



Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

9799

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

Project Title

Promoting Conservation, Sustainable Utilization and Fair and Equitable Benefit-sharing from Lesotho's Medicinal and Ornamental Plants for Improved livelihoods

Countries

Lesotho

Agency(ies)

UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s)

Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Biodiversity

Sector

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Biodiversity, Supplementary Protocol to the CBD, Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Productive Landscapes, Species, Threatened Species, Biomes, Wetlands, Grasslands, Influencing models, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Stakeholders, Type of Engagement, Participation,

Information Dissemination, Partnership, Consultation, Beneficiaries, Private Sector, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Capital providers, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, Civil Society, Non-Governmental Organization, Academia, Community Based Organization, Communications, Behavior change, Strategic Communications, Awareness Raising, Education, Local Communities, Indigenous Peoples, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender-sensitive indicators, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Women groups, Gender results areas, Capacity Development, Participation and leadership, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Access and control over natural resources, Access to benefits and services, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Knowledge Generation, Learning, Adaptive management, Indicators to measure change, Theory of change

Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation

No Contribution 0

Climate Change Adaptation

No Contribution 0

Biodiversity

Land Degradation

Duration

60In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

276,801.00

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-3_P8	Outcome 8.1: Legal and regulatory frameworks, and administrative procedures established that enable access to genetic resources and benefit sharing in accordance with the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol	GET	2,913,699.00	4,500,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			2,913,699.00	4,500,000.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To promote conservation, sustainable use and improved access and benefit-sharing from Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) products derived from selected Medicinal Plants in selected Highlands and Foothill areas of Lesotho

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
1. Enabling institutional capacity and regulatory framework strengthened to support implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS	Technical Assistance	<p>1.1: Functional national ABS policy and regulatory framework operational and supportive of ABS from the use of genetic resources</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> <i>ABS policy-, legal- and regulatory ? framework with gender considerations in place:</i> a) <i>ABS incorporated into the National Environmental Policy and the Biodiversity Bill; b) ABS in TK regulations; and c) IP rights guidelines related to ABS in place</i></p> <p>1.2: Capacity of national institutions to develop, implement and enforce national</p>	<p>Output 1.1.1: National Environment Policy of 1998 and Biodiversity Bill of 2018 reviewed to address ABS in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: National ABS, bioprospecting, TK, and intellectual property rights (IPRs) regulations developed, reviewed, and presented to parliament for approval.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: Local/Community Councils By-laws in the prioritized districts (guidelines) on ABS reviewed and finalized considering national frameworks on ABS and Biodiversity</p> <p>Output 1.1.4: ABS and TK Strategy developed.</p> <p>1.2.1: National Focal Point, Competent</p>	GET	538,947.00	1,475,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
		legislative, administrative or policy measures on ABS strengthened	National Authorities and Checkpoints capacity enhanced.			
		<u>Indicator:</u> <i>Improved capacity of institutions to develop, implement, and enforce ABS policies and regulations increased as measured by the UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard (please refer to Annex A, Indicator 5 for individual scores)</i>	1.2.2: Institutional Capacity Development Strategy for the ABS framework implementation, monitoring, enforcement and compliance developed and rolled-out.			
		1.3: Management, ownership and access rights, rules and procedures over access and utilization of genetic resources defined, clarified and encoded in the legal system (e.g. by-laws/	1.2.3: National guidelines for enforcing ABS regulatory framework developed and implemented			
			1.3.1: Guidelines and procedures for obtaining Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) developed and approved.			
			1.3.2: Biocultural community protocols governing management, ownership, access rights and benefit sharing rules and procedures			

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
		community protocols)	defined and adopted.			
		<p><u>Indicator:</u> <i>Administrative procedures for users and providers of genetic resources to develop, implement and monitor ABS agreements with proper Prior Informed Consent (PIC), Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) and Benefit Sharing (BS) principles and guidelines:</i></p>	<p>1.3.3: Codes of conduct, best-practices, and standards that ensure sustainable harvesting, fair and equitable benefit-sharing established for industry and research sectors active in bioprospecting.</p>			
		<p>a) <i>Guidelines and procedures for obtaining PIC and MAT</i></p>				
		<p>b) <i>Biocultural community protocols</i></p>				

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------	------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------

*governing
ABS*

*c) Codes of
conduct,
best-
practices
and
standards
for equitable
benefit-
sharing*

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
2. Building capacities for bioprospecting and value-addition of genetic resources	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 2.1: Opportunities for bioprospecting strengthened with improved research capabilities to add value to genetic resources, measured by:</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> <i>200 people trained to promote bioprospecting</i></p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> <i>At least three (3) research centres equipped</i></p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> <i>At least two (2) research collaborations agreements established between users (researchers and academia)</i></p>	<p>Output 2.1.1: National research and development strategy on bioprospecting, including role of traditional medicinal practitioners developed and implemented</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: National research centres (e.g., NUL, Department of Agricultural Research, and Katse Botanical Garden) strengthened and equipped to conduct R&D on genetic resources of medicinal plants, in collaboration with traditional medical practitioners associations/groups and international partners on bioprospecting.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3: A comprehensive valuation of genetic resources with known commercial and intangible values (cultural and spiritual) conducted, includes surveys to assess their</p>	GET	1,849,972.00	2,275,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
		<p><i>and providers (ILCs) of genetic resources with considerations for gender equity.</i></p>	<p>conservation status.</p>			
		<p>Outcome 2.2: Enhanced capacity of key stakeholders, including ILCs especially women, to participate in ABS and bioprospecting processes</p>	<p>2.1.4 E-permitting system for bioprospectors in place.</p>			
		<p><u>Indicator:</u> <i>1,000 key/local stakeholders trained (50% men and 50% women).</i></p>	<p>Output 2.2.1: Training program for small/medium-scale community-based organizations and enterprises and for national parks implemented for: a) negotiation of PIC, MAT, and ABS agreements; b) development of community protocols; and c) contribution of ABS to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.</p>			
			<p>Output 2.2.2: Experience exchange program raises awareness about regional/international ABS initiatives.</p>			
			<p>Output 2.3.2: Model biocultural community protocol</p>			

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------	------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------

developed considering medicinal plants with potential for bioprospecting.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
3. Gender Mainstreaming and Knowledge Management	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 3.1: Gender mainstreaming, lessons learned by the project through participatory M&E are used to guide adaptive management, collate and share lessons, in support of up-scaling</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> 50% women/ 50% men (including herders) differentiated by age benefiting from project interventions</p> <p>Outcome 3.2: Awareness on sustainable utilization, conservation and access to and benefit sharing from the use of genetic resources enhanced</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> increase</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1 Gender strategy developed and used to guide project implementation, monitoring and reporting.</p> <p>Output 3.2.1: Knowledge, attitudes, practices, and behavior (KAP/B) assessment/surveys carried out and an awareness-raising programme developed and implemented on ABS.</p> <p>Output 3.2.2: Participatory monitoring, evaluation and learning strategy developed and implemented to support project management, collate and disseminate lessons.</p>	GET	250,383.00	250,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
		<i>from 71.0% to 75.94% in the level of awareness among key stakeholders about the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS (measured by KAP/B index)</i>				
4. Monitoring & Evaluation	Technical Assistance	Outcome 4.1 Participatory M&E are used to guide adaptive management, collate and share lessons, in support of up-scaling	Output 4.1.1: Participatory monitoring, evaluation and learning strategy developed and implemented to support project management, collate and disseminate lessons.	GET	135,650.00	
Sub Total (\$)					2,774,952.00	4,000,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
				GET	138,747.00	500,000.00
				Sub Total(\$)	138,747.00	500,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)					2,913,699.00	4,500,000.00

Please provide justification

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)	In-kind	3,475,000.00
Other	National University of Lesotho (NUL)	In-kind	525,000.00
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	500,000.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)			4,500,000.00

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Lesotho	Biodiversity		No	2,913,699	276,801	3,190,500.00
Total Grant Resources(\$)						2,913,699.00	276,801.00	3,190,500.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required **true**

PPG Amount (\$)

100,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

9,500

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Lesotho	Biodiversity		No	100,000	9,500	109,500.00
Total Project Costs(\$)						100,000.00	9,500.00	109,500.00

Core Indicators

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Submitted

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		10,042		
Male		9,489		
Total	0	19531	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description

A.1. Project Description.

A.1. Project Description.

1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed.

1. Originally, project component 2 was designed to promote the sustainable utilization and conservation of selected commercially- important medicinal plants for the development of ABS products for the pharmaceutical sector. However, as pointed out per the GEF Sec the actual R&D activities to be carried out in the three target species were unclear and the proposed activities related more to bio-trade of a commodity, and not to the value chains of products derived from R&D. To address these issues, the GEF Sec suggested a conference call to discuss these matters before a re-submission of the project and recommend that Project Component 2 be reformulated focusing on developing national capacities for bioprospecting and value-addition of genetic resources rather than focusing in R&D on specific medicinal plants/species.

2. Based on the above recommendation from the GEF Sec, the barriers that need to be addressed were updated to indicate that the lack of R&D of genetic resources prevent the equitable sharing of the benefits (both monetary and non-monetary) with the holders of traditional knowledge and holders of the resources; and that the weak enabling policy and regulatory environment together with limited capacity at the national and local level to conduct R&D are the main barriers to establishing formal ABS arrangements.

2) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects. NA

3) The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area[1]¹ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.

3. As indicated previously, project component 2 was reformulated; however, components 1 and 3 are closely aligned to the original PIF. The changes made to the project's outputs as a result of this reformulation are presented below. A description of the project components is provided in **Section V: Results and Partnerships of the Project Document**. These changes are described as follows:

PIF Outputs (Component 1)	Project Document Outputs (Component 1)
---------------------------	--

<p>Output 1.1.2.: National ABS regulations developed and presented to Parliament for approval</p>	<p>Output 1.1.2: National ABS, bioprospecting, TK, and intellectual property rights (IPRs) regulations developed, updated reviewed, and presented to parliament for approval.</p> <p>Development of national regulations was expanded to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? bioprospecting and TK regulations for the implementation of activities under Component 2 (this need was identified during a participatory process conducted as part of the PPG) ? intellectual property rights (IPR) regulations, to develop local rights to intellectual property (as recommended by STAP).
<p>Not included</p>	<p>Output 1.1.3: Local/Community Councils By-laws (guidelines) in the prioritized districts on ABS reviewed and finalized considering national frameworks on ABS and Biodiversity.</p> <p>This output was added to establish consistency and close the gaps between the national- and local-level ABS regulations. Note that, despite the fact that Lesotho does not have a national ABS policy or regulatory framework in place, at the local level, local/community councils? by-laws for accessing and using genetic resources, including medicinal plants, have already been developed. The addition of this Output will enable the implementation of ABS/NP-related activities through Component 2 in the prioritized districts (Qacha?s Nek, Leribe, Butha-Buthe, and Quthing).</p>
<p>Output 1.1.3: Proposed interim ABS and Traditional Knowledge Strategy reviewed and finalized for approval</p>	<p>Output 1.1.4: ABS and TK Strategy developed.</p> <p>The wording of this output was simplified, but the scope of the output remains the same.</p>
<p>Output 1.2.1: National Focal Point, Competent National Authorities and Checkpoints identified and supported with training and technical capacity building to implement the ABS framework and to monitor and enforce compliance</p>	<p>Output 1.2.1: National Focal Point, Competent National Authorities and Checkpoints capacity enhanced.</p> <p>The wording of this output was simplified, but the scope of the output remains the same.</p>
<p>Not included</p>	<p>Output 1.2.3: National guidelines for enforcing ABS regulatory framework developed and implemented.</p> <p>This output was added so that the country will have guidelines available for decision-makers and checkpoints to assist them in enforcing the regulation that will be developed through Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, and 1.1.3.</p>

<p>Not included</p>	<p>Output 1.2.4: A national clearing-house mechanism in place to assist in the collection, provision, and dissemination of ABS information.</p> <p>This output was included to facilitate access to information by users and providers of genetic resources, to create transparency, and highlight aspects related to implementation of the NP on ABS in Lesotho. In addition, it will facilitate decision-making and co-ordination among different stakeholders interested in implementing ABS-related initiatives.</p>
<p>PIF Outputs (Component 2):</p>	<p>Project Document Outputs (Component 2)</p>
<p>Output 2.1.1: National research and development strategy on bioprospecting</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1: National research and development strategy on bioprospecting, including role of traditional practitioners developed and implemented.</p> <p>The role of traditional practitioners and herbalists with TK was added to this output to ensure their participation in all phases of future bioprospecting processes, including sample collection, isolation, characterization, and product development and commercialization. Modifying this Output to include the role of traditional practitioners and herbalists is part of the strategy of the project to develop local rights to intellectual property, as recommended by STAP.</p>
<p>Output 2.1.2: National University of Lesotho supported to conduct pharmacological research and development on selected genetic resources of medicinal value</p> <p>Output 2.2.2: National University of Lesotho's Innovation Hub supported to conduct R&D and natural product development for pharmaceutical and food and beverage use (with a focus on <i>P.sidoides</i> and <i>Hypoxis hemerocallidea</i>)</p>	<p>Output 2.1.2: National research centres (e.g., NUL Department of Agricultural Research, and Katse Botanical Garden) strengthened to conduct R&D on genetic resources of medicinal plants, in collaboration with traditional medical practitioners associations /groups and international partners on bioprospecting.</p> <p>Output 2.1.2 and Output 2.2.2 were merged into a single output and reformulated to include additional national research centres that may benefit from improving their capacity to conduct R&D on genetic resources of medicinal plants. Reference to <i>P. sidoides</i> and <i>H. hemerocallidea</i> was removed as the project will no longer focus on these medicinal plants.</p> <p>-</p>

