

Effective National Implementation of the Access and Benefit Sharing and Traditional Knowledge Regime in Niger in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10442

Countries

Niger

Project Name

Effective National Implementation of the Access and Benefit Sharing and Traditional Knowledge Regime in Niger in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol

Agenices

UNEP

Date received by PM

11/19/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

The GEF kindly request reconsidering the budget allocation to Component 1 and 2. The budget for Component 1 is almost the same as in Component 2, and very small when compared to similar projects on the NP in the region (UNEP has the values). Please reallocate funds to Component 1. Awareness raising on the Nagoya Protocol can be done with a fraction of the funds. The proponents should seriously consider concentrating all the resources in Component 1 and do the Awareness raising towards the end of the project via Adaptive Management once all the necessary activities for Component 1 have been completed. No clearance from GEF will be needed to take that decision.

1-6-20

Cleared

Agency Response

12-17-19

The budget has now been revised to consider the review guidance which is very much appreciated. Nevertheless, UNEP and the National Executing Agency consider that the Niger General Election in 2020 will increase the staff turnover and there is need to give importance to training, awareness-raising particularly for new actors (Parliamentarians, Mayors; staff from key institutions) as they will be important for the approval process of the framework to be developed and implementation.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Please try to increase the co-financing to at least 1:1. Combining GEF and co-financing is not even an MSP of \$2M.

1-6-20

Cleared

Agency Response

12-17-19

The co-financing has been increased taking into consideration new initiatives that are linked with the ABS implementation in the country. These baselines have been included in the PIF in the baseline description and the related financing included in Table C – Indicative Co-financing.

The co-financing ratio is now more than 1:3

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Yes. Project same as LoE and Fee 9.5%.

Cleared

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

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

Focal area set-aside?

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

Impact Program Incentive?

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

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Yes. Same as in LoE and Fee = 9.5%

Cleared

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Yes. Only indicator 11 as this project is building the capacity to implement the NP.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Please indicate the location of Table G.

1-6-20

Cleared

Agency Response

12-17-19

The Table G is now indicated at the right location with Annex C complementing it. The appropriate section in the portal has also been completed.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Barriers aligned with project components.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

There are sufficient background investments and a small baseline project (*the initiative in the context of cooperation between the Clearing House Mechanisms of Belgium and Niger*). This is acceptable considering that this is a capacity building project to establish the basic provisions requested by the Nagoya Protocol.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Cleared

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Cleared

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Please elaborate more on sustainability. Are funds likely to come from donors and Government before Private Sector engages on ABS Agreements?

1-6-20

Cleared

Agency Response

12-17-19

The sustainability section now more elaborated. The PPG phase will be used to come up with a more elaborated sustainability approach.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Please only include the stakeholders that will take an active role in the project. Please indicate if they have been consulted regarding this project.

1-6-20

Cleared

Agency Response

12-17-19

The stakeholder's section has been amended to consider the review guidelines. However, during the PPG UNEP and EA will come with a more elaborated stakeholder section given the multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder character of ABS.

The stakeholders in the table have been consulted during the development of this project through the National Biodiversity Focal Point.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Cleared

Agency Response**Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Please provide the names of the private sector companies (domestic or international) that are currently or potentially interested in ABS agreements. Remove generic language. If no private sector engagement for the moment, please state it.

1-6-20

Cleared

Agency Response

12-17-19

Currently, there is no private sector engagement on the ABS agreement in Niger. It is hoped that with the enabling environment the GEF project will be putting in place will help to attract the private sector in Niger.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Please address the question raised in this item: *institutional structure of the project including monitoring and evaluation coordination at the project level*. Elaborate on Arrangements for Executing Functions.

1-6-20

Cleared

Agency Response

12-17-19

The project institutional arrangement including M&E is now included and will be finetuned during the PPG phase. See section 6.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

The project was submitted with a LoC signed by the OFP currently listed in the GEF web site.

Cleared

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEF TF	UNEP	Biodiversity	45 662	867 580	86 758	1 000 000
Total GEF Resources			45 662	867 580	86 758	1 000 000

En vous réitérant mes sincères remerciements pour votre appui constant, je vous prie de croire, Madame la Coordinatrice, en l'assurance de ma considération distinguée.

Ampliation :

SE/CNEDD

YAKOUBOU MAHAMAN SANI

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-25-19

No. Please address the outstanding issues.

1-6-20

Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

undefined