolling and operations is supporting improved law enforcement effectiveness. In Niassa Special Reserve, intelligence-based operations have led to an increase both in the number of arrests and subsequent prosecutions for wildlife-related offences.

In Gorongosa National Park, one specialist team completed 15 operations that resulted in 30 arrests of suspected wildlife traffickers, as well as the seizure of live pangolins, pangolin scales, ivory, and lion teeth, claws and skin.

- The illegal wildlife trade project in South Africa launched its electronic permitting system for CITES-listed species. The e-permitting system prevents fraud and corruption in CITES permits for cross-border trade. Thanks to digital processing, the Border Management Authority is certain that documentation is authentic and error-free.

- In May 2023, the government of Tanzania endorsed a new National Anti-Poaching Strategy 2023–2033 after validation by stakeholders. The project is developing a draft fundraising strategy to support its implementation.

- Thailand strengthened frontline enforcement capacity at 43 border wildlife checkpoints by installing the Network-Centric Anti-Poaching System and enhancing the chain-of-custody process for handling and managing crime scene evidence. In addition, operational task forces (for wild hawk and tiger) monitored wildlife cybercrime on over 20 Facebook groups, resulting in the submission of selected cases to the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation for investigation.

- Thailand enhanced its international cooperation after strengthening national law enforcement collaboration through the Thai Wildlife Enforcement Network (Thai-WEN). Members of Thai-WEN participated in an exchange visit to Singapore to discuss wildlife forensics, Singapore’s national cooperation on law enforcement, and joint operations with INTERPOL. Additionally, bilateral meetings with agencies of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Malaysia led to drafting an MoU focused on technical cooperation against illegal wildlife trade and an exchange visit of Thai lawyers to Lao PDR to develop consistent laws and regulations.

- In Kenya, the project supported the training of almost 70 rangers in the Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems in crime-scene first response, enhancing frontline capacity in investigations, gathering of evidence, and legal aspects of case submission.

4 CIWT stands for Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade.
Awareness, outreach, and educational campaigns for the conservation of wildlife and prevention of illegal wildlife trade have been used across 18 projects. The impacts of these campaigns contribute to behavioral change, helping to reduce purchase and consumption of illegal wildlife products and reduce involvement in trafficking chains. Highlights include the following:

- **Thailand**, in partnership with the UNDP Youth Accelerator Lab, strengthened cross-border collaboration on combating illegal wildlife trade between Thailand and Lao PDR through the “Wildlife Heroes” campaign—a competition for youth to develop innovative solutions to demand reduction and disruption of trafficking routes between the two countries. Winners have the opportunity to apply their solutions at government wildlife checkpoints.

- The **UNDP-GEF-USAID Maritime Trafficking Project** (part of the GEF-6 global coordination project) reported on its “Join Our Team! Defend Our Wildlife” campaign, delivered with WildAid, that aimed to enhance awareness and encourage the active participation of port workers in combating wildlife crime. The campaign reached an estimated 9,000 to 11,000 port workers in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, leading to a reported 97 percent increase in knowledge and awareness of illegal wildlife trade, with port workers saying they are now more likely to report wildlife crime. Messaging took many forms, from 33,000 printed posters, stickers, and leaflets to 770 runs of a radio advertisement and four campaign videos produced in English and Swahili generating 15 million impressions. Partners produced a case study, “Combating Wildlife Crime through Awareness-Raising,” that provided step-by-step instructions on planning, designing, and implementing similar campaigns.
SECTION 3: GWP Knowledge Exchange and Learning

To facilitate project learning and exchange, the GWP global coordination project develops and implements a knowledge management platform that features an expanding set of resources and tools. The platform refers to all the activities, events, products, and reports that are available both in person and online—from e-libraries and guidance notes on technical topics to knowledge exchanges and mentoring. The knowledge platform is a critical component of the GWP, enabling project teams to share experiences and learn from each other and conservation and development partners to amplify their impact.
Technical and Knowledge Needs

Every year, the GWP global coordination project distributes a knowledge needs survey to understand the technical and knowledge priorities of projects as they evolve. Needs can change from year to year as projects move from concept and design to implementation and are required to adapt to changing circumstances. The GWP coordination project tailors its activities based on the results of the knowledge needs survey and other feedback from projects.

The GWP’s highest-ranking knowledge needs over time, presented in figure 3.1, show the progression of gaps and opportunities cited by project countries. In 2023, human-wildlife conflict—consistently among the top three priorities for the past five years—came out on top, with 91 percent of respondents categorizing it as “highly important” for technical support via the GWP global coordination project. Similarly, community engagement was consistently among the top three priorities and ranked third in 2023. Multistakeholder coordination, including with the private sector, was a new survey category that ranked second. Behavioral change was also one of the top knowledge needs of 2023, underscoring the importance of behavioral change as an amplifier to many of the other thematic priorities, including human-wildlife conflict and community engagement.

Figure 3.3 shows the top knowledge needs of GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects, with 2023 survey responses broken down by region. In Africa, wildlife species conservation was “highly important” to the largest share of respondents, followed by human-wildlife conflict, integrated landscape management, and multistakeholder coordination. In Asia, all respondents said that wildlife law enforcement capacity and coordination and community engagement were “highly important.” As for Latin America and the Caribbean, the application of social and behavioral change approaches to wildlife conservation and management was ranked highest, above human-wildlife conflict, integrated landscape management, and nature-based tourism development.

This year, the survey was also distributed to the GWP GEF-8 cohort to anticipate the needs of incoming projects (figure 3.2. represents GEF-8 knowledge needs). Results show that many of the same themes place at the top—with community engagement, human-wildlife conflict, corridors and connectivity, and conservation technology ranked by projects as the top four topics that are “highly important” for technical support and knowledge exchange.
Figure 3.3. Top GWP Technical and Knowledge Priorities (GEF-6 and GEF-7), 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Global</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human-wildlife conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multistakeholder coordination, including private sector engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement in conservation and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated landscape management, corridors, and connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife species conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife law enforcement capacity and coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature-based tourism development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipoaching and wildlife law enforcement including supporting rangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected and conserved area planning, financing, and establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multistakeholder partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife crime-related policy, strategies, and legal frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife-based economic opportunities (excluding nature-based tourism)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation financing mechanisms including private sector engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife-based livelihoods, jobs, and conservation enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticorruption, financial crimes, and anti-money laundering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife-ecosystem-human health links (One Health)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand reduction of illegal, unsustainable, or high zoonotic-risk wildlife products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B. Projects in Africa**                                                    |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife species conservation                                               |                  |                    |               |        |
| Human-wildlife conflict                                                      |                  |                    |               |        |
| Multistakeholder coordination, including private sector engagement           |                  |                    |               |        |
| Community engagement in conservation and management                          |                  |                    |               |        |
| Integrated landscape management, corridors, and connectivity                 |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife crime-related policy, strategies, and legal frameworks              |                  |                    |               |        |
| Conservation financing mechanisms including private sector engagement        |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife-based livelihoods, jobs, and conservation enterprises               |                  |                    |               |        |
| Anticorruption, financial crimes, and anti-money laundering                  |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife-ecosystem-human health links (One Health)                          |                  |                    |               |        |
| Demand reduction of illegal, unsustainable, or high zoonotic-risk wildlife products |                  |                    |               |        |

| **C. Projects in Asia**                                                      |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife law enforcement capacity and coordination                           |                  |                    |               |        |
| Community engagement in conservation and management                          |                  |                    |               |        |
| Multistakeholder coordination, including private sector engagement           |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife crime-related policy, strategies, and legal frameworks              |                  |                    |               |        |
| Conservation financing mechanisms including private sector engagement        |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife-based livelihoods, jobs, and conservation enterprises               |                  |                    |               |        |
| Anticorruption, financial crimes, and anti-money laundering                  |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife-ecosystem-human health links (One Health)                          |                  |                    |               |        |
| Demand reduction of illegal, unsustainable, or high zoonotic-risk wildlife products |                  |                    |               |        |

| **D. Projects in Latin America and Caribbean**                               |                  |                    |               |        |
| Application of social and behavior change approaches to wildlife conservation and management |                  |                    |               |        |
| Nature-based tourism development                                            |                  |                    |               |        |
| Multistakeholder coordination, including private sector engagement           |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife crime-related policy, strategies, and legal frameworks              |                  |                    |               |        |
| Conservation financing mechanisms including private sector engagement        |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife-based livelihoods, jobs, and conservation enterprises               |                  |                    |               |        |
| Anticorruption, financial crimes, and anti-money laundering                  |                  |                    |               |        |
| Wildlife-ecosystem-human health links (One Health)                          |                  |                    |               |        |
| Demand reduction of illegal, unsustainable, or high zoonotic-risk wildlife products |                  |                    |               |        |

Source: GWP 2023 technical and knowledge needs survey of project countries.
Lessons and Insights From Across the GWP

As GWP implementation continues, the sharing of challenges, experiences, and lessons learned contributes to the GWP’s growing knowledge base. Some insights from the GWP knowledge platform in 2023 are listed below.

1. As countries see the impact of their conservation efforts and wildlife populations increase, human-wildlife conflict emerges as a pressing priority.