<p>Output 2.1.3: A comprehensive valuation of selected genetic resources with known commercial value conducted</p>	<p>Output 2.1.3: A comprehensive valuation of selected genetic resources with known commercial and intangible values (cultural and spiritual) conducted includes surveys to assess their conservation status.</p> <p>The valuation of intangible values (cultural and spiritual) was added based on consultation with and suggestions from healers, herbalists, and local community representatives. The project will also take advantage of this assessment to determine the conservation status of genetic resources focusing on plant species of known commercial and cultural value.</p>
<p>Not included</p>	<p>2.1.4. E-permitting system for bio prospectors in place.</p> <p>This output was included to allow the country to have an electronic permit system to apply for permits for bioprospecting, including when traditional knowledge is involved, and for government authorities to review and approve applications more effectively. It will also allow monitoring compliance and will serve as source of information that will feed into the national CHM (Output 1.2.4).</p>
<p>Output 2.2.1: Small-scale community-based enterprises supported with business and value-addition skills to harvest, process, package and market natural products from selected genetic resources</p>	<p>Output 2.2.1: Training program for small/medium-scale community-based organizations and enterprises and for national parks implemented for: a) negotiation of PIC, MAT, and ABS agreements; b) development of community protocols; and c) contribution of ABS to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>This output was reformulated so that small/medium-scale community-based organizations, enterprises, and staff from national parks will have the necessary skills to participate in future ABS and bioprospecting processes, and for a better understating of linkages between access to genetic resources and their utilization and the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of its components.</p>

<p>Output 2.2.2: National University of Lesotho's Innovation Hub supported to conduct R&D and natural product development for pharmaceutical and food and beverage use (with a focus on <i>P.sidoides</i> and <i>Hypoxis hemerocallidea</i>)</p>	<p>Output 2.2.2: Experience exchange program raises awareness about regional/international ABS initiatives</p> <p>This output was reformulated as part of the strategy to enhance the capacity of local stakeholders to participate in bioprospecting. Activities related to this output will allow local community members from the prioritized districts (Qacha's Nek, Leribe, Butha-Buthe, and Quthing) and staff from national research centres interested in bioprospecting to interact with peers from other countries already involved in bioprospecting and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from the use of genetic resources and traditional knowledge.</p>
<p>Not included</p>	<p>Output 2.2.3: Model biocultural community protocol developed considering medicinal plants with potential for bioprospecting.</p> <p>This output was included to address aspects of traditional knowledge related to genetic resources and the in situ conservation of medicinal plants, and to serve as a model on how to engage local community and traditional healers with bioprospectors, including defining clear terms and conditions for the government, the private sector, and researchers for engaging with them and accessing their local resources and knowledge.</p>
<p>Output 2.3.1: The <i>Pelargonium</i> Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) adopted and implemented in close collaboration between the <i>Pelargonium</i> Working Group in South Africa, and community enterprises and CSO stakeholders in Lesotho</p>	<p>This output was removed as the project will no longer work with <i>Pelargonium sidoides</i> or other species prioritized at the time of the PIF or during the first submission of the CEO Endorsement Request.</p>
<p>2.3.2: ABS agreements with monetary and non-monetary benefits negotiated between providers and users of <i>P. sidoides</i> (locally known as Khoara).</p>	<p>This output was removed as the project will no longer work with <i>Pelargonium sidoides</i> or other of the species prioritized at the time of the PIF or during the first submission of the CEO Endorsement Request.</p>
<p>Output 2.3.3: Model ABS agreements cognisant of the pharmaceutical business models, developed/ reviewed and implemented for <i>P. sidoides</i> with a focus on medium enterprises and exporters</p>	<p>This output was removed as the project will no longer work with <i>Pelargonium sidoides</i> or other of the species prioritized at the time of the PIF or during the first submission of the CEO Endorsement Request.</p>
<p>PIF Outputs (Component 3)</p>	<p>Project Document Outputs (Component 3)</p>
<p>Component 3: Gender Mainstreaming, Knowledge Management, and M&E.</p>	<p>This component has been split into two to cater for a separate one for Monitoring and Evaluation. These changes have been reflected in the results framework and budget table of the project document.</p>

<p>Outcome 3.1: Gender mainstreaming lessons learned by the project through participatory M&E are used to guide adaptive management, collate and share lessons, in support of upscaling.</p>	<p>This outcome has been split into two to create a separate one for M&E under Component 4.: 3.1: Gender mainstreaming and lessons learned are used to guide adaptive management, collate and share lessons, in support of upscaling. 4.1: Participatory M&E results are used to guide adaptive management, collate and share lessons, in support of up-scaling. Indicator 12 has been introduced to measure outcome 4.1.</p>
<p>Output 3.2.2: Participatory monitoring, evaluation, and learning strategy developed and implemented to support project management, collate and disseminate lessons.</p>	<p>Output has been changed to 4.1.1 in line with the new Component (4) and outcome (4.1).</p>

4. Direct Project Costs (DPCs) have been removed from the GEF project grant budget. However, based on the implementing partner risk rating and government request for execution support services, Direct Project costs will be charged to UNDP co-financing funds to the project.

4) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF and co-financing.

5. There were no changes to the incremental/additional cost reasoning and approach as the project will no longer support the sustainable utilization and conservation of selected commercially- important medicinal plants for the development of ABS products for the pharmaceutical sector. Instead and as per GEF Sec recommendations, the project will focus on building local capacities for bioprospecting and value-addition of genetic resources. This will include strengthening opportunities for bioprospecting with improved research capabilities to add value to genetic resources, and enhancing capacity of key stakeholders, including ILCs especially women, to participate in ABS and bioprospecting processes.

5) Global environmental benefits (GEFTF).

6. Following revised scope of the project based on GEF Sec guidance, the project will target 19,531 (women: 10,042; men: 9,489) direct beneficiaries in line with core indicator 11 through the institutional strengthening and capacity building interventions.

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up. ?

7. An updated description of the project's innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scaling-up is included in the Project Document: **Section V. Results and Partnerships** (South-South and Triangular Cooperation [SSTrC] and Sustainability and Scaling-Up).

[1] For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives

and programs, please also describe which **Aichi Target(s)** the project will directly contribute to achieving..

A.2. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

Please refer to **Annex F** of the Project Document.

1. The successful implementation of the project will depend largely on effective communication and coordination with the multiple project stakeholders, and the implementation of mechanisms to ensure the participation of these stakeholders. The key national and sub-national stakeholders include the **Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)**; the Department of Environment (DoE); the Department of Science and Technology (DST); the Ministry of Forestry, Range, and Soil Conservation (MFRSC); the Ministry of Health (MoH); the Ministry of Water (MoW); the Ministry of Trade and Industry, Cooperatives, and Marketing (MTICM); the Ministry of Local Government, Chieftainship, and Parliamentary Affairs (MLGCPA); the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS); among others. At the local level, the most relevant stakeholders are communities and community groups (e.g., traditional healers, herders, custodians, harvesters, users and TK holders), including women's groups, and they are the primary beneficiaries of the project as they will participate in the key project activities **such as: training in the negotiation of PIC, MAT, and development of ABS agreements; and participation in an experience exchange program to raise awareness and build knowledge base regarding R&D and strengthening ABS value chains and their contribution to the conservation of biodiversity. Private sector agencies will benefit from an e-permitting system to apply for permits for bioprospecting and from activities directed on how to engage ILCs in ABS-related initiatives, particularly in bioprospecting.** In addition, research institutions such as the National University of Lesotho (NUL), **the Department of Agricultural Research,** and the Katse Botanical Garden will also benefit from research training, valuation skills, **and R&D equipment.** The extensive stakeholder consultations and engagement that began during the PPG phase will be continued throughout project implementation. To achieve this the project will make use of several mechanisms, including: a) Project Inception Workshop: the project will be presented to both direct stakeholders and the public; b) Project Board: comprised of representatives of the government agencies, private sector, and special interest groups, and will be responsible for approving the work plans, participation in the recruitment processes, and provide overall strategic guidance to the project; c) Project Management Unit (PMU): responsible for the implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan, communications plan, gender action plan, grievance redress mechanisms, and M&E; d) Communication and Dissemination of Information: the PMU will implement a stakeholder awareness plan to ensure communication with all stakeholders using a variety of methods (meetings, listserv, webpage, social media, etc.); the project will hire the services of a Communications/Knowledge Management Expert to achieve the objectives of the plan, and will have active knowledge management with the documentation of processes and lessons learned that will be shared with all stakeholders; in addition, updating the KAP/B index will allow assessing the project's impact on awareness levels about ABS, the sustainable use and conservation of medicinal plants, and gender; e) Local project committees will be established where project activities will be implemented;

through these committees, local partners will have the opportunity to participate in decision making with regard to project management, including implementation of plans and project reviews, and also with respect to the technical aspects of the project; f) Gender Action Plan: will secure the involvement of both genders, especially women and herders who are often marginalized and whose participation in natural resource management activities is low compared to men; a Gender/Safeguards Officer will be hired part-time to support gender mainstreaming and gender monitoring (Gender Action Plan) and monitoring of environmental and social risks; g) Grievance Mechanism: will be established and published so that all stakeholders are aware of its existence, documenting any potential grievances and ensuring they are addressed in a timely manner; h) Activities, Training, and Engagement Plans: will use a participatory approach that is rights-based and integrates the perspectives of all stakeholders using bottom-up approaches and integrating the different views of local stakeholders and beneficiaries; and i) Decentralized M&E: including meetings with the local committees, interviews with direct beneficiaries, local and national participatory workshops, and meetings with special groups such as women and herders to verify indicators. Communications/Knowledge Management Expert will work closely with the M&E Advisor on knowledge management and M&E aspects of the project.

? Select what role civil society will play in the project:

- Select what role civil society will play in the project:
- Consulted only;
- Member of Advisory Body; contractor;
- Co-financier;
- Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;
- Executor or co-executor;
- Other (Please explain)

Documents

Title	Submitted
5891 Annex G_ Herders Engagement Plan_Rev February2023	
Annex F_ Stakeholders Engagement Plan	

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body; Yes

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

1. Seventy per cent of the Basotho population lives in rural areas compared to 30% in urban areas[1]. 35% of rural households are headed by females[2]². There are significant gender differences in the prevalence of poverty in Lesotho whereby 58.1 per cent of households headed by a single mother are poor as against 48.4 per cent of households headed by a single father (World Bank, 2015). Gender roles and gender relations are very important considerations in natural resource management in general and in the promotion, conservation and sustainable utilization of locally available medicinal plants for improved livelihoods in particular. The knowledge around, and use of medicinal plants is part of the cultural heritage of the Basotho as well as a very important livelihood survival strategy, particularly in the rural areas where rural inhabitants are desperately far away from the majority of rural health services. The National Vision 2020 articulates that Lesotho "will be a country that has a healthy and well-developed human resource base, with a well-managed environment. It further notes that gender sensitivity should be one of the key characteristics of the development of Lesotho as a stable democracy and that there should be no gender disparities by the year 2020. With regard to the environment and access and benefit sharing, the Gender and Development Policy (2003) argues "gender relations are intertwined with environmental and natural resource management. Due to the traditional orientation the marginalized groups' needs and rights have been overlooked, potential hazards ignored and opportunities for better environmental protection and development missed". Despite the existence of progressive laws across several sectors discriminatory institutions and structures, coupled with patriarchal ideology and social norms, continue to limit women's full empowerment and progress in the country[3]³. This is reflected in low participation and representation of women in the political and economic decision making despite the gains they have made in education. , While more than 30 per cent of households in rural areas own livestock, only 30.5 per cent of that is owned by women and males' ownership is higher at 69.5 per cent[4]⁴. The social construction of females makes herding of livestock a gender role for males, as girls are socialized into undertaking reproductive roles, it is difficult for them to assume these roles when they grow.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment? (yes /no) If yes, please upload gender action plan or equivalent here.

Gender Action Plan						
Component 1: Enabling institutional capacity and regulatory frameworks strengthened to support implementation of the Nagoya protocol on ABS.						
Output 1.1.1: National Environment Policy of 1998 and Biodiversity Bill of 2021 reviewed to address ABS in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol.						
Output 1.1.2: National ABS, Bio-prospecting and TK Regulations developed, reviewed, updated and presented to Parliament for approval.						
Output 1.1.3: Local/Community Councils By-laws guidelines in the prioritized districts on ABS reviewed and finalized considering national frameworks on ABS and Biodiversity.						
Output 1.1.4: ABS and TK Strategy developed.						
<i>Gender-related activity</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Budget (USD)</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
Identify and analyse gaps regarding the ABS and the Nagoya Protocol of existing National Environment Policy, Biodiversity Bill, and other regulations with a gender perspective and in consultation with key stakeholders.	Number of related ABS laws, policies, guidelines, strategy and regulations developed, revised with gender mainstreamed	Five (5) policies & regulations instruments revised: - National Environment policy; - Biodiversity Act - ABS in TK regulations -IP rights guidelines related to ABS - TK Strategy	0	4,680	Year 1	Project Management Unit: Project Gender Expert; Department of Gender; Department of Environment; Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA); Ministry of Law & Constitutional Affairs; Traditional Healers Association
Output 1.2.2 Institutional Capacity Development strategy for ABS framework implementation, monitoring enforcement and compliance developed and rolled out						

Validation of gender needs and gaps considering PPG capacity assessment results and through consultations with prioritized stakeholders	Number of gender responsive analyses of biodiversity and genetic resources management completed.	Three (3) Gender specific analyses: - Gender Audit - Participatory Poverty Assessment - Gender Responsive Budget Analysis	0	8,500	<i>Year 1</i>	Project Management Unit; Gender Expert; Department of Gender; Department of Environment; WLSA.
Develop gender analysis tools for the collection of gender-specific data on biodiversity management and genetic resources use to inform baseline	Number of gender analysis tools for the collection of gender disaggregated data	Two (2) gender responsive data collection tools developed: - Gender Mainstreaming Systems: a) Gender Check lists; b) Gender Matrices	0			
Provide gender equality sensitization training to key project stakeholders including policy makers in the DoE and local level stakeholders for mainstreaming gender in project activities.	Percent of key project implementers demonstrating capacity to mainstream gender in all project documents and activities.	75 percent	10 percent of understanding of mainstreaming gender issues in the sector (KAP/B Index)			
Conduct gender responsive training and capacity building for the collection of gender specific data and use in the development of policies and guidelines to build national and local capacity.	Number of gender responsive training events for the collection of gender specific data in support of project activities.	At least 4 training events: 2 national level and 2 at the local level for the four sites.	No capacity in gender training			<i>Year 1&2</i>

Provide training targeted at women to strengthen their ability to take on leadership roles in ABS negotiations and agreements.	Percent of women participating in ABS agreements	At least 50 percent	0 percent	12,000	Year 1	Gender Expert Department of Gender WLSA & Gender Links
Output 1.3.2: Guideline for developing bio-cultural community protocols governing management, ownership, access rights and benefit sharing rules and procedures defined and adopted						
Establish genetic product development committees with women representation	Percentage of women participating in project committees	At least 50 percent	0 percent	2,400	Year 1&2	Gender Expert Community Councils Department of Gender
Component 2: Building capacities for bioprospecting and value-addition of genetic resources						
Output 2.1.2: National research centres (e.g., NUL, Department of Agricultural Research, and Katse Botanical Garden) strengthened to conduct R&D on genetic resources of medicinal plants, in collaboration with traditional medical practitioners associations /groups and international partners on bioprospecting						
Output 2.2.1: Training program for small/medium-scale community-based organizations and enterprises and for national parks implemented for: a) negotiation of PIC, MAT, and ABS agreements; b) development of community protocols; and c) contribution of ABS to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity						
Output 2.2.1: Experience exchange program raises awareness about regional/international ABS initiatives						
Output 2.2.3: Model biocultural community protocol developed considering medicinal plants with potential for bioprospecting						
Capacity building and technical exchanges to strengthen skills of women experts and technical staff of national research centres for bioprospecting	Percentage of women participating in value chains opportunities for women entrepreneurs	At least 50 percent	0 percent	21,900	Years 1 to 4	Gender Expert Research centres

Capacity building for women-based organizations and women-owned business with regard to: a) negotiation of PIC, MAT, and ABS agreements; b) development of community protocols; and c) contribution of ABS to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity	Percent of women enterprises benefiting from training	At least 50 percent	0 percent	133,000	Years 1 to 4	Gender expert, Women groups
Participation of women in experience exchange program to learn about regional/international ABS initiatives	Percentage of women participating	At least 50 percent	0 percent			
Participation of women in the development of a model biocultural community protocol	Percentage of women participating	At least 50 percent	0 percent	20,000	Years 2 to 5	Gender Expert
Component 3: Gender Mainstreaming & Knowledge Management						
Output 3.1.1 Gender Mainstreaming strategy developed and used to guide project implementation, monitoring and reporting.						
<i>Gender-related activity</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
Develop a gender mainstreaming strategy to guide implementation, monitoring and reporting of project activities	Ratio of women/men including herders by age benefiting from all project interventions.	50/50 (according to the PRF)	Institutional Gender mainstreaming strategy not in place	Paid through Component 3 budget (Gender Expert, Communications Expert and travel costs)	Years 1 to 2	Gender Expert Department of Gender.
Output 3.2.1 Knowledge, attitudes, practices, and behavior (KAP/B) assessment/surveys carried out and an awareness-raising programme developed and implemented on ABS						

Conduct project surveys and gender disaggregated data collection for baseline and ensure that a proportionate number of men and women respondents are included.	Percent of men and women respondents participating in project surveys to collect gender disaggregated data	100%	0%	Paid through Component 3 budget (Gender Expert, Communications Expert and travel costs)	<i>Years 1 to 2</i>	Communication and Knowledge Management Expert Gender Expert
Develop materials to document women experiences and to raise public awareness about women's needs and interests regarding biodiversity conservation and medicinal plants	Percent of training materials, public awareness materials, and curricula developed in biodiversity conservation, and sustainable harvesting including women experiences	At least 50 percent women	0 percent			
Integrate women's experiences into knowledge products that will incorporate institutional strengthening and capacity building initiatives, for continued institutional and private sector learning and activity implementation.	Number of knowledge products reflecting women's experiences in medicinal plants, conservation, harvesting and trade.	100 percent	0 percent			
<i>Component 4. Monitoring and Evaluation</i>						
<i>Output 4.1.1. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation and Learning strategy developed and implemented to support project management, collate and disseminate lessons.</i>						

Monitor and track indicators in the project results framework, including gender related indicators disaggregated for men and women	Percent of gender responsive indicators in project reporting, monitoring and evaluation tracked.	100 percent	0 percent	Paid through Component 3 budget (Gender Expert and travel costs)	Years 1 to 5	Gender Expert M&E Expert UNDP
Include sex disaggregated data into the project information management database for the four prioritized Project sites	Percent of sex disaggregated data for the four prioritized project sites included in the information management database	100 percent	0 percent		Years 1 to 2	Gender Expert BOS, DoE
Total budget allocation (percent or amount):				USD	202,480	

3 African Development Bank 2013

4 Bureau of Statistics, (2014a), ?2010/2011 Household Budget Survey: Analytical Report Vol. 1?, Bureau of Statistics, Maseru, November 2014

Documents

Title	Submitted
Annex H_ Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan	

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

- # of direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by sex (19,531 people with project benefits (male: 9,489; female: 10,042).
- ABS policy-, legal- and regulatory ? framework with gender considerations.
- At least two (2) collaboration agreements established between users (researchers and academia) and providers (ILCs) of genetic resources with considerations for gender equity.
- 1,000 key/local stakeholders trained (50% men and 50% women)
- 50% women/ 50% men (including herders) differentiated by age benefitting from project interventions.

A.5. Risks

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

An updated description of the project's risk is included in **Annex 6: UNDP Risk Registrar** of the Project Document. Based on application of UNDP's standard Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), the overall project risk categorization is moderate (see Annex 5). The key risks relate to unsustainable harvesting of target species (Standard 1.13); and excluding herders in benefit sharing (Standard 4.5 and 6.9). Appropriate mitigation measures to avoid or minimize the potential negative impacts have been elaborated in the SESP.

Annex 6: UNDP Risk Register

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	Risk Owner (including account manager/ the)
1	There is a risk that overharvesting of species in the wild continues unregulated or increases even under regulation.	As a result of demonstrated monetary benefits from ABS agreements	Which will impact the long-term survival of the targeted species	1. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL (1.4. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management) - UNDP Risk Appetite: CAUTIOUS	Likelihood: 3 - Moderately likely Impact: 3 - Intermediate Risk level: MODERATE (equates to a risk appetite of EXPLORATORY)	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR
2	There is a risk that lack of coordination between the different stakeholders (national government agencies and/or district local authorities, private sector, research and academic institutions and communities (e.g. harvesters, traders) operating in the biological and	As a result of working in silos and mandate driven focus of sectors	Which will impact harmonization of policies across sectors, inadequate information sharing, monitoring, and reporting on ABS related matters.	4. ORGANIZATIONAL (4.1. Governance) - UNDP Risk Appetite: EXPLORATORY TO OPEN	Likelihood: 2 - Low likelihood Impact: 3 - Intermediate Risk level: LOW (equates to a risk appetite of MINIMAL)	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	Risk Owner (including name and title)
	genetic resources sector.						
3	There is a risk that Climate change impacts negatively affect the ecosystems where these genetic and biological resources occur.	As a result of increased vulnerability and reduced resilience	Which will impact productivity, yield and sustainability of supply from target species	1. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL (1.5. Climate change and disaster risks) - UNDP Risk Appetite: CAUTIOUS	Likelihood: 3 - Moderately likely Impact: 3 - Intermediate Risk level: MODERATE (equates to a risk appetite of EXPLORATORY)	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR bbbb
4	There is a risk that duty-bearers may not have the capacity to meet their obligations to protect human rights, including the right to accessing information and participation, which may disproportionately	As a result of capacity gaps in knowledge, skills and resources	Which will impact ability of right holders to effectively benefit from the project investments.	1. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL (1.1. Human rights) - UNDP Risk Appetite: CAUTIOUS	Likelihood: 4 - Highly likely Impact: 2 - Minor Risk level: MODERATE (equates to a risk appetite of EXPLORATORY)	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	Risk Owner (including account manager the)
	<p>impact marginalized groups in the Project.</p>						

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	R O (ind acco J mar the
5	There is a risk that holders of traditional knowledge may not have the capacity to claim their rights to genetic resources and their traditional knowledge,	As a result of inadequate knowledge, skills and power to demand for their rights?	Which will lead to the exclusion of TK holders from the benefits of the project.	1. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL (1.7. Cultural heritage) - UNDP Risk Appetite: CAUTIOUS	Likelihood: 3 - Moderately likely Impact: 3 - Intermediate Risk level: MODERATE (equates to a risk appetite of EXPLORATORY)	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	Risk Owner (including account manager the)

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	R O (ind acco J mar the
6	There is a risk that local communities or individuals, may not have been given the opportunity, to raise human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process	As a result of inadequate consultations or approaches used to engage with stakeholders	Which will impact participation and benefits of marginalized populations.	1. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL (1.12. Stakeholder engagement) - UNDP Risk Appetite: CAUTIOUS	Likelihood: 1 - Not likely Impact: 1 - Negligible Risk level: LOW (equates to a risk appetite of MINIMAL)	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/U RR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	R O (including mar the
7	There is a risk that women could be excluded from the policy dialogue and decision-making processes, as well as from taking part in the bioprospecting and laboratory analyses of medicinal plants, further increasing their discrimination and vulnerability.	As a result of cultural patriarchal traditional institutions and beliefs	Which will impact in their ability to contribute and benefit from project investments?	1. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL (1.2. Gender equality and women's empowerment) - UNDP Risk Appetite: CAUTIOUS	Likelihood: 4 - Highly likely Impact: 2 - Minor Risk level: MODERATE (equates to a risk appetite of EXPLORATORY)	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	Risk Owner (including name and title)
8	There is a risk that the wider tangible and intangible dimensions of Cultural Heritage associated with	As a result of inadequate engagement of TK holders and herders during implementation	Which will impact the cultural integrity of TK bearers, traditional healers/herbalists	1. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL (1.7. Cultural heritage) - UNDP Risk Appetite: CAUTIOUS	Likelihood: 3 - Moderately likely Impact: 3 - Intermediate	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	R Over (including mar the
	the traditional methods of cultivation and harvesting of medicinal plants may be overlooked,	of project activities.	and herding groups.		Risk level: MODERATE (equates to a risk appetite of EXPLORATORY)		
						From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR
						From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	R O (ind acco J mar the
						From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/U RR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	Risk Owner (including name and title)
						From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR
9	There is a risk that although the ABS policy and regulatory framework would lead to benefits for TK bearers and herders in the	As a result of increased benefits and demand	Which will impact populations of target species in the wild.	3. OPERATIONAL (3.5. Partners? engagement) - UNDP Risk Appetite: EXPLORATORY TO OPEN	Likelihood: 3 - Moderately likely Impact: 3 - Intermediate Risk level:	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29 30-Sep-29	IP/URR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	Risk Owner (including account manager the)
	<p>project area, they may also, unintentionally, induce an intensification of the unsustainable harvesting of the medicinal plants in other regions of the country, because of their commercial value.</p>				<p>MODERATE (equates to a risk appetite of EXPLORATORY)</p>		

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	R O (including mar the
10	There is a risk that the establishment of a laboratory and the processing equipment for safety and efficacy of genetic-resource related products could lead to gender discrimination and to occupational safety and health risks.	As a result of inadequate awareness and training of workers on health and safety measures, and limited investment in occupational health and safety infrastructure.	Which will impact health of both men and women; reduce workers morale and productivity; reduce economic benefits for women	1. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL (1.10. Labour and working conditions) - UNDP Risk Appetite: CAUTIOUS	Likelihood: 3 - Moderately likely Impact: 2 - Minor Risk level: MODERATE (equates to a risk appetite of EXPLORATORY)	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR

#	Event	Cause	Impact(s)	Risk Category and Sub-category (including Risk Appetite)	Impact, Likelihood & Risk Level (see Annex 3 Risk Matrix)	Risk Valid From/To	Risk Owner (including name and title)
11	There is a risk that the spread of COVID-19 could pose a risk to the health of stakeholders during project implementation, particularly in activities that involve consultation.	As a result of person-to-person physical contacts	Which will impact the health and ability of stakeholders to effectively contribute to the project activities	1. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL (1.6. Community health, safety and security) - UNDP Risk Appetite: CAUTIOUS	Likelihood: 2 - Low likelihood Impact: 2 - Minor Risk level: LOW (equates to a risk appetite of MINIMAL)	From: 01-Mar-24 To: 30-Sep-29	IP/URR