This year, human-wildlife conflict emerged as the top knowledge need of GWP participating countries. It was also the most frequent entry point for GEF-8, indicating strong government interest in addressing this growing threat to wildlife conservation and development. Although managing human-wildlife conflict has always been a technical theme of the GWP, it has never before had this prominence. Many projects report challenges as the interfaces between wildlife and human settlements increase. For example, in Namibia, human-wildlife conflict has increased from project baseline levels because of increasing competition over resources such as water due to drought, and as the decreased prey base for wildlife has led to loss of livestock. The project is planning a range of human-wildlife conflict mitigation measures in response, which will build off the extensive human-wildlife conflict consultative sessions held with communities in the three project landscapes.

The GWP’s Human-Wildlife Conflict Global Perception Survey, completed by 70 governments, revealed that this increasing challenge is not unique to GWP countries. When asked about the nature of human-wildlife conflict, almost two-thirds of responding governments agreed that it was a “major” and “serious” concern in their country. Responses on the increasing nature of human-wildlife conflict were more conclusive, with 73 percent of countries agreeing that human-wildlife conflict “is increasing,” particularly among low-income and African countries (figure 3.5). Key drivers of this conflict—such as changes in habitat fragmentation, shifting wildlife and human populations, and natural disasters—occur globally and underpin these perceptions.

The GWP was an organizing partner for the first Human-Wildlife Conflict & Coexistence Specialist Group meeting, held March 30 to April 1, 2023, in Oxford, UK, and led by the IUCN Species Survival Commission’s Human-Wildlife Conflict & Coexistence Specialist Group. The GWP delegation included representatives from 19 countries and ensured strong government presence at the first global conference solely focused on human-wildlife conflict, sharing insights across regions and taxonomic groups. The GWP convened a session on the role of national policies in managing human-wildlife conflict, with experiences shared from the governments of Canada, India, Mozambique, and Namibia. The conference also allowed the GWP delegation to discuss important knowledge needs, identifying national policies, insurance and compensation, and interaction with media as areas of common interest.

Conflict and Coexistence, held March 30 to April 1, 2023, in Oxford, UK, and led by the IUCN Species Survival Commission’s Human-Wildlife Conflict & Coexistence Specialist Group. The GWP delegation included representatives from 19 countries and ensured a strong government presence at the first global conference solely focused on human-wildlife conflict, sharing insights across regions and taxonomic groups. The GWP convened a session on the role of national policies in managing human-wildlife conflict, with experiences shared from the governments of Canada, India, Mozambique, and Namibia. The conference also allowed the GWP delegation to discuss important knowledge needs, identifying national policies, insurance and compensation, and interaction with media as areas of common interest.

In response, the GWP coordination team provided additional support to projects on media and its impact on perceptions of human-wildlife conflict, which remains an ongoing topic of exchange. Sharing knowledge and experiences as countries aim to achieve human-
wildlife coexistence will be a priority for the knowledge platform in coming years, including through a May 2024 technical workshop for Africa on human-elephant conflict (with the Elephant Protection Initiative) and technical support on development of national strategies for human-wildlife conflict.

2. As the GWP knowledge platform evolves, there is a greater shift toward peer-to-peer learning and recognition of the vast expertise within the GWP community.

With the GWP now under way since 2015, the global knowledge platform is well established, with a wide range of topics and formats for sharing knowledge and experiences as well as evolution over time to increasingly hand the agenda to project teams. Reflecting the active engagement in the knowledge platform, project teams increasingly identify the topics they want to discuss and the specific experts that they want to hear more from. This demand-driven approach has emerged as a critical part of the GWP knowledge platform. While the knowledge agenda is informed by the results of knowledge needs surveys and challenges noted in project implementation reports (PIRs), targeted activities are also developed in direct response to project requests. For example, the first GWP guidance note on law enforcement coordination stemmed from common challenges noted by those project teams working to establish new coordination mechanisms in their countries, and the GWP’s focus on media and human-wildlife conflict responds to a request from the GWP delegation at the Oxford Conference on Human-Wildlife Conflict to learn more on this topic. The platform has also increasingly emphasized the identification and documentation of lessons across the GWP (box 3.1).

This past year saw the emergence of direct project-to-project exchanges. The 2023 annual conference (box 3.2) dedicated one session to “twinning” discussions to promote project-to-project exchange and learning around common themes. Inspired by twinning arrangements in project exchange and learning around common themes. Inspired by twinning arrangements in project exchange and learning around common themes. Inspired by twinning arrangements in GEF platforms such as the International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:Learn), this session matched GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects as “twins” or “triplets.” Each set of projects discussed common challenges in their countries and strategies to address them and then identified an exchange activity that the teams could do together to continue learning beyond the conference (see feature on “Project Twins”). For example, GWP projects in Ethiopia, Thailand, and Zimbabwe have focused on strengthening wildlife law enforcement and criminal justice systems. After a rich discussion on building law enforcement and forensic collaboration across regions, the projects suggested organizing a training exchange on DNA profiling at the Wildlife Forensic Unit (WIFOS) laboratory in Thailand. Such a training would also reflect wildlife trafficking routes between Africa and Asia, with many products transiting through Thailand en route to their market destinations. In comparison, Chad, Madagascar, and Mali share commonalities of developing antipoaching strategies and efforts to manage human-wildlife conflict and poaching at the local level. The three countries set up a WhatsApp group to continue sharing good practices and lessons, especially around establishing and strengthening antipoaching brigades.

GWP countries are proactively making connections to learn from each other and asking the coordination team to help facilitate these exchanges. For example, Bhutan is planning a study tour to Uganda to learn from its experiences on nature-based tourism and particularly insights on governance and the strong collaboration between the Uganda Wildlife Authority and the country’s Department of Tourism Development. Chad is similarly discussing a knowledge visit to South Africa to learn from its good practices in strengthening legal frameworks to combat wildlife crime, including processing of cases through the judicial process.

Box 3.1. Capturing and Sharing Lessons Across the GWP Network

In 2023, the GWP released new guidance notes featuring lessons and recommendations, including from GWP projects, on the following topical themes:

- Lessons learned in conservation technology, data collection, processing, and management
- Lessons learned in planning and implementing corridor and connectivity conservation (also available in Spanish)
- Lesson learning at the GWP national project-level: Reflections and recommendations from an action-learning pilot exercise on lesson-learning (UNDP)

Box 3.2. GWP Annual Conference

The GWP annual conference is the flagship event for program knowledge exchange, bringing together GWP countries from Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean every year to share results and lessons on combating wildlife crime, managing human-wildlife conflict, and building wildlife-based economies as well as to explore opportunities to strengthen collaboration and knowledge exchange. The November 2023 conference in Thailand was attended by 140 participants and 29 GWP countries.

The GWP coordination team solicited inputs from project teams and partners to plan an interactive agenda in Bangkok and a two-day field trip to Khao Yai National Park (World Heritage Site) and adjacent Thap Lan National Park. Several new sessions were planned for the first time, including a “twinning” session and a “levers of change” discussion (see features) as well as a conservation partner roundtable. These elements, along with built-in opportunities for networking, were popular with participants, who rated the conference a 4.8 out of 5 stars.

The GWP annual conference included a “twinning” session and a “levers of change” discussion, along with a conservation partner roundtable. These elements, along with built-in opportunities for networking, were popular with participants, who rated the conference a 4.8 out of 5 stars.
In their feedback on the knowledge platform, GWP teams asked for more opportunities to be connected to other projects working on similar issues and requested more informal social media groups to strengthen connections. Recognizing the opportunities for peer-to-peer learning, the GWP will add support for twinning exchanges to the knowledge platform agenda, with the first request for proposals to be launched in 2024. GEF-8 project preparation teams are also being asked to identify the potential for twinning exchanges—excluding to learn from earlier GWP projects—and set aside appropriate budgets to support these.

3. GWP projects are exploring multiple pathways to achieve transformative impacts for wildlife and development—and are using GWP knowledge to help them get there.

The GEF-8 replenishment identifies specific “levers of change” as being critical for achieving the desired transformations in socio-economic-ecological systems, and these levers will be a key feature for programming in the GEF-8 phase of the GWP. Although GWP projects often seek similar outcomes in terms of secured wildlife populations, healthy and functioning habitats, and meaningful benefits for local communities to enhance their support for conservation, they follow different pathways or “levers” to get there, ranging from strengthening national policy and legal frameworks and establishing new sector-spanning partnerships to promoting innovation and adopting social and behavioral change approaches in wildlife conservation.

Reflecting this variety—and the potential for the GWP community to exchange good practices and challenges across different pathways—the 2023 annual conference included a session on “Transforming Knowledge to Action.” The session invited participants to share their experiences and plans against five levers of change: policy and law, capacity and skills, data and information, partnerships and finance, and innovation and change (see feature on “Levers of Change”). For example, like many other countries in the policy and law group, Mexico identified human-wildlife conflict policy as an area for attention, citing lack of resources and multidisciplinary approaches as challenges to moving policy forward. The issue of funding came up several times across levers, including under “capacity and skills.” In Tanzania, for example, financial constraints are a barrier to strengthening capacity to combat illegal wildlife trade. So far, adopting a multiagency coordinated approach on wildlife law enforcement has been critical for progress.

Under the partnerships lever, participants identified the importance of multisectoral partnerships and the increased engagement of the private sector to support wildlife-based economies. Mali noted the importance of partnerships to strengthen the management of protected areas. Such collaborative management partnerships are of interest to many GWP countries. Building off the guidance provided in its Collaborative Management Partnership Toolkit, the GWP organized a February 2023 study tour to Rwanda on collaborative management partnerships. Ten African countries joined to share their experiences on collaborative management partnerships and learn from the Akagera Management Company, a special purpose vehicle formed between the Rwanda Development Board and African Parks to manage Akagera National Park.