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

1. Institutional arrangements are described in **Section VII: Governance and Management Arrangements** of the Project Document. In addition, an updated description of the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives is included in Section V. Results and Partnerships of the Project Document. The project will be implemented under UNDP's **assisted** national implementation modality (NIM) with CO support, in accordance with the established policies and procedures and in line with the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Lesotho, and the Country Programme. The institutional arrangements include the Project Board responsible for making by consensus, management decisions, including recommendations for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions, and addressing any project level grievances. The Project Board includes representation of the project owner, beneficiaries and development partner. The governance structure also includes UNDP quality assurance role, Project Management Unit, District-level Project Technical Committee and Local-level Project Implementation Committee.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The project will provide benefits to national and local level stakeholders, including community members, women, youth, and herder groups, healers and herbalists, and research groups interested in R&D within the framework of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. The project has a strong training component that will benefit the following: a) small/medium-scale community-based organizations and enterprises for the negotiation of PIC, MAT, and ABS agreements; the development of community protocols; and contribution of ABS to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; b) National Focal Point (DoE/MDNSE), Competent National Authorities (e.g., DoE/MDNSE) and Checkpoints (e.g., Lesotho Mounted Police Services, Lesotho Revenue Authority, Department of Lands, Surveys, and Physical Planning) with improved capacity to develop, implement, and enforce ABS/NP-related national legislative, administrative, or policy measures; c) extension officers of the MDNSE and MFRSC, including Park Managers, Park Rangers, District Environment Officers, Range Management Officers, and Forest Officers at district levels to monitor the use of plant genetic resources at the local level; d) local authorities, chiefs, community councils, and Community Conservation Forums (CCFs) with enhanced capacity for the protection, conservation, and management of natural resources, especially rangelands and associated genetic resources; and e) experts and technical staff from national research centres to conduct R&D of genetic resources. In addition, at least three national research centres (e.g., NUL, Department of Agricultural Research, and Katse Botanical Garden) will be equipped to conduct R&D on genetic resources, in collaboration with traditional medical practitioners and international partners. The project will also raise awareness among selected local communities in prioritized

landscapes on sustainable utilization, conservation and access to and benefit sharing from the use of genetic resources. The project will directly benefit 19,531 people (men: 9,489; women: 10,042).

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

Project Component 3: Gender Mainstreaming & Knowledge Management outlines the knowledge management strategy to promote learning through participatory processes, as well as communication and outreach on the project activities and the results of project interventions for **strengthening implementation of Nagoya Protocol on ABS** and gender mainstreaming. This strategy includes specific outputs on how best practices will be documented and experiences will be shared with stakeholders. This will include: a) conducting awareness and sensitization workshops for local authorities, traditional practitioners, and women regarding ABS; and b) documenting and sharing best practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming, medicinal plant product development, and TK. The project will have its own webpage to facilitate sharing knowledge and lessons learned, and a Communications/Knowledge Management Expert will be hired on a part-time basis to conduct communication and awareness-raising activities and will be responsible for the documentation and systematization of lessons learned and best practices. In addition, the results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through a number of existing UNDP information-sharing networks and forums. This may include participating in the community of practice and making use of South-South Cooperation mechanisms developed under the GEF ID 5731 (UNDP) global project *Strengthening Human Resources, Legal Frameworks and Institutional Capacities to Implement the Nagoya Protocol*. A description of the knowledge management approach for the project is provided in **Section IV: Results and Partnerships** of the Project Document.

A separate Component 4 (Monitoring and Evaluation) has been included in the results framework including indicator 12 and associated baseline and targets.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

The project is in line with several ongoing initiatives being carried out by the GoL for biodiversity conservation, sustainable use, and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of biological resources, and is consistent with the GoL's priorities as set out in national policy documents and plans and projects, including Vision 2020, National Strategic Development Plans (I and II) (NSDP), National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), Environment Act 2008, Biodiversity Resources Management Draft Bill

of 2018, National Range Resources Management Policy of 2014, and Ministry of Water No. 15 of 2008 Act, and the related Letšeng-la-Letsie Integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMP) 2013. The project will support the mainstreaming of the NP into these instruments and facilitate the creation of an enabling environment to facilitate the operationalization of an ABS system, in line with the NP.

The project is related to several priority activities under the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), which seeks to enable implementation of biodiversity conservation goals. These include the identification of the following: a) biological diversity components through research and compiling inventories to improve biodiversity conservation; b) processes likely to threaten Lesotho's biodiversity; c) and implementation of strategies that ensure the sustainable conservation of biodiversity components (PAs, resource management areas [RMAs], environmental resources management areas (ERMAs), botanical gardens, Maboeella); and d) enhanced management of Lesotho's unique wetland systems. In addition, the project is also aligned with the following activities under the NBSAP: a) strengthening of legal measures; b) development of human resources and improving the skills required for biodiversity management; c) increased participation of rural households in forest activities through their own initiatives, for their own purposes and under their own control; d) reformation of agricultural practices in Lesotho, management and constraining of human activities that are responsible for the destruction of biodiversity; e) environmental impact studies performed prior to implementation of activities that are likely to adversely affect biological diversity; f) establishment of benefit-sharing measures; g) development of material incentive program to change people's behaviour so that future land title holders make appropriate conservation decisions; and h) engagement in international strategies that facilitate the security of national and regional biodiversity components. In addition, this project contributes to the Aichi Targets 1, 2, 12, 16, and 18.

The project is relevant to, and will contribute to at least seven of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Firstly, it will contribute to the eradication of poverty (Goal 1) by establishing ABS deals that bring monetary and non-monetary benefits to local communities that provide genetic resources and research institutions and companies that use those resources for research, product development, and commercialization. Secondly, the project will contribute to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (Goal 5) through gender equality and inclusion of women's interests and experiences into policy development, training, in-situ and ex-situ conservation of selected resources, sustainable harvesting, research, product development, and equal participation in the benefits derived from ABS agreements. Thirdly, it will contribute to the creation of Decent Work and Economic Growth (Goal 8) by supporting small/medium-scale community-based enterprises with propagation/re-introduction, business and value-addition skills to harvest, process, package, and market natural products from selected genetic resources, and sustainable harvesting and trade. Fourthly, it will contribute to the development of Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure (Goal 9) through pharmaceutical R&D on selected genetic resources of medicinal value in collaboration with traditional medical associations and R&D and natural product development for pharmaceutical and food and beverage use. Fifthly, the project seeks to contribute to sensitization for Responsible Consumption and Production (Goal 12) through sustainable harvesting of plant genetic resources, in particular *P. sidoides*. Sixthly, the project will contribute to Climate Action (Goal 13) through R&D activities and conservation that will promote the resilience of genetic resources, and the ecosystems and landscapes where they are found. Finally, the project will contribute to improving Life on Land (Goal 15), through promoting both in-situ and ex-situ conservation of selected resources under communal management, conservation of selected resources under household botanical gardens and nurseries, and in-situ conservation of selected resources within PAs.

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

The budgeted M&E plan is included in Section VIII: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. A summary is provided in the following table.

GEF M&E requirements to be undertaken by Project Management Unit (PMU)	Indicative costs (US\$)
Inception Workshop and Report	GEF Grant: 8,500
M&E required to report on progress made in reaching GEF core indicators and project results included in the project results framework	GEF Grant: 2,000 at Mid-term) & 2,000 (at Terminal stage)
Preparation of the annual GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	GEF grant: 0
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	GEF grant: 7,500 (1,500/yr)
Monitoring of Stakeholder Engagement Plan	GEF grant: 15,000 (3000/yr)
Monitoring of Gender Action Plan	GEF grant: 7,500 (1,500/yr)
Monitoring and Evaluation visits and validation workshops	GEF grant: 10,000 (7,500 (1,500/yr), 1,000 for yr 1 and 1,500 for yr 2 Co-financing: 17,500- (7,500 for yr 3 & 10,000 yr 5)
Project board meetings	GEF grant: 12,000 (2,400/year for 5 yrs) Co-financing: 2,500 (500 yr 5 yrs)
Learning missions	GEF grant: 0
Supervision missions	GEF grant: 0
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR):	GEF grant: 30,650
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE):	GEF Grant: 40,500
TOTAL indicative COST	GEF grant: 135,650 Co-financing: 20,000

[1] The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

[1] Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

[2] The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	5/28/2019	Onesimus Muhwezi	256772465154	onesimus.muhwezi@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): Goal 5 ? Gender equality; Goal 8 ? Decent work and economic growth; Goal 9 ? Industry, innovation and infrastructure; Goal 10 ? Reduced inequalities; Goal 12 ? Responsible consumption and production; Goal 15-Life on Land.					
This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document: Outcome 2- All people living in Lesotho enjoy improved food and nutrition security, with transformed national food systems, benefiting from natural resources and green growth that is risk informed and climate resilient.					
This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan: 4.1 Natural resources protected and managed to enhance sustainable productivity and livelihoods					
Project Objective:	To strengthen national and local capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) with a focus on traditional knowledge on medicinal plants in Lesotho and the potential for bioprospecting.				
	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions

	<p><u>Mandatory indicator 1:</u> # of direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by sex (at least 50% women).</p>	<p>39,060 people with zero benefits (male: 18,977; female: 20,083) Sehlabathebe National Park: a) Male: 4,108 with zero benefit; b) Female: 4,159 with zero benefit Bokong Nature Reserve: a) Male: 4,279 with zero benefit; b) Female: 4,454 with zero benefit T?ehlanyane National Park: a) Male: 5,390 with zero benefit; b) Female = 5,610 with zero benefit Let?eng-la-Letsie Ramsar site: a) Male: 5,200 with zero benefit; b) Female = 5,860 with zero benefit</p>	<p>9,766 people with project benefits (male: 4,745; female: 5,021) Sehlabathebe National Park: a) Male: 1,027; b) Female: 1,039 Bokong Nature Reserve: a) Male: 1,070; b) Female = 1,114 T?ehlanyane National Park: a) Male: 1,348; b) Female: 1,403 Let?eng-la-Letsie Ramsar site: a) Male: 1,300; b) Female = 1,465</p>	<p>19,531 people with project benefits (male: 9,489; female: 10,042) Sehlabathebe National Park: a) Male: 2,054; b) Female: 2,080 Bokong Nature Reserve: a) Male: 2,140; b) Female: 2,227 T?ehlanyane National Park: a) Male: 2,695; b) Female: 2,805 Let?eng-la-Letsie Ramsar site: a) Male: 2,600; b) Female = 2,930</p>	<p><u>Data sources:</u> Gender-based surveys Project final report Updated Gender Action Plan and related reports</p>
	<p><u>Indicator 2:</u> Legal, policy and institutional frameworks in place for access and benefit</p>	<p>No legal, policy and institutional framework related to ABS</p>	<p>Drafts of key ABS legislation, policies, and guidelines under discussion</p>	<p>Functional legal, policy and institutional framework related to ABS in place</p>	<p><u>Data sources:</u> Official gazette Project final report National reports on implementation of the Nagoya Protocol</p>

	<p>sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems.</p>		<p>40% of the Institutional Capacity Development Strategy for the ABS framework implemented.</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u> Project time framework not long enough to achieve the proposed legal, policy and institutional changes</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Willingness by decision makers to implement the Nagoya Protocol on ABS.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Risks:</u> Gender barriers are difficult to overcome limiting women participation especially in rural areas Herders are relatively less educated and this might bring a challenge in their uptake of the intervention On-going conflict in Let?eng?la?Letsie between communities of two area chiefs might slow progress in the implementation of the project</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Continued interest from women and men to participate in the project Improvement assumed at 25 percent at mid-term and 50 percent at project end Involvement of NGOs as partners will support herders? capacity building and address grievances from herders and concerned communities.</p>
--	---	--	--	---

Component 1	Enabling institutional capacity and regulatory framework strengthened to support implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS				
Outcome 1.1: Functional national ABS policy and regulatory framework operational and supportive of ABS from the use of genetic resources	<u>Indicator 3:</u> ABS policy-, legal- and regulatory ? framework with gender considerations	- A national environmental policy without ABS regulations - No ABS in TK regulations - No intellectual property (IP) rights guidelines related to ABS <i>l.</i>	- ABS incorporated into the National Environmental Policy and the Biodiversity Bill, including gender considerations related to ABS	- ABS in TK regulations - IP rights guidelines related to ABS in place	<u>Data sources:</u> Drafts of policies and regulations Official gazette <u>Risks:</u> Project time framework not long enough to achieve the proposed policy, legal and regulatory reforms <u>Assumptions:</u> Continued political will to strengthen the national regulatory framework to support implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS
Outputs: Output 1.1.1: National Environment Policy of 1998 and Biodiversity Bill of 2021 reviewed to address ABS in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol. Output 1.1.2: National ABS, bioprospecting, traditional knowledge (TK), and intellectual property rights (IPRs) regulations developed, reviewed, updated, and presented to parliament for approval. Output 1.1.3: Local/Community Councils By-laws (guidelines) in the prioritized districts on ABS reviewed and finalized considering national frameworks on ABS and biodiversity Output 1.1.4: ABS and TK Strategy developed.					
Outcome 1.2: Capacity of national institutions to develop, implement and enforce national	<u>Indicator 4:</u> Improved capacity of institutions to develop, implement, and enforce ABS	? CR 1: ? Traditional Practitioners = 67% ? Community Conservation	? CR 1: ? Traditional Practitioners = 81% ? Community Conservation Forums = 70%	? CR 1: ? Traditional Practitioners = 90% ? Community Conservation Forums = 78%	<u>Data sources:</u> Updated UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard Capacity building participation lists