In the discussion on innovation and change, Panama raised the inclusion of women as decision-makers as a key focus. The project has made progress by inviting more women to meetings and trainings, with the aim of changing the mindset around women’s leadership. This is just one of many efforts under way across the GWP that recognize the importance of gender mainstreaming and engaging women as “agents of change” (see feature, “Gender in the GWP”). In support of these efforts, the GWP has a gender adviser facilitating the exchange of insights and lessons. Activities included a March 2023 gender training workshop on ways to implement a gender-inclusive approach in wildlife conservation for countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and a November 2023 virtual knowledge exchange, “Women as Catalysts for Change in Conservation,” with insights provided by GWP teams in Botswana and Thailand.

Achieving behavior change will be an important lever of change for GWP success. Behavioral change and social science approaches have strong potential to support reduction of threats such as illegal wildlife trade, overexploitation, consumption or trade of high-zoonotic-risk products, human-wildlife conflict, and unsustainable tourism. Behavioral change is one of seven priority cross-cutting themes in the GEF-8 Strategic Positioning Framework, and all proposals to join the GWP in GEF-8 were asked to address the selection criteria of “potential to integrate and promote behavioral change and social change approaches to address drivers of wildlife loss.” To build awareness and capacity on this topic, the GWP, via TRAFFIC, provides technical support on behavior change. An ongoing series of knowledge exchanges has engaged teams in virtual sessions on “Using Behavior Change Approaches and Strategies to Support Wildlife Conservation for Development” and “Social Research for Conservation Insight and Impact Evaluation.” TRAFFIC also developed a GWP behavior change e-library to share a range of authoritative and accessible resources on behavior change with the wildlife management community (for more on GWP e-libraries, see box 3.3). The GWP is preparing further knowledge exchanges and guidance notes to continue to build awareness and capacities to use social and behavior change approaches and share good practices from the GWP community and other partners. TRAFFIC is also offering dedicated support on the topic to GEF-8 project preparation teams.
4. As GEF-6 projects close and the new GEF-8 phase begins, sustainability emerges as an area of attention and opportunity for both national projects and the overall program.

The GEF-8 phase provides the opportunity for new projects to learn from the experiences of the countries that have participated in the GWP before them. Over the next 12–18 months, the bulk of the GEF-6 projects are expected to conclude implementation. As projects close, they are gradually transitioned out of knowledge management activities, which target the projects under implementation.

How to continue to leverage the experiences of closing projects was discussed at the World Bank progress review for the coordination project, noting the challenge of maintaining engagement in the knowledge platform as projects end and their dedicated project teams move on. The GWP annual conference in Bangkok continued this discussion with a session on sustainability chaired by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office. Participants discussed essential factors for the GWP’s long-term success and identified political will and budget, partnerships, capacity, stakeholder buy-in, and ongoing regular interactions as factors to consider.

When conference attendees were asked how the GWP coordination project could support project teams to plan for and ensure sustainability, the provision of guidance on developing sustainability plans and sharing of case studies and lessons on sustainability were the most popular suggestions (figure 3.5). Regional coordination calls also highlighted the interest in sustainability strategies. At the Asia call, for example, the Indonesia CIWT project presented its sustainability plan and sought experiences and guidance from across the GWP network.

The development of a GWP “alumni network” has also been suggested, with interest from project teams. Such a network would leverage the strong peer-to-peer connections established across the GWP and encourage people to continue these personal relationships. The GWP coordination team will follow up on the development of an alumni network for countries with closed projects and explore how the experiences and lessons of the “GWP alumni” can continue to be shared and used to support wildlife conservation.

Figure 3.5. Participant Responses on Support the GWP Can Provide to Help Project Teams Plan for and Ensure Sustainability

1. Guidance on developing sustainability plans
2. Case studies/lessons from other projects
3. Maintain my existing GWP connections as alumni
4. Review my sustainability plan
5. Continue to engage in targeted GWP events
6. Have mentors from closed GWP projects

Source: GWP 2023 survey of annual conference participants.
Project Twins at the Annual Conference Twinning Session

**Chad, Madagascar, and Mali**

**COMMONALITIES**
Chad, Madagascar, and Mali are all working on natural resource management, income-generating activities for communities, and setting up or strengthening antipoaching units. They also found that all projects involved antipoaching strategies and human-wildlife conflict activities at the local level.

**PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY**
The three countries set up a WhatsApp group to continue sharing best practices, especially around antipoaching brigades. This way, Chad and Mali, which both have experience in this domain, can easily continue sharing lessons learned with Madagascar, which is in the process of initiating its own brigade.

**Ecuador, Namibia, and Panama**

**COMMONALITIES**
Ecuador, Namibia, and Panama all have communities living in close proximity to wildlife, which is causing the loss of livestock and high levels of human-wildlife conflict. Although all three are actively working with communities to mitigate the issue, they are all employing different means. Ecuador is using alternative protein projects, Namibia is focusing on wildlife-based tourism for improving livelihoods, and Panama is installing electric fences.

**PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY**
This group would like to set up a virtual gathering for more time to discuss other initiatives, such as changing community attitudes toward wildlife and introducing offsets and insurance schemes to compensate for losses from human-wildlife conflict. This would lead to an in-person visit centered around site visits led by community leaders to see these ideas in action.
Indonesia CIWT and Tanzania

COMMONALITIES
Indonesia CIWT and Tanzania have similar project objectives and components, including the strengthening of national legal and regulatory frameworks to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trade. Both projects are engaging local communities and building enforcement capacity at the local level.

PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY
As Indonesia has developed a command-and-control center for mobile wildlife identification and cyber patrol, and Tanzania is in the process of setting up a similar center, they proposed a site visit to Tanzania to share Indonesia’s experiences.

Bhutan and South Africa Wildlife-Based Economy

COMMONALITIES
Both countries are working to mainstream biodiversity economies, with Bhutan focusing on tourism and South Africa on a more diverse range of sustainable use options around protected areas.

PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY
To continue the knowledge sharing, the two projects would like to organize an exchange visit focused on tourism, antipoaching, and human-wildlife conflict.

India Wild Cats and Malaysia

COMMONALITIES
India Wild Cats and Malaysia are both focused on combating illegal wildlife trade through community participation in patrolling. Additionally, both countries are using innovative financial instruments, such as applying the Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN) methodology and exploring the use of tiger bonds to scale up conservation.

PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY
The two projects proposed hosting a capacity building visit to showcase and learn from Malaysia’s special protected areas response team (SPARTA), which was formed in 2017 as a forest counter-poaching unit.

Belize and Kenya

COMMONALITIES
Both Belize and Kenya are promoting alternative livelihoods through wildlife-based economies and working with a wide range of stakeholders. Ecotourism and honey production are present in both projects, while Kenya is also promoting beadwork and Belize soap production. They are also both developing databases to improve knowledge and enforcement.

PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY
Given they are both working on sustainable alternative livelihoods, they propose a site visit to Belize to see how jaguar conservation is practiced in partnership with communities and the progress on alternative livelihood and income generation.

PROGRESS REPORT 2023
GLOBAL WILDLIFE PROGRAM
India SECURE Himalaya and Mozambique

COMMONALITIES
India and Mozambique are facing an increase in elephant populations and human-wildlife conflict. Additionally, they are both using gazetted community conserved areas to protect elephants and support livelihood options for local communities. These areas are managed by natural resource committees in Mozambique and landscape-level committees in India. Both countries are training communities to design and lead small-grants projects for livelihood development.

PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY
The countries would like to organize a training exchange on DNA profiling and wildlife forensics, potentially in Thailand as the wildlife forensics laboratory was strengthened under their GWP project. As wildlife trafficking chains often span regions, this collaboration on wildlife forensics could strengthen traceability and enforcement across regions.

Botswana and Pakistan

COMMONALITIES
Botswana and Pakistan face challenges when it comes to land management and planning, resulting in increased human-wildlife conflict. Both countries are using integrated landscape management and mitigation strategies and interventions to overcome conflict.

PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY
They would like to continue sharing experiences and lessons on how integrated landscape management is being taken up by stakeholders and how ecotourism is supporting the reduction of human-wildlife conflict.

Indonesia CONSERVE and Zambia

COMMONALITIES
Indonesia CONSERVE and Zambia are both dealing with human-wildlife conflict challenges, particularly with elephants. Similarly, they are using a multisector landscape approach that engages all relevant stakeholders in mitigation of conflicts.

PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY
The projects would like to arrange a study visit to exchange knowledge and approaches for human-elephant conflict management.

Ethiopia, Thailand, and Zimbabwe

COMMONALITIES
Ethiopia, Thailand, and Zimbabwe are all tackling illegal wildlife trade and have established strong units for prosecuting wildlife crime. There was agreement on the importance of involving communities in antipoaching activities and ensuring they have access to diversified livelihoods to sustain project impacts.

PROPOSED EXCHANGE ACTIVITY
The countries would like to organize a training exchange on DNA profiling and wildlife forensics, potentially in Thailand as the wildlife forensics laboratory was strengthened under their GWP project. As wildlife trafficking chains often span regions, this collaboration on wildlife forensics could strengthen traceability and enforcement across regions.
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**Levers of Change Session**

Participants at the 2023 GWP annual conference discussed how five “levers of change” can transform knowledge into action to strengthen wildlife conservation.

### What do you want to partner with and why?

Projects want to establish multisectoral partnerships and strengthen collaboration across government agencies; engage the private sector; strengthen partnerships for protected area management; and work with civil society organizations, the United Nations, and multilateral development banks as they build these partnerships.

### What is holding you back?

Countries often lack clear frameworks or policies to support partnerships, and they raise limited capacity for engaging both technical and financial mechanisms.

### Where have you made progress?

Progress has been made in law enforcement coordination, on convening of dialogues for multisector coordination and private sector engagement, and on engaging partners in GEF project development and implementation.

### Who is critical to success?

Projects cited financial institutions, multilateral development banks, and technical assistance from NGOs and experts.

### What needs to change? How can innovation help?

Responses varied from the inclusion of more women to better communication and adoption of emerging technology.

### What is holding you back?

Responses highlighted both resistance to change through cultural sensitivities and limited funding.

### Where have you made progress?

Projects have begun using new technologies, such as solar fencing, and focusing on equity efforts.

### Who is critical to success?

Knowledge sharing across the GWP platform has helped projects. So has maintaining constant communication between government institutions, NGOs, and communities.

### What data or information do you need? Why?

Projects expressed a need for data on species populations, illegal trade, seizures, human-wildlife conflict incidences and impacts, and livelihoods improvements.

### What is holding you back?

Most cited barriers included lack of capacity and skills, shifting government priorities, lack of resources, and funding, as well as trust and the mindset of the community.

### Where have you made progress?

Projects have made progress with political support, understanding user needs, proposal development, and collaboration.

### Who is critical to success?

GEF funding has helped projects collect data and information. National organizations are needed to collect information and provide guidance.
**Gender in the GWP – Women as Agents of Change**

Integrating a gender lens across wildlife management and conservation efforts is vital because men and women view, manage, and interact with nature differently. GWP projects are working to close gender gaps, from helping women benefit from conservation and livelihood efforts to supporting them to become decision-makers and agents of change. The GWP knowledge platform shares these experiences and lessons through a range of activities.

**Mali**

Mali is strengthening women’s livelihoods and empowerment by funding income-generating activities and natural resource management training, benefiting 57 percent of women. Tailored income-generating activities such as establishing a livestock feed bank and planting trees have aimed to empower women financially and socially, enhancing their independence and status.

One of the immediate effects of this has been to empower women, facilitate their access to land, and enhance their involvement in land and natural resource management.

**Botswana**

Botswana recognizes women as powerful agents of change and equips them with entrepreneurial skills. As recalled by the Botswana project manager in the GWP “Women as Catalysts for Change in Conservation” event, 60 percent of the households get most of their income from women’s labor, making them strategic decision-makers and “influencers” within their communities.

Consequently, the Botswana project trained 62 people (including 27 women) in community-based entrepreneurship development in two districts, allowing the project to empower women through natural resource management.

**Thailand**

Thailand is integrating gender mainstreaming with efforts against wildlife crime by organizing the “Wildlife Heroes” cross-border innovation challenge. The latter saw a female winner initiating a crowdfunding campaign for wildlife rehabilitation and spearheading a public awareness event involving over 100 participants. See the UNDP blog for more information.

The GWP virtual knowledge exchange “Women as Catalysts for Change in Conservation,” put the spotlight on the added value of women voices and actions in wildlife conservation. During that event, the GWP Thailand project team shared additional insights from their project on how women’s specific motivations, distinct skills, and innovative ideas are particularly beneficial to wildlife conservation efforts and should be fostered.

**India**

India is integrating more women into the leadership of its local institutions, which is creating a positive impact on conservation issues. For instance, under the GWP India SECURE Himalaya project, a Biodiversity Management Committee (BMC), constituted of women only, has proven particularly active and ambitious by declaring Yaya Tso a Biodiversity Heritage Site. On the United Nations’ International Day for Biological Diversity 2023, this BMC also conducted a mass cleanup drive in and around the hot sulfur spring, declaring the area a “litter-free zone.”

Such leading roles further train women to induce change, even beyond the project duration.

The initiative and results from the India SECURE Himalaya project were highlighted during the GWP virtual Knowledge Exchange on Community Conservation Groups.
South Africa
The South Africa Illegal Wildlife Trade project sees women as strategic assets for the country’s ranger workforce. It consequently appointed 28 women as environmental monitors as part of SANParks’ community-based Environmental Monitor program. Their mission covers environmental education, security (both armed and unarmed), and research support.

Malawi
In Malawi, although women traditionally struggle to access land rights, the GWP Malawi project has allowed 31,779 farmers to secure land tenure, of whom (51 percent) are women. Five smallholder-owned commercial farm enterprises registered as cooperatives, with 51 percent of member landowners being women. With women often holding different views from men on natural resources, initiatives allowing women access to leadership roles in farming activities will not only benefit those individual women but also influence their management of natural resources and conservation.

Panama
Panama works with women cattle ranchers to mitigate human-jaguar conflict on ranches. These women farmers are pioneers in taking on new farming practices and mobilizing their communities to get onboard.

The GWP organized a virtual knowledge exchange for projects on “Tools and Techniques for Measuring and Reporting on Gender.” It discussed intentional ways to bring more women into project activities, including by identifying women “champions” in communities. This UNDP blog highlights the assets of female community rangers in combating wildlife crime in Indonesia.

Indonesia
The Indonesia GEF-6 Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade Project (CIWT) engages and trains women living in local communities around national parks to become forest rangers and conservation champions. By training these women to promote conservation education in their communities and support alternative livelihoods, these efforts contribute to enhancing the longer-term impact of counter-IWT activities.

Mozambique
Mozambique develops mechanisms for women empowerment. In Gorongosa National Park, 11 Women’s Development Committees (WDCs) were created, comprising 209 members in Catemo and Nhabawa in Chreingoma district. These WDCs trained women in leadership skills that secured their active involvement in the decision-making processes of the project.

Such structures, beyond empowering women individually, allow GWP projects to integrate a gender lens by allowing those women leaders to share and act upon their specific view on conservation and development matters.
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SECTION 4:
GWP Implementation Progress

Using results from project implementation reports (PIRs), mid-term reviews (MTRs), and terminal evaluations (TEs), the following section updates the status of implementation progress across the GWP portfolio. It reports on financial status, performance progress, and risk ratings to understand how projects are progressing.
### Implementation Status

As of June 30, 2023, the GWP portfolio comprised 37 projects from 31 countries, as shown in figure 4.1. Out of these, 20 projects were from the GEF-6 and 17 from the GEF-7 phase of GWP. Two GEF-7 projects, one in Malaysia and the other in South Africa (human-wildlife conflict), successfully secured GEF chief executive officer (CEO) endorsement in the fiscal year ending June 2023 (FY23). Only one project in Pakistan remained in the project preparation stage. In Angola, the government requested a revision to the project’s executing arrangements, which required restructuring. Following the required revisions, the GEF CEO re-endorsed this project, and implementation is expected to start in the next fiscal year. As of June 30, 2023, projects in Afghanistan and Cameroon remained suspended. Gabon and Viet Nam completed their projects over this reporting period, bringing the total number of closed projects to five.

### Financial Status

Across GEF-6 and GEF-7 the GEF has provided nearly $225 million in financing to 37 GWP projects. As of the end of June 2023, $103 million of the financing has been disbursed. As figure 4.2 shows, most of the funding, which amounts to 74 percent of the total GEF-6 funding, was used by GEF-6 projects, totaling $96 million. On the other hand, projects funded by GEF-7, most of which were still in the early stages of implementation, used only 8 percent of the total GEF-7 funding, which amounted to almost $8 million.

---

5 The UNDP subsequently canceled the Afghanistan project in September 2023.

---

**Figure 4.1. GWP Project Portfolio, by Phase of the Project Cycle, as of June 30, 2023**

- **Active Projects:**
  - Belize - Bhutan - Botswana - Cambodia
  - Chad - Congo, Dem. Rep. - Ecuador - Ethiopia
  - Global coordination (GEF-7) - India SECURE
  - India Wild Cats - Indonesia CIWT
  - Indonesia CONSERVE - Kenya - Madagascar
  - Malaiz - Mali - Mozambique - Namibia - Panama
  - South Africa NT - South Africa WBE - Tanzania
  - Thailand - Zambia - Zimbabwe

- **Closed Projects:**
  - Congo, Rep. - Gabon - the Philippines - Viet Nam
  - Global coordination project (GEF-6, WBG component)

- **Suspended Implementation:**
  - Afghanistan

---

**Figure 4.2. Total GEF Grant vs. Disbursement by GEF Phase, as of June 30, 2023**

- **GEF-7**
  - **Grant:** $7,818,006
  - **Disbursement:** $95,688,018 (8%)

- **GEF-6**
  - **Grant:** $95,552,798
  - **Disbursement:** $129,150,529 (74%)

---

Source: GWP global coordination project analysis.

Note: Indonesia CIWT = Indonesia GEF-6 Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade Project; NT = illegal wildlife trade; WBE = wildlife-based economy.

The GWP grant and disbursement figures reflect contributions from multiple donors, including but not limited to the GEF, GIZ, UNDP, and USAID.
GWP Performance Progress

Progress on Achieving Global Environmental Benefits

Through June 2023, the GWP made substantial progress toward most GEF-6 Core Indicator estimated targets, including terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management, areas of land restored, and direct beneficiaries. To date, only GEF-6 projects have reached the stage of implementation where they can report their GEF Core Indicator results. No GEF-7 projects have reported these results yet, as they remain in their early stages of implementation. Twelve out of 20 GWP GEF-6 projects (60 percent) have reported their first results through MTRs, while 5 projects (or 25 percent) reported their final results through TEa. Three projects from this cohort (or 15 percent) are yet to report results via their MTR or TE. Figure 4.3 shows the cumulative progress made toward the GEF Core indicators over the last three years for which data are available.