<p>legislative, administrative or policy measures on ABS strengthened</p>	<p>policies and regulations increased as measured by the UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard: - CR 1: Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders. - CR2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge - CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development - CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation - CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate</p>	<p>Forums = 58% ? Community Councils = 67% ? Private Sector = 58% ? CR 2: ? Academia = 45% ? Community Conservation Forums = 40% ? Department of Environment = 45% ? CR 3: ? Community Conservation Forums = 42% ? Community Councils = 33% ? National Parks = 42% ? Department of Environment = 42% ? CR 4: ? Department of Environment = 63% ? Department of Range Resources Management = 63% ? Department of Forestry = 63% 2. ? CR 5: ? Department of Range Resources Management = 25% ? Department of Forestry = 25%</p>	<p>? Community Councils = 89% ? Private Sector = 77% 3. ? CR 2: ? Academia = 60% ? Community Conservation Forums = 53% ? Department of Environment = 60% 4. ? CR 3: ? Community Conservation Forums = 56% ? Community Councils = 44% ? National Parks = 56% ? Department of Environment = 56% 5. ? CR 4: ? Department of Environment = 84% ? Department of Range Resources Management = 84% ? Department of Forestry = 84% ? CR 5: ? Department of Range Resources Management = 33% ? Department of Forestry = 25% ? National Parks = 33%</p>	<p>? Community Councils = 100% ? Private Sector = 93% ? CR 2: ? Academia = 72% ? Community Conservation Forums = 64% ? Department of Environment = 72% ? CR 3: ? Community Conservation Forums = 68% ? Community Councils = 53% ? National Parks = 68% ? Department of Environment = 68% 6. ? CR 4: ? Department of Environment = 100% ? Department of Range Resources Management = 100% ? Department of Forestry = 100% ? CR 5: ? Department of Range Resources Management = 40% ? Department of Forestry = 40% ? National Parks = 40% ? Community Conservation Forums = 40%</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u> Knowledge drain and implementation capacity constraints at government due to the staffing limitations <u>Assumptions:</u> Interest from stakeholders to participate in the training and using tools to be provided by the project Beneficiaries apply additional knowledge acquired The assumed increase is 25% of the baseline per annum</p>
---	---	--	--	---	---

		? National Parks = 25% ? Community Conservation Forums = 25% ? Community Councils = 25% ? Department of Environment = 25%	? Community Conservation Forums = 33% ? Community Councils = 33% ? Department of Environment = 33%	? Community Councils = 40% ? Department of Environment = 40%	
Outputs:					
Output 1.2.1: Capacities of National Focal Point, Competent National Authorities and Checkpoints enhanced.					
Output 1.2.2: Institutional Capacity Development Strategy for the ABS framework implementation, monitoring, enforcement and compliance developed and rolled-out.					
Output 1.2.3: National guidelines for enforcing ABS regulatory framework developed and implemented.					
Output 1.2.4. A national clearing-house mechanism in place to assist in the collection, provision, and dissemination of ABS information.					
Outcome 1.3: Management, ownership and access rights, rules and procedures over access and utilization of genetic resources defined, clarified and encoded in the legal system (e.g. by-laws/ community protocols)	<u>Indicator 5:</u> Administrative procedures for users and providers of genetic resources to develop, implement and monitor ABS agreements with proper Prior Informed Consent (PIC), Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) and Benefit Sharing (BS) principles and guidelines	No administrative procedures for implementing ABS available	Drafts of administrative documents for review: a) Guidelines and procedures for obtaining PIC and MAT b) Biocultural community protocols governing ABS c) Codes of conduct, best-practices and standards for equitable benefit-sharing	Administrative procedures for users and providers of genetic resources approved: a) Guidelines and procedures for obtaining PIC and MAT b) Biocultural community protocols governing ABS c) Codes of conduct, best-practices and standards for equitable benefit-sharing	<u>Data sources:</u> Final drafts of administrative documents and principles and guidelines <u>Risks:</u> Ownership and access rights not clearly defined <u>Assumptions:</u> Continued interest from decision makers to support implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS
Outputs:					
Output 1.3.1: Guidelines and procedures for obtaining Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) developed and approved.					
Output 1.3.2: Guideline for developing biocultural community protocols governing management, ownership, access rights, and benefit-sharing rules and procedures defined and adopted.					
Output 1.3.3: Codes of conduct, best-practices, guidelines and standards that ensure ethical bioprospecting, sustainable harvesting, fair and equitable benefit-sharing established for industry and research sectors active in bioprospecting.					
Component 2		Building capacities for bioprospecting and value-addition of genetic resources			
Outcome 2.1: Opportunities for bioprospecting	<u>Indicator 6:</u> Number of people trained	0	75	200	<u>Data sources:</u> Training reports and lists of participants to training events

strengthened with improved research capabilities to add value to genetic resources.	to promote bioprospecting				<u>Risks:</u> Loss of capacities due to high staff turnover in institutions <u>Assumptions:</u> Continued interest from the private and public to conduct studies and research on genetic resources
	<u>Indicator 7:</u> Number of research centres equipped	0	At least three (3)	At least three (3)	<u>Data sources:</u> Procurement plans, invoices, and equipment inventories <u>Risks:</u> Delays in purchasing / procurement processes (import processes). <u>Assumptions:</u> Active engagement of research centres
<u>Outputs:</u> Output 2.1.1: National research and development strategy on bioprospecting, including role of traditional medical practitioners developed and implemented. Output 2.1.2: National research centres (e.g., NUL Department of Agricultural Research, and Katse Botanical Garden) strengthened to conduct R&D on genetic resources of medicinal plants, in collaboration with traditional medical practitioners? associations /groups and international partners on bioprospecting. Output 2.1.3: A comprehensive valuation of genetic resources with known commercial and intangible values (cultural and spiritual) conducted includes surveys to assess their conservation status. Output 2.1.4. E-permitting system for bio prospectors in place.					
Outcome 2.2: Enhanced capacity of key stakeholders, including ILCs especially women, to participate in ABS and bioprospecting processes.	<u>Indicator 8:</u> Number of research collaboration agreements established between users (researchers and academia) and providers (ILCs) of genetic resources with considerations for gender equity	0	At least one (1)	At least two (2)	<u>Data sources:</u> Draft of agreements Signed agreements <u>Risks:</u> Conditions not met to establish ABS agreements <u>Assumptions:</u> Interest from stakeholders, including local communities in entering into ABS agreements
	<u>Indicator 9:</u> Number of key/local stakeholders	0	350	1,000	<u>Data sources:</u> Training reports and lists of participants to training events

	trained (50% men and 50% women).				<u>Risks:</u> Delays in training activities. <u>Assumptions:</u> Available markets Interest from men and women/ILCs to participate in ABS and bioprospecting processes.
<u>Outputs:</u> Output 2.2.1: Training program for small/medium-scale community-based organizations and enterprises and for national parks implemented for: a) negotiation of PIC, MAT, and ABS agreements; b) development of community protocols; and c) contribution of ABS to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Output 2.2.2: Experience exchange program raises awareness about regional/international ABS initiatives. Output 2.2.3: Model biocultural community protocol developed considering medicinal plants with potential for bioprospecting.					
Component 3	Gender mainstreaming and Knowledge Management				
Outcome 3.1: Gender inclusive awareness on sustainable utilization, conservation and access to and benefit sharing from the use of genetic resources enhanced	<u>Indicator 10:</u> Ratio of women/ men including herders by age benefitting from project interventions	0%	30%	50%	<u>Data sources:</u> Gender-based surveys Updated Gender Action Plan and related reports Project Completion reports
<u>Outputs:</u> Output 3.1.1 Gender strategy developed and used to guide project implementation, monitoring, and reporting.					
Outcome 3.2: Awareness about sustainable use, conservation, and access to and benefit-sharing from the use of genetic resources enhanced.	<u>Indicator 11:</u> Level of awareness among key stakeholders about the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS (measured by KAP/B index)	10 %	33.75%	75.94%	<u>Data sources:</u> Updated KAP/B index <u>Risks:</u> Project time period too short to have a noticeable impact on level of awareness <u>Assumptions:</u> Wide-ranging and timely dissemination -
<u>Output:</u> Output 3.2.1: Knowledge, attitudes, practices, and behavior (KAP/B) assessment/surveys carried out and an awareness-raising programme on ABS developed and implemented.					
Component 4: Monitoring and & Evaluation					

Outcome 4.1: Participatory M&E results are used to guide adaptive management, collate and share lessons, in support of up-scaling.	Indicator 12: Quality rating of project reports (PIR, MTR and TE) as per UNDP/GEF requirements	NA	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<p>Risks: Inadequate M&E capacity of project staff</p> <p>Assumptions: Project resources will be adequate to build the capacity of project staff and partners on M&E. Bureau of Statistics (BOS) strengthened to collect gender disaggregated data on genetic resources development</p>
<p>Outputs: Output 4.1.1: Participatory monitoring, evaluation and learning strategy developed and implemented to support project management, collate and disseminate lessons.</p>					

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference in CEO Endorsement Document
Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement (FSP)/Approval (MSP): September 25, 2017		
No comments		
STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF). Date of screening: May 14, 2017		
<p>1. STAP welcomes the project by UNDP entitled "Promoting conservation, sustainable utilization and fair and equitable benefit-sharing from Lesotho's Medicinal Plants for improved livelihoods." Overall, STAP feels that this is a well-written and well-structured proposal to address the loss of critical biodiversity in Lesotho through an access and benefit sharing approach. In general, the project would be much improved with the inclusion of maps to provide the reader with context.</p>	<p>To provide the reader with context, maps of four prioritized sites where project-related activities will be implemented, have been added, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? T?ehlanyane National Park and surrounding areas ? Bokong Nature Reserve and surrounding areas ? Schlabathebe National Park and surrounding area ? Let?eng-la-Letsie Ramsar site and surrounding areas 	<p>Project Document, Annex 17: Target Landscape Description</p>

<p>2. 2. The project objective is to promote conservation, sustainable use and improved access and benefit-sharing from ABS products derived from select Medical Plants in selected Highlands and Foothill areas of Lesotho. The main problems/issues are many and varied, including poor quality of environmental legislation and implementation of laws, low capacity and inadequate financial resources, lack of awareness, etc. The project seeks to conserve important medicinal plants by (1) strengthening Lesotho's ABS institutions and capacity (2) enhancing sustainable use through research, valuation, and small-scale community enterprises and (3) mainstreaming gender and knowledge sharing.</p> <p>While STAP sees great merit in this project, it would be enhanced greatly through a more in-depth investigation of the underlying issues explaining the reliance on medical plants by local people and whether or not these problems can be resolved through national level actions related to increased cooperation, drafting of plans and legislation, etc. as described in this project. For example, research indicates that 70% of HIV-positive people in some areas of Lesotho use medical herbs to treat their condition without a clear understanding of efficacy or interactions with antiretroviral drugs. (Mugomeri et al., 2016). Perhaps improved information and collaboration with Western doctors, also lacking (Shale et al., 1999), could be built into sections on Stakeholder Involvement and awareness raising to reduce demands for certain herbs that may not be effective, but could be at risk from a conservation perspective. Overall, STAP feels that more attention needs to be paid to the underlying issues related to the use of plants for medicinal purposes (as well as for magic and sorcery) (Moteetee and van Wyk, 2011) and the important role of women ? particularly in a country where 40 ? 60% of married women have husbands working abroad ? mostly in South Africa</p>	<p>The project will no longer focus on the three species of plants with medicinal properties that were selected at the time of the PIF and that are harvested locally and that are traded in national and international markets: <i>Pelargonium sidoides</i> (Khoara) <i>Hypoxis hemerocallidea</i> (Moli/African potato), and <i>Aloe polyphylla</i> (spiral aloe). Accordingly, the project will not address issues related to overharvesting of these species and the role of women in their use and/or trade.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	------------

<p>3. In addition, STAP believes that in order to be successful, it is critical that the project address community tenure of medicinal plants (at the village or lower scale). While STAP strongly supports the strategy of raising the value of medicinal plants, we note that this will have the opposite effects that the project intends unless rights of use and exclusion are clearly defined (by increasing private benefits and exacerbating environmental degradation in an open-access property regime ? Hardin's Tragedy of the Commons). The need for local custodianship is mentioned several times in the PIF, if it is read carefully, but this issue is so important to the outcome of the project that it needs to be clarified in the extreme. Learning from the success of Community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) in the southern African region (especially CAMPFIRE pre-state capture, and CBNRM in Namibia), the critical ingredient is individual or village-level tenure, at least for the raw materials in question. The development of local rights to intellectual property will transform this into a truly innovative project. One example of an effective strategy would be to build the capacity of the regulatory agency to empower communities to exclude others from taking their resources (i.e. "own") without paying a fair price for them.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, the project will no longer focus on the three species of plants with medicinal properties that were selected at the time of the PIF. Accordingly, specific issues related to community tenure of these medicinal plants will no be addressed. ,</p> <p>However, issues related to community tenure of medicinal plants will be addressed in a more broader sense. This issue has been built into the <u>Stakeholder Engagement Plan</u>, which includes the Ministry of Local Government, Chieftainship, and Parliamentary Affairs (MLGCPA), which is mandated to ensure the decentralization of public services and empowerment of local authorities, including District and Community Councils, which are mandated through the Local Government Act of 1997 (as amended) to have control over natural resources, environmental protection, and other communally owned property-chiefs role in addressing conflicts based on social differentiation for the purpose of inclusiveness.</p> <p>In addition, <u>through Output 1.1.2</u> related to the national ABS regulatory framework, regulations regarding IPR will be developed to protect the potential misuse of genetic resources and associated TK, and to provide a legal framework for negotiations or agreements on ABS.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Document: B. Project Description Summary</p> <p>Project Document, Annex 8: Stakeholder Engagement Plan.</p>
---	---	---

<p>4. Illegal exploitation and trade in local and international markets (e.g. South Africa) is listed as a threat; however, it is not clear how activities in any of the Components will directly address problems of biopiracy.</p>	<p>Through <u>Output 1.2.1</u>, the project will enhance the capacity of Checkpoints to enforce ABS regulations. This will include training Lesotho Revenue Authority (LRA) officials in ABS and environmental aspects in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) enhance the control of illegal trade and biopiracy of genetic resources across borders b) improve communication mechanisms with other agencies (e.g., DoE/MDNSE and MFRSC); c) improve permitting mechanisms considering the ABS/NP framework; and d) consolidate the certification and permitting process for moving materials to discourage illegal trade across borders. <p>The project will also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? support and complement the survey of prohibited and restricted goods that is currently underway ? review and update the Curriculum of the Police Training Centre/ Lesotho Mounted Police Services to include legal issues on environment and conservation to enhance their capacity for enforcement of ABS regulations locally. 	<p>Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships.</p>
--	--	--

5. Investments in University of Lesotho appear aspirational rather than achievable, because it is unlikely to yield new pharmaceutical products given the high costs and long lead times for these processes. The return on investment would be higher (and more likely) if output 2.1.2 was targeted more towards inventorying medicinal plants and knowledge about them.

Project Component 2 has been reformulated to focus on developing national capacities for bioprospecting and value-addition of genetic resources rather than focusing in R&D on specific medicinal plants/species. Accordingly, the project will no longer aim at developing new pharmaceutical products as this is currently not feasible; instead, through Output 2.1.2 the project will enhance the capacity of the NUL and other national research centres to conduct R&D on genetic resources of medicinal plants, in collaboration with traditional medical practitioners associations /groups and international partners on bioprospecting. In addition, the project has included, as part of the National R&D strategy on bioprospecting with the participation traditional practitioners and herbalists (Output 2.1.1), the review and updating of the inventory of medicinal plants in Lesotho to facilitate the production, validation, and publication of a national research and bioprospecting strategy documents and implementation guidelines.

Project Document,
**Section V. Results
and Partnerships.**

<p>6. Community groups, including healers are listed last in the list of stakeholders; however, given that local people are the main collectors and users of plants for medicinal, and other purposes, greater attention should be given to these stakeholders versus focusing on cooperation between Ministries, reviewing policies, creating strategies, etc. at the national level.</p>	<p>The participation of community groups, including healers, herbalists, herders, and women, will be a key component for project implementation. Healers / traditional medical practitioners were actively consulted during the design of the project and some project outputs were updated based on their recommendations and to ensure their participation in the project, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? the development of regulations related to IPR, ? updating Local/Community Councils By-laws in the prioritized districts (guidelines) on ABS, ? conducting an assessment of intangible values (cultural and spiritual) of genetic resources ? defining the role of traditional practitioners as part of the national research and development strategy on bioprospecting ? establishing collaborations with national research centres for conducting R&D on genetic resources of medicinal plants <p>The project will also work with the Lesotho Traditional Healers Association (LTHA), a platform for male and female healers and herbalists whose main purpose is to guard against misuse of traditional medicinal plants and knowledge; Community Conservation Fora (CCFs); community councils; women's organizations; and herders groups in the implementation of the project activities as described in the <u>Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan</u>. A Herders Engagement Plan has been developed to ensure their effective participation in the project given their vast knowledge of traditional herbs.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Document: B. Project Description Summary</p> <p>Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships; Annex 8: Stakeholder Engagement Plan; Annex 18: Herders Engagement Plan; Annex 9: Gender Analysis and Action Plan</p>
--	---	--

<p>7. 7. The project seems to be one-sided in delivering technical support to community-based enterprises; however, given the extensive use of plants by locals for hundreds (thousands?) of years, it would seem to make sense to initiate a process of dialogue that allows local people to share information and knowledge about specific plants, their properties, how they are used, why they are valuable, how they are harvested, etc.</p>	<p>During the PPG, a dialogue was initiated that will lead to interaction with local communities, including healers and herbalists, to share information and knowledge about medicinal plants species.</p> <p>During implementation the project will:</p> <p>? Develop a national regulation for TK, to ensure that TK associated with genetic resources held by local communities and traditional healers is accessed with their approval and involvement, and that mutually agreed terms (MAT) have been established.</p> <p>? Convene stakeholder consultation workshops with traditional healers and herbalists, among other local community members with knowledge about medicinal plants, for the compilation and appropriation of TK and to agree to benefit-sharing protocols; this information will be instrumental in the development of a national R&D strategy on bioprospecting.</p> <p>? Conduct an assessment of intangible values (cultural and spiritual) of genetic resources with the participation of local community members and traditional practitioners and herbalists to document how genetic resources are valued locally, including plant genetic resources for medicinal and other uses.</p>	<p>Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships</p>
---	--	---

<p>8. 8. In terms of risk, STAP believes that the greatest risk is doing nothing, so overall this project reduces risk. However, improving the value chain of medicinal plants is risky if it is not accompanied by strengthening the capacity for exclusion (of unsustainable and/or non-paying harvesting). This capacity needs to be strengthened at both national and local level simultaneously. The role of the national level should be to legislate local level rights, and to support local people in protecting these rights (through courts, policing, knowledge, etc.)</p>	<p>Through <u>Component 1</u>, the project will develop the necessary regulations to protect the rights of local peoples. In addition, the project will build the capacity at national and local levels to enforce these jointly with local communities and holders of TK related to medicinal plants. Key interventions will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) building capacity to develop, implement, and enforce ABS/NP-related national legislative, administrative, or policy measures in national entities including: the National Focal Point (DoE/MDNSE), Competent National Authorities (e.g., DoE/MDNSE) and Checkpoints (e.g., Lesotho Mounted Police Services, Lesotho Revenue Authority, Department of Lands, Surveys, and Physical Planning) b) review and update of the Curriculum of the Police Training Centre/ Lesotho Mounted Police Services to include legal issues on environment and conservation to enhance their capacity for enforcement of ABS regulations local c) building capacity for the protection, conservation, and management of natural resources (especially rangelands and associated genetic resources), and monitoring the use of plant genetic resources at the local level. Key participants will include: extension officers of the MDNSE and MFRSC, including park managers, park rangers, district environment officers, range management officers, and forest officers at district levels d) building capacity among local authorities, chiefs, community councils, and CCFs 	<p>UNDP-GEF Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships</p>
--	---	---

<p>9. Overall, STAP believes that the sum of outputs is likely to contribute to the outcomes if, and only if, the matter of rights of use and exclusion are clarified and operationalized. As noted above, this seems to be recognized in the document is a general way; however, this is a necessary condition for success, and there is knowledge about how to do it, especially within the southern Africa CBNRM and Sustainable Use Movement (Jones and Weaver 2009, Murphree 2009, Child and Wojcik 2014, NACSO 2016). The project should make a point of following principles set forth in sustainable use theory, whereby landholders are critical, through the objective of "maximizing the value of wild resources to the people who live on the land with them" (SASUSG 1996). In this case, the project should focus on communities as resource custodians or intended resource custodians with strong rights to access, use, benefit from, manage and exclude others from medicinal plants as a priority, and as a key goal of the project (Ostrom 1990, Schlager and Ostrom 1992). This should be central and not an afterthought (tellingly, this is last in the list of stakeholders, and mixed up with users).</p>	<p>The project design includes the strong participation of local communities. During the PPG phase, consultations were carried out with representatives of local communities in three of the four sites selected for implementation, and representatives of traditional practitioners and herbalists and community councils participated in the inception, results framework, and validation workshops. Their views and feedback were included in the final design of the project and their participation is outlined in the <u>Stakeholder Engagement Plan</u>. During implementation, local project committees will be established in the four project sites. Through these committees, local partners will have the opportunity to participate in decision making with regard to project management, including implementation of strategies for building capacities for bioprospecting and value-addition of genetic resources at the local level.. Project activities, training, and engagement plans will use a participatory approach that is rights-based and integrates the perspectives of all stakeholders using bottom-up approaches and integrating the different views of local stakeholders and beneficiaries. The project will establish a grievance redress mechanism through which stakeholders can raise their concerns; local communities will be informed so that they are aware of its existence. In addition, environmental and social grievances during implementation will be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR. Finally, the project will decentralize M&E, which will include meetings with the local committees, interviews with direct beneficiaries, local and national participatory workshops, and meetings with special groups such as women and herders to verify impact indicators related to their participation in the project as direct beneficiaries.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Document: A.3. Stakeholders.</p> <p>Project Document, Annex 8: Stakeholder Engagement Plan;</p>
--	---	--

The legal basis for ensuring that communities are resource custodians or intended resource custodians with rights to access, use, benefit from, manage, and exclude others from medicinal plants as a priority, will be achieved through:

? Output 1.3.1, in line with guidelines and procedures for obtaining PIC and MAT

? Output 1.3.2 for the development of guidelines for biocultural community protocols governing management, ownership, access rights, and benefit-sharing rules and procedures of genetic resources. These ABS-related regulations will complement existing regulations (e.g., Historical Monuments, Relics, Fauna and Flora Act 41 of 1967/ as amended by Legal Notice No. 93 of 2004, and the Environment Act No. 2008) that protect local communities and provide local authorities (chiefs and community councils) with the terms for exploiting plant resources from their jurisdictions.

? Output 1.1.3: Local/Community Councils By-laws in the prioritized districts (guidelines) on ABS reviewed and finalized considering national frameworks on ABS and Biodiversity, was added to the project (originally not included in the PIF), as, local/community councils? by-laws for accessing and using genetic resources, including medicinal plants, are already being used to ensure that communities are resource custodians or intended resource custodians with rights to access, use, and benefit from the use of genetic resources.

? Output 2.1.2. will result in the establishment of at least two research collaboration agreements between users (researchers and academia) and providers (ILCs) of genetic resources in which local communities will be identified as

	resource custodians or intended resource custodians with strong rights to access, use, manage, and benefit from the plant genetic resources.	
GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project ? GEF - 6: 10-20-19		
10. The project charged \$36,522 for ?Direct project Costs? (Details on the items are in Annex J). This charge needs to be removed since the associated activities need to be carried out by Executing Agency. Budget to be reallocated	DPC has been removed from GEF grant budget and will be covered by UNDP core resources co-financing to the project	GEF-UNDP Project Document: IX. Total Budget and Work Plan
11. The Audit should be charged to PMC not M&E. Budget to be revised.	The Audit has been charged to PMC as suggested and the budget was updated as needed.	GEF-UNDP Project Document: IX. Total Budget and Work Plan
12. Why is there a charge for Stakeholder Engagement and Gender Plans if these two activities were already carried out for the preparation of the CEO Endorsement. Please remove and reallocate the budget to the components.	Cost related with the Stakeholder Engagement and Gender Plans are for their implementation and monitoring, not to the preparation as this was covered as part of the PPG. Accordingly, there was no budget reallocation.	Part II: Project Justification, C. Describe the Budgeted M&E Plan GEF-UNDP Project Document: VI. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan; IX. Total Budget and Work Plan
13. The project charged percentages of the Project Manager and Finance & Administration Officer to Components 1&2. These two salaries need to come out of the PMC	The salaries of the Project Manager and Finance & Administration Officer have been charged to the PMC (15% a and 57% of their total cost, respectively); the remaining cost will be covered by UNDP co-financing.	GEF-UNDP Project Document: IX. Total Budget and Work Plan
14. The project charged the Annual External Audit to Component 3. This should be charged to PMC.	The Audit has been charged to PMC as suggested and the budget was updated as needed.	GEF-UNDP Project Document: IX. Total Budget and Work Plan

<p>15. Why is there no reference to the risk of being out-compete in the R&D agenda on the target species? Who else is working on the proposed research activities (internationally), knowing that there are multiple entries on the extracts and claimed properties of the two species?</p>	<p>Based on discussion and guidance from GEF Secretariat during the conference call of 24 August 2021, the project was re-designed to focus only on developing national capacities for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS which will not include bioprospecting related to medicinal plants. As such, any potential competition risks which could have been associated with medicinal products no longer exist. Component 2 now focuses on building national R&D capacities instead of specific R&D on plant species as earlier proposed.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document Part II-Strategy-component 2</p>
<p>GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project ? GEF - 6: 07-18-2023</p>		
<p><i>1.</i> The revised project structure is adequate. In annex E on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field. This includes the Location Name, Latitude and Longitude. Please include the geographic location of any physical project activity (such as event or knowledge sharing activity), to ensure the project is visible on the map.</p>	<p>Sehlabathebe National Park [SNP] (lat -29.904204477, long 29.054546368),</p> <p>Tschlanyane National Park [TNP] (Lat -28.9230868445, Long 28.384412543),</p> <p>Bokong (Lat -29.416525926, Lon 28.616670390),</p> <p>Letsa-la-Letsie (Lat -30.279628739, Long 27.965472953)</p>	<p>UNDP-GEF Prodoc Part II and Annex 3</p>
<p><i>a.</i> The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles (and fuel and maintenance) is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program. Please, provide a justification for this request.</p>	<p>Costs for vehicle purchase, fuel and maintenance have been transferred to UNDP co-financing.</p>	<p>UNDP-GEF Prodoc Part IX</p>