The GEF-6 GWP projects reported significant progress in their efforts as of the end of June 2023. Ten countries reported a combined total of nearly 16 million hectares of protected or conserved areas under more effective management, equivalent to 54 percent of the target. This means that more wildlife habitats and critical ecosystems across 34 sites are now being better managed and protected from habitat loss and degradation.

Moreover, GWP projects have successfully started restoring 548,185 hectares of land, which surpassed the GEF-6 GWP target of 496,200 hectares. Seven countries have commenced land restoration using a variety of methods, including agroforestry, reforestation, and regeneration of degraded lands through soil and water conservation and area closures. Furthermore, projects have improved land management practices outside of protected areas, covering 1.6 million hectares with better and more sustainable land management practices. This represents 27 percent of the target and is a step forward in mitigating the negative impact of human activities on the environment, with benefits for people and wildlife.

Figure 4.3. GWP GEF-6 Contributions to GEF Core Indicators, as of June 30, 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEF Core Indicators</th>
<th>Cumulative Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>FY22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Achieved</td>
<td>Percentage of Projects Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Area of land and ecosystems under restoration |
| FY21 | FY22 | FY23 | GWP Target GEF-6 |
| 6,422 | 57,285 | 548,185 | 496,200 |
| Percentage Achieved | Percentage of Projects Reporting |
| 100% | 100% |

| Area of landscape under improved practices (excluding protected areas) |
| FY21 | FY22 | FY23 | GWP Target GEF-6 |
| 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 6.0 |
| Percentage Achieved | Percentage of Projects Reporting |
| 27% | 55% |

| Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated |
| FY21 | FY22 | FY23 | GWP Target GEF-6 |
| 0.05 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 16.5 |
| Percentage Achieved | Percentage of Projects Reporting |
| 148% | 57% |

| Direct beneficiaries |
| FY21 | FY22 | FY23 | GWP Target GEF-6 |
| 214,251 | 225,085 | 377,523 | 733,946 |
| Percentage Achieved | Percentage of Projects Reporting |
| 51% | 84% |

Source: GWP global coordination project analysis.

Note:

a. The GEF-6 targets are still estimates, as not all GEF-6 projects have transitioned to reporting via GEF Core Indicators. No GEF-7 targets or results are displayed, as no projects from the GEF-7 phase submitted their mid-term reviews or Core Indicator spreadsheets as of June 2023.
b. Of the ten projects reporting, 3 (30%) reported their final results within the mid-term results.
c. Of the seven projects reporting, two (29%) reported their final results, while five (71%) reported their mid-term results.
d. Of the six projects reporting, one (17%) reported its final result, and five (83%) reported their mid-term results.
e. Of the four projects reporting, two (50%) reported their final results, while two (50%) reported their mid-term results.
f. Of the 19 projects reporting, 6 (32%) reported their final results, while 13 (68%) reported their mid-term results.
By restoring and better managing these lands, as well as through a combination of other measures, GWP projects are also helping to mitigate the impact of climate change while conserving biodiversity. Four projects have successfully mitigated or avoided GHG emissions. They have reported reducing or avoiding emissions of 24.5 million metric tons of CO$_2$e, which exceeds the target of 16.5 million metric tons of CO$_2$e set for GEF-6 GWP GHG emission reduction. Few GEF-6 projects are formally reporting data on GHG emissions reductions to the GEF, and this target likely underestimates GWP contributions through habitat management efforts.

Finally, GWP projects have directly affected people’s lives, with 377,523 people benefiting from the various interventions implemented by the 17 projects contributing data. These beneficiaries include local communities, Indigenous peoples, and other stakeholders who rely on locally available natural resources to fulfill their needs and for their livelihoods.

**Project Implementation Report Ratings**

Twenty-six GWP projects—15 GEF-6 and 11 GEF-7 projects—submitted PIRs for the fiscal year ending June 2023. Each project rated its progress toward the identified development objective based on the reported achievement of project targets.

On par with last reporting year, 77 percent of the projects rated in the “satisfactory” range. For the first time in the past five years, one project in Panama received a “highly satisfactory” rating. Twenty-seven percent, or seven projects, received a “satisfactory” rating, and 46 percent were “moderately satisfactory.” Fifteen percent of projects rated “moderately unsatisfactory,” and two projects remain “unsatisfactory” (figure 4.4).

Although the percentage distribution of ratings across categories was similar to last year’s,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (FY23) %</th>
<th>Country Projects</th>
<th>Rating Change from FY22*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfactory or targets achieved</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory or on track to target</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Ethiopia, India SECURE Himalaya, Indonesia CIWT, South Africa IWT, Tanzania, Thailand, Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately satisfactory or minor shortfalls</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Cambodia, Chad, Indonesia CONSERVE, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, South Africa WBE, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately unsatisfactory or shortfalls</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep., India Wild Cats, Madagascar, Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory or unlikely to achieve targets</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Cameroon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1. Ratings Toward Project Development Objectives, as of June 30, 2023**

*Note: ↑ rating improved since last FY; ┼ rating worsened; ┼ no change in the rating; NA no rating available for previous FY (the first year that the PIR was submitted); Indonesia CIWT = Indonesia GEF-6 Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade Project; IWT = illegal wildlife trade; WBE = wildlife-based economy.

Source: GWP global coordination project analysis.

---

Figure 4.4. GWP Project Implementation Report Ratings, FY19 to FY23

Source: GWP global coordination project analysis.
distribution, the projects’ composition within each category differed, as shown in table 4.1. Over the reporting period, six projects (23 percent) improved their progress toward development objectives, while the rating of two projects (7 percent) declined. Of all the projects that submitted their PIRs for FY23, just under half (42 percent, or 11 projects) saw no change in their rating, with most continuing to perform satisfactorily or moderately satisfactorily. Two projects under suspension kept their unsatisfactory rating, as was the case in FY22. In FY23, a cohort of GEF-7 projects began implementation, with seven (27 percent) submitting their first PIR. These projects reported mixed ratings, with three rated as “moderately satisfactory” and four as “moderately unsatisfactory” (MU) due to early implementation delays and challenges. The implementation of two components of the India Wild Cats project was delayed due to the transfer between GEF Agencies from WWF-US to UNDP, resulting in a rating of MU. In Madagascar, UNEP noted that challenges in appointing project staff delayed the start. The Democratic Republic of Congo project faced delays due to political instability, limited field staff, and the introduction of a new UNDP program management system. Namibia’s project was delayed due to limited project management capacity and pending baseline and safeguards analyses.

As of June 30, 2023, 16 projects had completed their MTRs, five of which took place in the reporting year. The projects in India (SECURE Himalaya), Kenya, and Mozambique received an MTR rating of “satisfactory” toward their development objectives. At the same time, Cambodia was rated as “moderately satisfactory,” and Mali was deemed “moderately unsatisfactory” (figure 4.5).

Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation Ratings

As of June 30, 2023, 16 projects had completed their MTRs, five of which took place in the reporting year. The projects in India (SECURE Himalaya), Kenya, and Mozambique received an MTR rating of “satisfactory” toward their development objectives. At the same time, Cambodia was rated as “moderately satisfactory,” and Mali was deemed “moderately unsatisfactory” (figure 4.5).

During FY23, the GWP project in Mali received a “moderately unsatisfactory” rating due to significant security concerns, political instability, and staffing issues. In response, UNDP, as the GEF Agency, introduced measures to mitigate risks and improve project performance. Similar adaptive management measures were also implemented for projects in Botswana and Thailand after they received “moderately unsatisfactory” ratings at their MTRs in FY21. UNDP anticipates that these measures will enhance performance and lead to better ratings at terminal evaluations, scheduled for fiscal years 2024 and 2025. Gabon’s project showed significant improvement after receiving a “moderately unsatisfactory” rating at its MTR in 2020, which resulted in the World Bank giving it a “satisfactory” rating at the terminal evaluation completed in FY23.

Between June 2022 and June 2023, three additional projects successfully completed their TEs, bringing the total number of completed TEs to five. Two (40 percent) of these projects received a satisfactory rating, with Gabon being added to the GEF-6 GWP coordination project implemented by the World Bank in this category. The Republic of Congo’s and Viet Nam’s projects obtained a moderately satisfactory TE rating in FY23. The total percentage this category, including the TE rating of the Philippines from FY22, is 60 percent.

Risk Management

Over the reporting year, six projects (23 percent) reported either a high or substantial level of risk. Risk ratings show a slight improvement from last year, when 33 percent of projects fell into the top two risk categories, with three rated as “high” and four as “substantial.” Recurrent reasons for
elevated risk ratings among projects included COVID-19 interruptions, institutional challenges and capacity, and climate change’s impact on conservation objectives (figure 4.6).

Additionally, the percentage of projects that rated their overall risk as “low” rose from 38 percent last year to 54 percent this reporting year. In these cases, projects cited increased stability within countries and further recovery from COVID-19 disruptions as reasons for the change in situation.

According to the World Bank’s 2023 list of fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS), nine GWP countries were categorized as FCS (table 4.2). This year, the World Bank modified how it categorizes countries by dividing them into either having “conflict” or “institutional and social fragility” without assigning an intensity level. Under this new rating system, six GWP project countries are designated as experiencing “conflict” and three as experiencing “institutional and social fragility.” Many countries that made the list reported direct impacts on project delivery. For example, Zimbabwe, listed under “institutional and social fragility,” experienced currency instability because of soaring inflation and rapidly depreciating local currency. The fiscal challenges affected the project because many service providers increased their charges for goods and services to offset costs.