<p>b. A technical adviser has been charged to the project component. Kindly note that this is a eligible activity to be covered by the co-financing portion of the PMC. Please, adjust the budget table accordingly.</p>	<p>As discussed with the GEF SEC Practice Manager (Adriana) on 28 July 2023, the Technical Advisor will be maintained under GEF grant financing. The Technical Advisor will be an international consultant engaged on short term basis to support delivery of project components. The Technical Advisor will provide technical backstopping and strategic guidance to the project team, support M&E and quality assurance activities given the capacity gaps with executing partners. In particular, the TA will provide support to development of activity concept notes and terms of reference for technical experts, mandatory project reporting to UNDP and GEF, MTR and TE including core indicators tracking and reporting; and oversee implementation of social and environmental safeguards.</p>	<p>Prodoc Annex 7</p>
<p>c. Please, itemize the budget lines for activities / expenditures ? the way it is presented prevents the analysis of the reasonability for charging these activities / expenditures to the three identified sources: PMC, M&E and Components. Please, also align the totals (last row) with the columns.</p>	<p>This has been assessed as a portal system issue which will be reviewed in consultation with the Portal IT Team.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>The co-financing letter from MDNSE is from May 2022. Please consider including an updated estimation of the actual amount that is estimated that will really go to the project considering the timeframe of both ?the co-finance and the revised GEF project.</p>	<p>Co-financing letter of \$3,475,000 has been re-issued dated 31 Jul 2023. The name of the Ministry has changed to Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE) following government restructuring in 2022.</p>	<p>Prodoc Annex 11</p>
<p>The co-financing letter from NUL is from July 2022. Please consider including an updated estimation of the actual amount that is estimated that will really go to the project considering the timeframe of both ?the co-finance and the revised GEF project.</p>	<p>Co-financing letter \$525,000 has been issued dated 11 Sep 2023</p>	<p>Prodoc Annex 11</p>

<p>The co-financing letter from UNDP is from May 2022 Please consider including an updated estimation of the actual amount that is estimated that will really go to the project considering the timeframe of both the co-finance and the revised GEF project.</p>	<p>Co-financing letter of \$500,000 has been re-issued dated 27 Jul 2023</p>	<p>Prodoc Annex 11</p>
<p>Please, indicate the area of landscape under improved practices (excluding PAs) under Core Indicator 4. Also, please provide an explanation about indicators in appropriate space under table.</p>	<p>As indicated in previous review sheet response under question 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? Following redesign of the project based on consultations with GEF-SEC on 24 August 2021, project focus is on capacity building interventions for R&D institutions and bioprospecting; and does not involve on-ground activities that can contribute to core indicator 4. Therefore, no activities are planned on the ground to possibly result in global environmental benefits related to indicator 4 on landscapes under improved management of biodiversity. Any global environmental benefits at the landscape level would be indirect and for that reason we have chosen not to include this indicator as we will not be able to track and monitor its achievement</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Please, provide responses to comments made above and also indicate in the OFP letter the detailed list of services (and respective budget) for the exceptional role to be provided by Agency for consideration of policy exemption.</p>	<p>Response to the comments have been provided in the review sheet and highlighted in yellow</p>	<p>NA</p>
	<p>Revised OFP letter of support for agency execution services has been provided listing services to be provided by UNDP, budget and associated costs.</p>	<p>Prodoc Annex 2</p>

References:

Child, B. and D. Wojcik (2014). Developing Capacity for Community Governance of Natural Resources: Theory & Practice. Bloomington, AuthorHouse.

Jones, B. and C. Weaver (2009). CBNRM in Namibia: Growth, Trends, Lessons and Constraints. Evolution & Innovation in Wildlife Conservation. H. Suich and B. Child. London, Earthscan: 223-242.

Moteetee, A., and B.E. Van Wyk (2011). The medical ethnobotany of Lesotho: a review. Bothalia 41(1): 209 ? 228.

Mugomeri et al., (2016). Medicinal herbs used by HIV-positive people in Lesotho. African Journal of Traditional Complementary and Alternative Medicines, 13(4): 123 ? 131.

Murphree, M. W. (2009). "The strategic pillars of communal natural resource management: benefit, empowerment and conservation." Biodiversity and Conservation 18: 2551-2562.

NACSO (2016). The State of Community Conservation in Namibia. Windhoek, Namibia, Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organizations.

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action, Cambridge University Press.

SASUSG (1996). Sustainable use issues and principles, Southern Africa Sustainable Use Specialist Group, IUCN Species Survival Commission: 23.

Schlager, E. and E. Ostrom (1992). "Property-rights regimes and natural resources: a conceptual analysis." Land Economics 68(3): 249-162.

Shale, T.L., W.A. Stirk, and J. van Staden (1999). Screening of medicinal plants used in Lesotho for anti-bacterial and anti-inflammatory activity. Journal of Ethnopharmacology 67: 347 ? 354.

Comments submitted by council members on the GEF November 2017 Work Program

Germany

No comments

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 100,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews			
National Expert on Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) and Nature-based Enterprise Development	38,500	34,213	4,286
Sustainable Livelihoods, Gender and Stakeholder Engagement expert			
Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes			

Project Development Specialist (GEF PPG Team Leader)	48,000	47,481	519
Component C: Validation Workshop and Report			
Workshop/Training & Travel	13,000	10,758	2,242
Supplies and miscellaneous	500	48	452
Total	100,000	92,500	7,500

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
85,000	0		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the four sub-indicators (4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4) for that stage.

4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, noncertified)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Qualitative description at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Qualitative description at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Qualitative description at MTR	Ha (achieved at TE)	Qualitative description at TE
85,000	Not described and it was mentioned that the target would be confirmed at PPG phase	0					

Add rows as needed.

Core Indicator 11. Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Total number (expected at PIF)	Total number (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total number (achieved at MTR)	Total number (achieved at TE)
Women	n/a	10,042		
Men	n/a	9,489		
Total	n/a	19,531		

ANNEX F: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Influencing models			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transform policy and regulatory environments		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Convene multi-stakeholder alliances		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate innovative approaches		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Deploy innovative financial instruments		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Sector		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capital providers	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial intermediaries and market facilitators	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large corporations	
		<input type="checkbox"/> SMEs	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individuals/Entrepreneurs	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Grant Pilot	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Project Reflow	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Communities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academia	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions and Workers Unions	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type of Engagement		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Dissemination	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communications		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness Raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Education	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Public Campaigns	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Behavior Change	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity, Knowledge and Research			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Generation and Exchange		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Theory of Change	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indicators to Measure Change	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge and Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Management	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Engagement Plan		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Equality			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Mainstreaming		

		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women groups	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex-disaggregated indicators	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender-sensitive indicators	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender results areas		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access and control over natural resources	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation and leadership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access to benefits and services	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge generation	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal Areas/Theme			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Programs		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Commodity Supply Chains ("Good Growth Partnership")	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodities Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Screening Tools
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Conservation Value Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Carbon Stocks Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Soybean Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Oil Palm Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Beef Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Resilience (climate and shocks)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Production Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agroecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land and Soil Health
			<input type="checkbox"/> Diversified Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Land and Water Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small and Medium Enterprises
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Genetic Diversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Gender Dimensions
			<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-stakeholder Platforms
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Restoration
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodity Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Land Use Planning
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Landscapes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Cities	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated urban planning
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban sustainability framework
			<input type="checkbox"/> Transport and Mobility
			<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings
			<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal waste management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Green space
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Biodiversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Energy efficiency
			<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal Financing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Global Platform for Sustainable Cities
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Resilience

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected Areas and Landscapes	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Protected Areas
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal and Marine Protected Areas
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Productive Landscapes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Productive Seascapes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Community Based Natural Resource Management
		<input type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Extractive Industries (oil, gas, mining)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Forestry (Including HCVF and REDD+)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Tourism
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & agrobiodiversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries
			<input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure
			<input type="checkbox"/> Certification (National Standards)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Certification (International Standards)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Species	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Illegal Wildlife Trade
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threatened Species
			<input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife for Sustainable Development
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Wild Relatives
			<input type="checkbox"/> Plant Genetic Resources
			<input type="checkbox"/> Animal Genetic Resources
			<input type="checkbox"/> Livestock Wild Relatives
			<input type="checkbox"/> Invasive Alien Species (IAS)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mangroves
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sea Grasses
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands
			<input type="checkbox"/> Rivers
			<input type="checkbox"/> Lakes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical Rain Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical Dry Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Temperate Forests
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grasslands
			<input type="checkbox"/> Paramo
			<input type="checkbox"/> Desert
		<input type="checkbox"/> Financial and Accounting	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Payment for Ecosystem Services
			<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting
			<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Trust Funds
			<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Finance
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Protocol to the CBD	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing
	<input type="checkbox"/> Forests		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest and Landscape Restoration	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest	
			<input type="checkbox"/> REDD/REDD+
			<input type="checkbox"/> Amazon
			<input type="checkbox"/> Congo
			<input type="checkbox"/> Drylands
	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Land Management	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands
			<input type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem Approach
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach
			<input type="checkbox"/> Community-Based NRM
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Livelihoods

			<input type="checkbox"/> Income Generating Activities
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Agriculture
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Pasture Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Fire Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Drought Mitigation/Early Warning
		<input type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation Neutrality	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land Productivity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land Cover and Land cover change
			<input type="checkbox"/> Carbon stocks above or below ground
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security	
	<input type="checkbox"/> International Waters		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ship	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Aquifer
			<input type="checkbox"/> River Basin
			<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Basin
		<input type="checkbox"/> Learning	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances	
		<input type="checkbox"/> SIDS : Small Island Dev States	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pollution	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances
			<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from Wastewater
		<input type="checkbox"/> Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan preparation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Action Plan Implementation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large Marine Ecosystems	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Aquaculture	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Marine Protected Area	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mangrove
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
			<input type="checkbox"/> Seagrasses
			<input type="checkbox"/> Polar Ecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Constructed Wetlands
	<input type="checkbox"/> Chemicals and Waste		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Mercury	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Artisanal and Scale Gold Mining	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Power Plants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Industrial Boilers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cement	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Ferrous Metals Production	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ozone	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sound Management of chemicals and Waste	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Waste Management	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste
			<input type="checkbox"/> e-Waste
		<input type="checkbox"/> Emissions	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Disposal	

		<input type="checkbox"/> New Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Polychlorinated Biphenyls	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Eco-Efficiency	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pesticides	
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Vector Management	
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Other	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Emissions	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Open Burning	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Best Available Technology / Best Environmental Practices	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Green Chemistry	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance
			<input type="checkbox"/> Least Developed Countries
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small Island Developing States
			<input type="checkbox"/> Disaster Risk Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sea-level rise
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Resilience
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate information
			<input type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem-based Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Programme of Action
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Plan
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector
			<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Complementarity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Community-based Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Livelihoods
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land Use
			<input type="checkbox"/> Energy Efficiency
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Urban Systems and Transport
			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Energy
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities
		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Endogenous technology
			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Needs Assessment
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
		<input type="checkbox"/> United Nations Framework on Climate Change	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nationally Determined Contribution
			<input type="checkbox"/> Paris Agreement
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Development Goals
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance (Rio Markers)	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 0
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 1
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 2
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 0
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 1
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 2

ANNEX G: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USD)							Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	M&E	Sub-Total	PMC	Total (USD)	(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency) [1]
Equipment	This budget is reserved for Office furniture of PMU staff. Total estimated cost is \$5,000.					-	5,000	5,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Equipment	This budget is reserved for procurement of equipment: Laboratory and processing equipment for research centres to strengthen the capacity for bioprospecting. Total cost: \$440,000 during years 2 and 3 (Output 2.1.2). Total estimated cost is \$440,000		440,000			440,000		440,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Equipment	This budget is reserved for communication and connectivity of PMU staff Costs of internet connection and monthly connectivity fee (telephone bills etc) (@\$50/month for 6 project staff for 60 months) @\$3,600 per year for 5 years Total estimated cost is \$18,000					-	18,000	18,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)

Equipment	This budget is reserved for IT equipment of PMU staff:a) Computer for Project Manager. Total cost: \$1,500. b) Computer for Financial/Administrative Officer: Total cost: \$1,500 c) Computer for Communication/KM Officer. Total cost \$1,500d) Printer (1). Total cost: \$250.e) Digital camera (1). Total cost: \$250.f) Projector (1). Total cost: \$500.Total estimated cost is \$5,500.					-	5,500	5,500	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Equipment	This budget is reserved for procurement of IT equipment for the Field coordinators @ 2000/ per person during the 1st year. Total estimated cost is \$4,000		4,000			4,000		4,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Contractual services-Individual	This budget is reserved for:Financial/Administrative Officer salary: financial management of the project, accounting, purchasing, and reporting, etc. Total cost: \$74,485.20 @ \$1,241.42 per month for 5 yearsTotal estimated cost is \$74,485.20					-	74,747	74,747	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)

Contractual services-Individual	<p>This budget is reserved to cover portion of project staff salary :a) Field Coordinator -2 staff (This component will cover 100% of their salaries): field support for building capacities for bioprospecting and value-addition of genetic resources. Total cost: \$283,200 for 5 years @ \$2,360 per month for one facilitator (all Outputs in Component).b) Driver. Total cost: \$43,140 @ \$719 per month for 5 years (all Outputs in Component).Total estimated cost is \$326,340</p>		326,340		326,340	326,340	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
---------------------------------	--	--	---------	--	---------	---------	--