Countries listed under “conflict” often face security threats, as a threshold number of conflict-related deaths relative to the population determines the classification. For example, Mozambique faced challenges because of conflict in Cabo Delgado Province, with occasional expansion to areas of the Niassa Special Reserve, affecting security and access to the park. In Mali, the project implementation context continued to generate progress despite being strongly affected by the effects of the country’s security and political crisis. Political instability continued to negatively affect the project in Afghanistan, which remained suspended for this entire reporting period, with the UNDP eventually canceling the project in September 2023.

Table 4.2. GWP Countries Listed as Fragile and Conflict-Affected Projects, as of June 30, 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict-Affected</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Cameroon, Congo, Dem. Rep., Ethiopia, Mali, Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and Social Fragility</td>
<td>Chad, Congo, Rep., Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Original data from the World Bank’s FY23 list of fragile and conflict-affected situations.

Figure 4.6. Overall Risk Rating in Project Implementation Reviews, By Percentage of Projects, as of June 30, 2023
**Gabon**

The Wildlife and Human-Elephant Conflicts Management (GeFaCHE) project in Gabon has achieved significant success in reducing elephant poaching, mitigating human-elephant conflicts, strengthening institutions, and improving livelihoods. Highlights include:

- **Reduction in Elephant Poaching:** The project successfully reduced elephant poaching in four national parks by strengthening patrols, improving surveillance, and implementing more effective anti-poaching measures. Although the number of illegally killed elephants fluctuated from year to year, the project reported zero incidents of illegal elephant killings in 2022, the final year of the project implementation. A total of 58 joint patrols were carried out with Congolese rangers in the Mayumba and Conkouati transboundary parks.

- **Mitigation of Human-Elephant Conflicts:** The project led to a decrease in the number of reported incidents of human-elephant conflicts from 247 to 79 through various activities. These included increasing the capacity of local management committees, conducting 46 annual awareness campaigns, and implementing specific mitigation measures. Moreover, the project partnered with 18 private sector concessionaires to develop and execute wildlife management plans in elephant corridors. It also improved connectivity between national parks through the creation of four elephant corridor management plans.

- **Institutional Strengthening:** The project contributed to institutional strengthening by training Local Management Consultant Committee members and 403 rangers, judges, magistrates, customs and police officers in wildlife crime prevention and management. A significant achievement was the establishment of a wildlife genetic analysis laboratory through collaboration and resource pooling among various donors. This laboratory, the first of its kind in Central Africa, is crucial in combating elephant poaching and illegal wildlife trade. It has become a regional center of excellence for genetic assessment of ivory samples, supporting Cameroon and Nigeria in analyzing seized ivory.

- **Poverty Reduction and Shared Prosperity:** The project significantly impacted the livelihoods in areas where electric fencing was installed, resulting in a decrease or elimination of elephant intrusions. For farmer-beneficiaries in these specific areas, this led to an increase of around $134 in monthly household income, which equates to a 40% rise in their monthly earnings. In total, the GeFaCHE project reached 5,285 direct beneficiaries, including 2,505 women.

**Viet Nam**

The Strengthening Partnerships to Protect Endangered Wildlife in Viet Nam project made notable contributions to the ongoing efforts to conserve and protect the country’s wildlife. The project focused on strengthening the legal and regulatory framework, and the implementation capacity for protecting threatened wildlife. Key achievements include:

- **Legal and Regulatory Framework Strengthening:** The project has submitted legal and regulatory amendments for government approval to enhance existing laws and regulations, fill gaps, and facilitate implementation. Technical support was provided to enhance policies, including measures to conserve wild and migratory birds, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2030, amendments to the Law on Biodiversity, regulations for managing wildlife conservation facilities, and integrating threatened species protection in tourism activities. The project also strengthened the National Biodiversity Crime Prevention Strategy by integrating wildlife crime issues and clarifying roles among relevant authorities.

- **Institutional Strengthening:** During thirteen training events, 546 field staff, enforcement, and conservation officers enhanced their skills in enforcing wildlife protection laws. Additionally, the project supported the development of an information-sharing platform to protect endangered species, alongside implementing a conservation program dedicated to endangered species. The project also facilitated inter-agency coordination and the development of four collaboration plans /MOUs to strengthen strategic partnerships for wildlife conservation.

- **Strengthening Capacities for Protection of Threatened Wildlife:** Targeting the areas of high concern for poaching, the project carried out training for the conservation and enforcement officials to support widespread deployment of the SMART tool for monitoring and reporting on poaching and illegal activities in 44 protected areas. Of these, 35 are using the tool, while the remaining 9 protected areas plan to deploy it when financial resources become available.

- **Promoting Knowledge Sharing and Awareness Raising:** To help reduce the demand for and consumption of wildlife products, the project promoted knowledge sharing and awareness raising. It supported Viet Nam’s national Endangered Wildlife Partnership Forum, facilitating its expansion. The awareness-raising program on the consumption of threatened wildlife products targeted central and local government staff and reached 80 percent of the intended audience. In addition, awareness campaigns through print and broadcast media, as well as special public events, were conducted to educate the general public on topics related to endangered species and biodiversity conservation.
The Republic of Congo

The Strengthening the Management of Wildlife and Improving Livelihoods in northern Republic of Congo project has enhanced biodiversity protection and management in two national parks. The project has also implemented measures to combat wildlife crime, supported climate change mitigation, and promoted income-generating activities for local communities and Indigenous Peoples. Key achievements of the project include:

- Improved protected area management: Partnering with WWF and WCS, the project significantly improved the management effectiveness of the Nouabalé-Ndoki National Park and the newly established Ntokou-Pikounda National Park, covering 427,000 hectares. The project’s investments led to an enhanced biodiversity protection in these forest ecosystems and contributed to an increased population of Western lowland gorillas, chimpanzees, elephants, and hippos in the national parks.

- Strengthened anti-poaching capacities: The project enhanced the park authorities’ capacity to combat poaching by constructing or renovating ranger facilities and watchtowers, providing essential equipment and training in wildlife law enforcement. Additionally, the project deployed a specialized sniffer dog team for detecting illegal wildlife products. These efforts led to 939 seizures of poached animals or animal parts from elephants and other protected species.

- Climate change mitigation: The project generated global carbon sequestration benefits through improved forest management, interventions to combat land degradation, and sustainable land management practices such as agroforestry on 950 hectares of degraded land. According to the Ex-Ante Carbon-Balance Tool analysis, the project is expected to reduce emissions by about 23.8 million tCO2e over 20 years. The World Bank estimated that the present value of the carbon benefits from the project over 2017–2036 ranges from US$695 million to US$1.4 billion, depending on the pricing scenario used.

- Poverty reduction and shared prosperity: Successful capacity-building and income-generating activities were provided for local communities and Indigenous Peoples in remote rural areas near forest concessions and national parks, reaching 3,690 direct beneficiaries. Some activities, such as agroforestry, were particularly beneficial for the farmers. There was a strong interest in cocoa cultivation in areas where cultivating staple crops was impossible due to repeated wildlife damage.

TERMINAL EVALUATION RATINGS:

OUTCOME: Moderately satisfactory
WORLD BANK PERFORMANCE: Moderately satisfactory
QUALITY OF M&E: Substantial

PROJECT OVERVIEW:

GRANT AMOUNT: US$6.5 million
GEF PHASE: GEF-6
KEY DATES: 2017-2022
GEF AGENCY: World Bank

7 This project was part of the World Bank’s Forest and Economic Diversification project, implemented by the Ministry of Forest Economy.
Appendices
## APPENDIX A

### List of GWP Projects with Executing Entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>EXECUTING ENTITIES</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>GEF AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Strengthen Management and Climate Change Resilience in Angola’s Conservation Areas for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Angola Ministry of the Environment</td>
<td>$14.8 million</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>Enhancing Jaguar Corridors and Strongholds Through Improved Management and Threat Reduction</td>
<td>Ministry of Sustainable Development and Climate Change, Forest Department</td>
<td>$1.2 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the Tourism Sector in Bhutan</td>
<td>Tourism Council of Bhutan</td>
<td>$4.9 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Managing the Human-Wildlife Interface to Sustain the Flow of Agro-Ecosystem Services and Prevent Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Drylands</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources Conservation and Tourism; Department of Environmental Affairs; Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Councils</td>
<td>$6.0 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Cambodia Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Rural Development</td>
<td>$4.4 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Chad Local Development and Adaptation Project (ALBIÁ)</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Water and Fisheries</td>
<td>$4.5 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>Strengthening the Management of Wildlife and Improving Livelihoods in Northern Republic of Congo</td>
<td>Ministry of Forest Economy</td>
<td>$6.5 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Integrating Landscape Considerations in Wildlife Conservation, with Emphasis on Jaguars</td>
<td>WCS - Ecuador</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Enhanced Management and Enforcement of Ethiopia’s Protected Area Estate</td>
<td>Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission; Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority; Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute</td>
<td>$7.3 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A.1 List of GEF-6 and GEF-7 Projects with Executing Entities and Grant Amounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>EXECUTING ENTITIES</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>GEF AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Coordination GEF-6</td>
<td>Global Coordination Project GEF-6</td>
<td>World Bank, UNDP</td>
<td>$7.0 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Coordination GEF-7</td>
<td>Global Coordination Project GEF-7</td>
<td>World Bank, UNDP</td>
<td>$9.2 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Securing Livelihoods, Conservation, Sustainable Use and Restoration of High Range Himalayan Ecosystems (SECURE)</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change</td>
<td>$11.5 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Combating Illegal and Unsustainable Trade in Endangered Species in Indonesia (GIWT)</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry</td>
<td>$7.0 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Catalyzing Optimum Management of Natural Heritage for Sustainability of Ecosystem, Resources and Viability of Endangered Wildlife Species (CONSERVE)</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Directorate General of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Conservation</td>
<td>$6.3 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife</td>
<td>$2.8 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Sustainable Management of Conservation Areas and Improved Livelihoods to Combat Wildlife Trafficking in Madagascar</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development</td>
<td>$5.8 million</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Lower Shire Valley Landscape Project, part of the Shire Valley Transformation Program I</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy, and Mining; Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation, and Water Development; African Parks Network</td>
<td>$5.6 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Building Institutional and Local Capacities to Reduce Wildlife Crime and Enhance Protection of Iconic Wildlife in Malaysia</td>
<td>Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources</td>
<td>$7.1 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>EXECUTING ENTITIES</td>
<td>GRANT AMOUNT</td>
<td>GEF AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Community-Based Natural Resource Management that Resolves Conflict, Improves Livelihoods, and Restores Ecosystems throughout the Elephant Range</td>
<td>Ministry of the Environment, Sanitation, and Sustainable Development; Mali Elephant Project</td>
<td>$4.1 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Strengthening the Conservation of Globally Threatened Species in Mozambique through Improving Biodiversity Enforcement and Expanding Community Conservancies Around Protected Areas</td>
<td>National Agency for Conservation Areas, Gorongosa Restoration Project, WCS</td>
<td>$15.8 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Integrated Approach to Proactive Management of Human-Wildlife Conflict and Wildlife Crime in Hotspot Landscapes in Namibia</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism</td>
<td>$6.2 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Conservation of Wildcats and Prey Species Through Public-Private Partnerships and Human-Jaguar Conflict Management in Panama</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Yaguá Panamá Foundation</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Combating Environmental Organized Crime in the Philippines</td>
<td>Biodiversity Management Bureau, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (BMB-DENR)</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
<td>ADB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Reducing Human-Wildlife Conflict Through an Evidence-Based and Integrated Approach in Southern Africa</td>
<td>Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment</td>
<td>$3.4 million</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Strengthening Institutions, Information Management and Monitoring to Reduce the Rate of Illegal Wildlife Trade in South Africa</td>
<td>Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment</td>
<td>$4.9 million</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Catalyzing Financing and Capacity for the Biodiversity Economy around Protected Areas (Wildlife-Based Economy)</td>
<td>Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment; South African National Biodiversity Institute; National Prosecuting Authority; South African National Parks; iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority</td>
<td>$13.4 million</td>
<td>UNEP, World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade in Tanzania through an Integrated Approach</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Wildlife Division</td>
<td>$5.4 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade, focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand</td>
<td>Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation; Royal Thai Police; IUCN; TRAFFIC; TRACE</td>
<td>$4.0 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>Strengthening Partnerships to Protect Endangered Wildlife in Viet Nam</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Zambia Integrated Forest Landscape Project</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture; Department of National Parks and Wildlife, Forestry Department</td>
<td>$8.1 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry</td>
<td>$10.0 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>EXECUTING ENTITIES</td>
<td>GRANT AMOUNT</td>
<td>GEF AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>The Jaguar Corridor</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development; WWF Colombia; Panthera Colombia</td>
<td>$8.4 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eswatini</td>
<td>Establishment of Big 5 Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>$5.2 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Promoting Integrated Conservation of Wildlife and Landscapes for Sustainable</td>
<td>Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority; Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute</td>
<td>$11.9 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Global Coordination Project</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development</td>
<td>$14.7 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Protection of Wildlife in the Folonigbè Reserve through Participatory and</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development</td>
<td>$8.6 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Law Enforcement for Sustainable Viable Ecosystems and Biodiversity Resilience</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Forestry; Ministry of Finance;</td>
<td>$14.4 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through Multi Sectors Engagement (LEVERAGE)</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, National Research and Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Advancing Human-Wildlife Conflict Management Effectiveness in Kenya through</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife, and Heritage (State Department of Wildlife); Wildlife</td>
<td>$9.6 million</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an Integrated Approach</td>
<td>Research and Training Institute; Kenya Wildlife Service;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association; International Fund For Animal Welfare; UNEP; State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Information and Communication Technology; WWF Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Central Region Protected Areas and Landscapes Project</td>
<td>Department of National Parks and Wildlife; Department of Forestry</td>
<td>$7.1 million</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>From Conflict to Coexistence, Safeguarding Wildlife Corridors in Mexico for</td>
<td>Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources through Nacional Financiera’s</td>
<td>$11.9 million</td>
<td>WWF-US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Sustainability Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Transforming Wildlife Conservation and Livelihoods at the Landscape Scale in</td>
<td>Ministry of Land and Environment</td>
<td>$15.1 million</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique (TRANSFORM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.2 List of GEF-8 Projects with Executing Entities and Grant Amounts, Based on the Approved Concept Notes

- **COUNTRY**
- **PROJECT NAME**
- **EXECUTING ENTITIES**
- **GRANT AMOUNT**
- **GEF AGENCY**

## GWP Webinars and Events

### Table B.1. Webinars Hosted by the GWP in 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Title and Link to Recording</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Diseases in Wildlife Management: Sharing Guidance and Insights to Support Practice</td>
<td>Franck Berthe, World Bank; Catherine Machalaba, EcoHealth Alliance; Dao Nguyen, IUCN; Kalpy Julien Coulibaly, Pasteur Institute de Côte d’Ivoire; Francois Diaz, WOAH, founded as OIE; Jackson Katampi, Zambia</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Rangers Through the 3Cs—Conditions, Conduct and Capacity</td>
<td>Kunzang Choden, Bhutan For Life Fund Secretariat; Cristina Sganga, human rights expert; Theresa Sowy, Southern African Wildlife College</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countering Corruption in Wildlife Trade and Conservation</td>
<td>Micol Martini, WWF International; Daniela Sota Valdivia, UNDOC; Alastair Nelson, Conservation Synergies; Alexandra Habershon, World Bank</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B.2. Events and Workshops Hosted, Cohosted, or Sponsored by the GWP in 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Title and Link to Event Page</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda Collaborative Management Partnership Study Tour</td>
<td>Kathleen Fitzgerald, World Bank; GWP government representatives; Ariella Kageruka, Rwanda Development Board; Eugene Mutanganga, Rwanda Development Board; Ladis Ndahiriwe, Akagera Management Company (AMC)</td>
<td>February 20-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Exchange on Conservation Technology</td>
<td>Stephanie O’Donnell, World Bank; Franziska Steinbruch, Mozambique; Chipangura Chirara, Zimbabwe; Ricardo Moreno, Panama; Achmad Priadi, Indonesia; Yanira Pop, Belize; Dan Morris, Google AI for Nature and Society; Sarah Maston, Microsoft &amp; Project 15; Piotr Naskrecki, Gorongosa National Park, Mozambique, and Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University</td>
<td>March 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Training Workshop for Latin America</td>
<td>Joni Seager, World Bank; Natalia Young, Panama; Elba Cortes, Panama; Ricardo Moreno, Panama; Alexis Kovach, Ecuador; Mireya Villacis, Ecuador; Yanira Pop, Belize; Heron Moreno, Belize; Renata Cao, Mexico; Members of the Panama Project Gender Advisory Group; Christel Moller, World Bank</td>
<td>March 21-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Conference on Human-Wildlife Conflict</td>
<td>Celmira da Silva, Mozambique; Koustubh Sharma, Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program; Greta F. Iori, Elephant Protection Initiative Foundation; Rakesh Jagania, India; Richard Fryer, Nambia; Steve Michel, Canada; Lisa Farroway, World Bank; Hasita Bhammar, World Bank; Alexandra Zimmermann, World Bank and IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict &amp; Coexistence Specialist Group</td>
<td>March 30- April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Behavior Change Approaches and Strategies to Support Wildlife Conservation for Development</td>
<td>Gayle Burgess, TRAFFIC; Rhys Lim, World Bank; Richard Ryder, Rare; Lisa Farroway, World Bank</td>
<td>June 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Exchange on Community Conservation Groups</td>
<td>Dianna Pizarro, World Bank; Elisante Omboni, Tanzania; Stanzin Namdol, India; Natalia Young, Panama; Hercilla Chipanga Martin, Mozambique</td>
<td>August 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Title and Link to Event Page</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop on Media and Its Impact on Human-Wildlife Conflict Perceptions</td>
<td>Virat A. Singh, World Bank</td>
<td>September 21–October 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women as Catalysts for Change in Conservation</td>
<td>Joni Seager, World Bank; Mbigrany Frederic Dipotso, Botswana; Phansiri Winichagoon, Thailand; Peeranun Panyavaranant, Thailand</td>
<td>November 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Research for Conservation Insight and Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>Gayle Burgess, TRAFFIC; Sacha Riley-Smith, TRAFFIC</td>
<td>November 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWP Annual Conference 2023</td>
<td>GWP government focal points; GWP project management units; GEF agency and partners staff; GEF coordination team, World Bank; Yanira Pop, Belize; Jenny Paola, Colombia; Paul Aulestia, Ecuador; Kumara Wankira, Ethiopia; Krishna Kumar, India; Shadrack Ngenie, Kenya; Syarifah Khadijah Binti Syed Mohd Kamil, Malaysia; Jorge Fernando, Mozambique; Kaninya, Namibia; Lorille Salvador, Philippines; Chayanan Pakdeejit, Thailand; Apollinaris Apollonius, Namibia; Kanita Ouitavon, Thailand; Adriana Moreira, GEF; Hannah Fairbank, GEF; Anupam Anand, GEF IEO; Saile Yung, UNEP; Georgina Lloyd, UNEP; Maelle Vandierendonck, UNEP; Aiko Yamaumoto, UNDP; Jenna Dawson-Faber, UNODC; Yoko Watanae, ADB; Penpicha Akapittayatant, AMATA Foundation; Prasert Sornsathapornnikul, DNP; Daraporn Chaicharit, DNP; Somphol Duangchantrasiri, DNP; Somying Thunhikorn, DNP; Arun Kaewsamakki; Peeranuch Dulkul Kappolle, DNP; Kriengsak Chaturasubsakul, DNP; Prawatsart Chanthep, DNP; Somphon Pakpien, DNP; Khalid Pasha, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); Peter Cutter, RECOFTC; (Center for People and Forests); Colin Holmes, United States Agency for International Development; Jonathan Hunter, Wildlife Conservation Society; Scott Robertson, Wildlife Conservation Society; Sarah Olson, Wildlife Conservation Society; Pornkamol Jomjumroh, Wildlife Conservation Society; Boonyakorn Chimsanchart, Wildlife Conservation Society; Nuthakarn Boonpha, Wildlife Conservation Society; Stephanie O’Donnell, World Bank; Nuthatai Chotechuang, Wildlife Conservation Society; Sandra Petrone Mendoza, WWF; Rob Parry-Jones, WWF; Stephen Carney, Wildlife Justice Commission; Grant Miller, Zoological Society of London</td>
<td>November 27–December 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