Contractual services-Company	<p>This budget is reserved for contracting a company/consortium that should include the following experts;; Environmental policy expert who can provide the following: a) ABS Legal/Policy Expert (international): Support the development of an enabling institutional capacity and regulatory framework for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. Total cost: \$126,000 during 30 months over 3 years (Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.3.1, 1.3.2, and 1.3.3)b) ABS and TK Expert: Develop an ABS and TK Strategy through a participatory process. Total cost: \$31,500 during year 1 (Output 1.1.4).c) ABS capacity development expert: Develop an institutional Capacity Development Strategy for the ABS framework implementation, monitoring, enforcement and compliance following the validation of needs and gap assessment conducted during the PPG. Total cost: \$28,170 during year 2 (Output 1.2.2).d) Design and put into operation a user-</p>	234,670				234,670		234,670	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
------------------------------	---	---------	--	--	--	---------	--	---------	--

<p>friendly web-based national CHM. Total cost: \$49,000 during year 1 (Output 1.2.4). Total estimated cost is \$234,670. Note: If it is necessary to source such a company/consortium internationally regionally, it will be a requirement that the team includes national counterparts.</p>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Contractual services-Company	<p>This budget is reserved for contracting several companies/consortia that provide the services related to this component:a) A Company/Consortium that can provide the following services: i. Conduct a national research and development strategy on bioprospecting, including role of traditional practitioners and herbalists. Total cost: \$25,000 during years 1 to 4. (Output 2.1.1).ii. Conduct a comprehensive valuation of selected genetic resources with known commercial and intangible values (cultural and spiritual): baseline assessment and economic valuation. Total cost: \$57,440 during years 2 and 3 (Output 2.1.3).b) A Company to strengthen capacities through targeted training of experts and technical staff of national research centres in R&D associated to medicinal plants. Total cost: \$70,000 during year 1 (Output 2.1.2)c) A Company to establish an accredited testing laboratory for safety and efficacy of genetic resources related products including development of</p>		729,270			729,270		729,270	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
------------------------------	--	--	---------	--	--	---------	--	---------	--

	<p>Occupational Safety and Health Action Plan (OSHAP). Total cost: \$250,000 during years 1 and 2 (Output 2.1.2) d) A Company to identify potential medicinal plants species for value-chain development and improvement. Total cost: 100,000 during years 2 to 5 (Output 2.1.2)e) A Company to develop and E-permitting system for bio prospectors. Total cost: \$50,000 during years 2 and 3 (Output 2.1.4).f) A Company to conduct training of small/medium-scale community-based organizations and enterprises and for national parks and establish a template for ABS agreements. Total cost: \$80,000 during years 1 to 4 (Output 2.2.1).g) A Company to develop a model biocultural community protocol considering medicinal plants with potential for bioprospecting. Total cost: \$46,830 during years 3 (Output 2.2.3). Total estimated cost is \$629,270</p>								
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

International Consultants	This budget is reserved for hiring international consultant (IC) to support the following activities: a) Mid-Term Review (International Consultant) @ \$15,000 in Yr 3(Output 4.1); and b) Terminal Evaluation (International consultant) @ \$20,000 in Yr 5(Output 4.1)Total estimated cost is \$35,000				35,000	35,000		35,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
International Consultants	This budget is reserved for Technical Adviser to provide technical and strategic guidance and technical backstopping. Total cost: \$120,000 over 5 years (all outputs in component). Total estimated cost is \$120,000		120,000			120,000		120,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Local Consultants	This budget is reserved for hiring National Consultant (IC) to support the following activities: a) Mid-term project review. Total cost: \$10,000 during year 3. (Output 4.1) and b) Terminal evaluation. Total cost: \$13,500 during year 5. (Output 4.1)c) collecting data for MTR core indicator during year 3 @\$2000 and for TE core indicator during year 5 @\$2000Total Estimated cost is \$27,500				27,500	27,500		27,500	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)

Local Consultants	<p>This budget is reserved for hiring National Consultant (IC) to support the following activities:</p> <p>a) Web page design for the project. Total cost: \$9,130 during year 1 (Output 3.2.1).b) Gender/Safeguards Officer. Support gender mainstreaming and gender monitoring (Gender Action Plan), monitoring of environmental and social risks, and develop, implement and monitor the IPP and secure PIC. Total cost: 66,000 (@\$100 per day for 660 days over the project period). The cost will cover the support to be provided from year 1 to 5. (Outputs 3.1.1).c) Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA). Total cost: \$50,000 during Yr1 Total estimated cost is \$125,130</p>			125,130		125,130		125,130	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
-------------------	--	--	--	---------	--	---------	--	---------	--

Local Consultants	<p>This budget is reserved to hire a National (IC):a) Provide training to National Focal Point, Competent National Authorities, and Checkpoints. Total cost: \$7,000 during years 1 and 2 (Output 1.2.1).b) Environmental Policy Expert: Support the development of National guidelines for enforcing ABS regulatory framework. Total cost: \$10,500 during year 2 (Output 1.2.3).Total estimated cost is \$17,500</p>	17,500				17,500		17,500	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
-------------------	--	--------	--	--	--	--------	--	--------	--

<p>Training , Workshops, Meetings</p>	<p>This budget (multi-year) is reserved for conferences and training events linked to Component 1 Activities and quantified as follows:a) Validation workshops for updating the National Environment Policy of 1998 and Biodiversity Bill of 2021 to incorporate ABS/NAGOYA PROTOCOL considerations. Total cost: \$8,000 during year 1. (Output 1.1.1).b) Validation workshops for the development of National ABS, Bioprospecting and TK Regulations. Total cost: \$12,000 during year 1 (Output 1.1.3).c) Validation workshops for updating Local/Community Councils By-laws to incorporate ABS and biodiversity conservation considerations. Total cost: \$12,000 during year 1. (Output 1.1.3).d) Consultation workshops for the development of an ABS and TK Strategy. Total cost: \$12,000 during year 1. (Output 1.1.4).e) Training workshops and meeting for National Focal Point, Competent Authorities and Checkpoints to develop, implement</p>	<p>216,000</p>				<p>216,000</p>		<p>216,000</p>	<p>Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)</p>
---------------------------------------	--	----------------	--	--	--	----------------	--	----------------	---

<p>and enforce national legislative, administrative or policy measures on ABS. Total cost: \$16,000 during years 1 and 2 (Output 1.2.1).f) Training, workshops, and participation in conferences as part of the implementation of the Institutional Capacity Development Strategy on ABS. Total cost: \$88,000 during years 2 to and 4. (Output 1.2.2).g) Consultation workshops for the development of National guidelines for enforcing ABS regulatory framework. Total cost: \$12,000 during year 2 (Output 1.2.3).h) Consultations and validation workshops: draft of guidelines and procedures for obtaining PIC and MAT. Total cost: \$16,000 during year 2. (Output 1.3.1).i) Consultation and validation workshops: draft of biocultural community protocols governing management, ownership, access rights and benefit sharing rules and procedures. Total cost: \$16,000 during year 2 (Output 1.3.2).j) Consultation and validation workshops: draft of</p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>patenting protocols for TK. Total cost: \$12,000 during year 2 (Output 1.3.2).k) Consultation and validation workshops for the development of codes of conduct, best-practices, and standards that ensure sustainable harvesting, fair and equitable benefit-sharing. Total cost: \$12,000 during years 2 and 3 (Output 1.3.3).Total estimated cost is \$216,000</p>								
<p>Training , Workshops, Meetings</p>	<p>This budget (multiyear) is reserved for conferences and training events linked to Component 3 Activities and quantified as follows: a) Awareness and sensitization workshops for local authorities, traditional practitioners and women on ABS. Total cost: \$45,000 during years 1 to 5 (Output 3.2.1).b) Workshops and meetings related to IPP and PIC. Total cost: \$31,000 over 5 years Total estimated cost is \$76,000</p>			76,000		76,000.00		76,000.00	<p>Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)</p>

<p>Training , Worksh ops, Meeting s</p>	<p>This budget (multiyear) is reserved for workshops/conferences and/or training events linked to Component 3 Activities and quantified as follows: a) Project Inception Workshop. Total cost \$8,500 during year 1 (Output 3.2.2).b) Knowledge forums to share lessons learnt and good practices with multiple stakeholders. Total cost: \$15,000 during years 2 to 5 (Output 3.2.1).c) Mid-term project review related workshops. Total cost: \$1,000 during year 3 (Output 3.2.2).d) Terminal evaluation related workshops. Total cost: \$1,500 during year 5 (Output 3.2.2).e) Quarterly Project board meetings. Total cost: \$12,000, \$2,400 per year from year 1 to 5 (Output 3.2.2).f) Monitoring of Environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plan as relevant. Total cost: \$7,500 from year 2 to 5g) Workshops/meetings related to Gender action plan. Total cost \$7,500 from year 2 to 5.Total estimated cost is \$53,000</p>				<p>53,000</p>	<p>53,000</p>		<p>53,000</p>	<p>Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)</p>
---	---	--	--	--	---------------	---------------	--	---------------	---

<p>Training Workshops, Meetings</p>	<p>This budget is reserved for meetings/workshops/trainings costs: a) related to exchange programmes with more established product developers to capacitate local stakeholders and develop commercial products. Total cost: \$60,000 during years 2 to 5 (Output 2.1.2). b) related to establishment of partnerships and collaboration by local product developers with international partners. Total cost: \$55,047 during the 5 years (Output 2.1.2).c) for exchanges of experience program to raise awareness about regional/international ABS initiatives. Total cost: \$70,000 during the 5 years (Output 2.2.2). Total estimated cost is \$185,047</p>		<p>185,047</p>			<p>185,047</p>		<p>185,047</p>	<p>Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)</p>
<p>Travel</p>	<p>This budget is reserved for Travel expenses related to this component including oversight and stakeholders? meetings @ \$6000/year Total estimated cost is \$30,000</p>		<p>30,000</p>			<p>30,000</p>		<p>30,000</p>	<p>Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)</p>

Travel	<p>This budget is reserved for travel expenses related to this component: a) Travel costs for mid-term project review (including DSA): Total cost: \$5,650 during year 3. (Output 4.1)b) Travel costs for terminal evaluation (including DSA): Total cost: \$7,000 during year 5. (Output 4.1)c) Travel costs for M&E of project activities: Total cost: \$7,500 during year 1 to 5. (Output 4.1)Total estimated cost is \$20,150</p>				20,150	20,150		20,150	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Travel	<p>This budget is reserved for travel expenses related to this component: a) Travel costs for the implementation and monitoring of gender mainstreaming activities: Total cost: \$15,000 during years 1 to 5 (Output 3.1.1).b) Travel costs for communication and knowledge management activities: Total cost: \$13,953 during years 1 to 5 (Output 3.2.1).Total estimated cost is \$28,953</p>		28,953		28,953			28,953	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Travel	<p>This budget is reserved to PMU related travel. Total cost \$15,000 @ \$3,000/year for 5 years. Total estimated cost is \$15,000</p>				-	15,000	15,000	15,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)

Travel	Travel costs related to enabling institutional capacity and regulatory framework strengthened to support implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. The cost will cover from year 1 to 4 (all outputs in component). Total estimated cost is \$20,000	20,000				20,000		20,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Office Supplies	Office and IT supplies in support of Component 1 activities. The cost will cover from year 1 to 5 (all outputs in component). Total estimated cost is \$5,000	5,000				5,000		5,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Office Supplies	This budget is reserved for Office supplies: Total estimated cost is \$5,500 @ \$1,100 per year during the 5 years.					-	5,500	5,500	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Other Operating Costs	This budget is reserved for Annual External audit fee for the 5 years @ \$3,000 per year. Total estimated cost is \$15,000					-	15,000	15,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)

Other Operating Costs	<p>This budget is reserved for Communication materials:</p> <p>a) Translation of all relevant legal and policy instruments into local language (i.e., Sesotho). Total cost: \$10,000 during year 1 (Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, and 1.1.4).b) Translation of biocultural community protocols governing management, ownership, access rights and benefit sharing rules and procedures into local language (i.e., Sesotho). Total cost: \$8,000 during year 2 (Outputs 1.3.2).c) Printing and production costs of biocultural community protocols governing management, ownership, access rights and benefit sharing rules and procedures. Total cost: \$7,000 during year 2 (Output 1.3.2).d) Printing and productions costs of patenting protocols for TK. Total cost: \$7,000 during year 2 (Output 1.3.2).e) Printing and productions costs of codes of conduct, best-practices and standards that ensure sustainable harvesting, fair and equitable benefit-sharing. Total cost: \$7,000 during year</p>	39,000				39,000		39,000	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
-----------------------	--	--------	--	--	--	--------	--	--------	--

	3. (Output 1.3.3). Total estimated cost is \$39,000								
Other Operating Costs	This budget is reserved for communications materials production and staff communication means: Publications and media products related to knowledge management and communication. The cost will cover the support provided under Output 3.2.1 from year 1 to 5. Total estimated cost is \$20,300			20,300		20,300		20,300	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Other Operating Costs	Incidental expenses related to building a systemic and institutional capacity for integrated landscape management at national level. The cost will cover for the entire period for all outputs in the component. Total estimated cost is \$6,777	6,777				6,777		6,777	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)
Other Operating Costs	This budget is reserved for incidental expenses including insurance and bank charges etc a) Insurance vehicle. Total cost: \$10,500; \$2,100/year during the 5 years b) Incidental expenses related to Building capacities for bioprospecting and value-addition of genetic resources. Total cost: \$4,815 during the 5 years (all outputs in component) Total estimated cost is \$15,315		15,315			15,315		15,315	Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)

	Total	538,947	1,849,9 72	250,38 3	135, 650	2,774, 952	138, 747	2,913, 699	
--	--------------	---------	---------------	-------------	-------------	---------------	-------------	---------------	--