GWP Team

GWP Global Coordination

World Bank – GWP Coordination Team: Lisa Farroway, Wendy Li, Monica Zavaghi, Hasita Bhammar, Inela Weeks, Christel Moller, Héloïse Lebon, Sharee Lawler, Manali Baruah, Liam Mullins, Shane Ferdinandus, Sthie Naz Mowlana

GWP Technical Advisers: Joni Seager, Stephanie O’Connell, Kathleen Fitzgerald, Annika Keeley, Diego Juffe Bignoli, Salvatore Amato, Virat A. Singh, Alexandra Zimmermann


UNDP Combating Maritime Wildlife Trafficking Team: Harun Guclusoy, Mikhail Paltsyn, Tamara Tschentscher, Deniz Baskan, Petra Valastinova, Mandy Cadman

GEF Secretariat: Adriana Moreira, Hannah Fairbank

GWP Program Steering Committee: Lisa Farroway, Arunkumar Abraham, Katharine Thoday, Wouter Schalken, Charity Nalyanya, Free De Koning, Prapti Bhandary, Yaisa Bejarano, Angela Armstrong, Olga Stradysheva

GEF-6 and GEF-7 National Projects

Angola: Charity Nalyanya, Robert McNeil, Ruud Jansen, Laureen Cheruiyot, Paula Francisco Coelho, Abias Huongo

Belize: Yanira Pop, Kenrick Williams, Juan Calles, Diane Wade Moore, Ismirla Andrade, Ismirla Andrade, E. Wilber Sabido, John Pinelo, Judith Middleton, Victoria Chi, Leon Castillo, Miguel Tsb, Jasmin Andrades, German Lopez, Irene QuINTERO, Heron Moreno Jr., Christina Garcia, Elizabeth Dorgay, Kimberly Westby, Boris Arevalo, Wilber Martinez, Celso Poot, Emma Sanchez, Marcela Kelly, Amanda Acosta, Zoey Walker, Roberto Rivero, Ramon Pacheco

Bhutan: Dorji Dhadhul, Tashi Tenzin, Dhendrup Tshering, Solene Le Dohe, Dhendrup Tharchen, Jigme Dorji, Jamyang Gyeltshen, Sita Devi Gautam

Botswana: Mbiganyi Frederick Dipotso, Onesimus Muhwezi, Bame Mannathoko, Kagoetsile Motlokwa, Chimbi Bratoncevic, Kabelo Senyatso, Retshepile Johny, Julius Rakose, Naununguli Maja, Tabona Nyakwane, Johnson Lebotse, Tshireletso Kgoe, Tsheliso Tau

Cambodia: Khin Mengkheang, Khieu Borin, Salimata D. Follea, Elisabeth Steinmayr, Erica Cristine Honeck, Pheanrach Hing

Chad: Tahir Brahim Adouma, Aurelie Rossignon, Taibou Maiga, Soumaila Oumar Gadj, Olivier Seid Kimto, Victoire Lebkioka Boikinebe, Mahamad Seidou Siboune, Erik Winter Reed


Ecuador: Angela Reed Clavijo, Esteban Jacome, Pau Aulestia, Mireya Villacis, Lisett Herrera, Sebastian Valdivieso, Melanie Alemán, Gálo Zapata, Mayra Romero, Alexandra Fischer

Ethiopia: Arega Mekonnen, Kumara Warkiya, Kaavya Varma, Wubba Mekonnen, Fanuel Kebede, Demelketa Dinka, Neway Betemariam, Behailu Mekonnen, Andualem Moti, Lomitu Bane

India SECURE Himalaya: Tashi Dorji, Ruchi Pant, Krishna Kumar, Parth Joshi, Ishu Chakraborty, Siddarth Nair

India Wild Cats: Rajesh Gopal, Bivash Banerji, R. Raghu Prasad, Sunil Sharma, Tashi Dorji, Renae Stenhouse, Ruchi Pant, Dipankar Ghose, Arundhati Mohanty

Indonesia CIWT: Achmad Pribadi, Iwan Kurniawan, Sustyo Iriyono, Kaavya Varma, Muhammad Yadav, Weni Andriana, Hidayat Abdillah, Risau Budiarti, Doni Erlanga

Indonesia CONSERVE: Wahdi Azmi, Indra Explorations, Fifin Nopiansyah, Badiah Achmad Sayat, Kaavya Varma, Iwan Kurniawan, Muhammad Yadav Aftanto


Malawi: William Mgoola, Nicholas Stephen Zmijewski, Brighton Kumchedwa, Daoulos Mauambeta, Mary Chilimampunga, Titus Zulu, Maurice Makuwila, Mphatso Kalemba, Wisely Kawaye

Malaysia: Khairul Naim Bin Adham, Aizalasni Binti Anuar, Beatrice Aten Ajeng Laing, Mohd Rashid Bin Sarmin, Solene Le Doze, Pek Chuan Gan, Nawaraj Chhetri, Ange (Seok Ling Tan), Ka Han Le, Clara Yan Yi Wei

Mali: N’dje Hamay, Modibo Konate, Charles Tamou, Oumar Tamboura, Fatoumata Doucoure, Djakaridja Coulilaly

Mozambique: Lolita Hilario Fondo, Jorge Fernando, Kaavya Varmay, Eunice Mucache, Goetz Schorth, Cidália Mahumane, Emir Amade, Mike Marchington, Hilario Patricio, Richard Musarara

Namibia: Raill Hashheela-Haipinge, Burton Julius, Bennett Kahuure, Jose Kaumba, Onesimus Muhwezi, Uazamo Kaura, Christian Shingoro, Martha Ndove, Cameron Kandjji, Isaskar Uahoo, Helena Shiweda, Siegfried Tjipto, Martha Kasongo, Elton Emula, Victory Hamushila, David Shihepo

Pakistan: Fauzia Bilqis Malik, Syed Asif Hyder Shah, Ifikhar ul Hasan Shah Gilani, Anshuman Saikia, Mahmood Akhtar Cheema, Saeed Abbas

Panama: Ricardo Moreno, Jose Victoria, Eric Neufz, Cándida Somarriba, Natalia Young, Arturo Puertes, Guillermo McPhearson, Elba Cortés, Robert Erath

South Africa IWT: Mercedes Marele, Charles Bopape, Jane Nimpamya, Simon Malate, Sipho Mabunda, Carol Poole, Matthew Child, Olga Kumalo, Mpho Tjiane, Molefe Lebethe, Marisa Coetzee, Moscow Marumo, Nita Viljoen, Linda Hlengwa, Lindie Botha


South Africa WBE: Wayne Erlank, Lucia Motloung, Sarah Moyer, Jane Nimpamya, Simon Malete, Frances Craigie, Wendy Tripe

Tanzania: Theotimos Rwegasira, Fortunata Msolle, Onesimus Muhwezi, Gertrude Lyatuu, Elisante Ombeni, Dasas Masologo, Martha Delphinus, Sikuju Juma, Tulumbaba Bangu, Sawiche Wamuza, Alessandra Rossi, Mussa Dighesh, Renatus Kusamba, Deusdedit Fidelis, Abraham E. Mulokoz, Eluupendo Laltaika, Lazaro Msowere

Thailand: Klairoong Poonpon, Prasert Sornsathapornkul, Solene Le Doze, Khan Ram-Indra, Sukanya Thonghumrong, Tippawan Sethapun

Zambia: Noel Muchimba, Silvia Mauri, Victoria Musonda, Francis Samalumo, Lewis Daka, Erastus Kancheya, Sinyala Nyirongo, Edward Chilufya, Godfrey Phiri, Mushokabanji Likulanga, Leo Lwizi, Arthur Asumani

Zimbabwe: Chipangura Chirara, Edward Samurirwo, Onesimus Muhwezi, Jeremiah Mushoshio, Emelie Isaksen, Yvonne Chingarande, Sekai Mativenga