

Support to Nagoya protocol implementation, research and development, on Biodiversity value chain for small holders in the South West and Far North Regions of Cameroon

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10850

Countries

Cameroon

Project Name

Support to Nagoya protocol implementation, research and development, on Biodiversity value chain for small holders in the South West and Far North Regions of Cameroon

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

11/30/2022

Review completed by PM

12/15/2022

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: The project remains well aligned with the Biodiversity focal area priorities (BD 3.9 ? Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing)

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: The proposed project design has improved meaningfully from PIF stage and the proposal has addressed the comments received satisfactorily in relation to better elaboration of expected outcomes and outputs.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-12-22: The co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10%, for a co-financing of \$19,000,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,900,000 instead of \$732,000 (which is 3.8%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please, amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | | Sub Total (\$) | 1,818,182 |
| Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ | | | |
| | GET | 181,818.00 | |
| | Sub Total(\$) | 181,818.00 | |
| | Total Project Cost(\$) | 2,000,000.00 | 1 |

Agency Response

23 May 2023

The Cofinancing for PMC has been amended to read US\$ 1,900,000. Figures of co-financing on the project outcomes were amended accordingly.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: The financing presented in Table D is satisfactory.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-12-22: Please, provide details on the activities funded through the PPG and not only stipulate ?national/international consultants?. Also there is a small typo in amount spent to date on the *Travel on Official business*

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

| <i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i> | <i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i> | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| | <i>Budgeted Amount</i> | <i>Amount Spent To date</i> | <i>Amount Committed</i> |
| National Consultants | 13,000 | 13,000 | 0 |
| International Consultants | 16,000 | 16,000 | 0 |
| Travel on Official business | 2,662 | 2,632 | 0 |
| Meetings and Stakeholders consultations | 14,000 | 14,000 | 0 |
| Total | 45,662 | 45,662 | 0 |

Agency Response

May 23, 2023

Activities funded through the PPG have been organized and presented. The include:

- The CEO Endorsement Document and relevant annexes including Annex 9: UNEP Project Document
- Annex H Thematic baseline studies funded through the PPG
- Annex I: Meetings, Stakeholders consultations and workshops reports, including the Project inception and validation workshop.

The typo in the Table in Annex C has been corrected to read 2,662.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Please, include the target for core indicator 11 in the annex A (results framework)

Agency Response

May 23, 2023

The Target for core indicator 11 has been included in Annex A under the CEO Endorsement document under Outcome 2.2, and Appendix 4 of the Project Document.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: The proposal presents satisfactory elaboration on threats, root causes and impacts of environmental degradation to be addressed by the project.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Baseline scenario and associated projects are adequately described and has been satisfactory enhanced since PIF stage. .

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2-12-22: Component description and proposed outcomes are satisfactory.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: The alignment with the strategies of the BD focal area is satisfactory.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Incremental reasoning is satisfactory.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Project's expected contributions to Global Environment Benefits are adequately elaborated..

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Description of innovation, sustainability and scaling up aspects is adequate. The project represent a good opportunity to promote and influence policy on ABS at subnational and national level.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Map of Project's sites is adequate.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Project includes adequate stakeholders engagement plan.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: The project conducted gender analysis and includes gender-sensitive activities under a Gender Action Plan, and indicators linked with project objectives.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2-12-22: Engagement with private sector is adequately described.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2-12-22: Risk analysis and proposed mitigation measures are adequate.

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2-12-22: Institutional arrangements are adequate with clear indication of roles and responsibilities. Coordination with other relevant projects/initiatives is also described.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: The alignment with the national strategies and plans is satisfactorily described.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Proposed knowledge management approach is adequate. .

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Environmental and social risks are adequately described and consistent with the GEF guidelines.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8-12-22: Please add a line to stipulate the total for M&E.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

| Type of M&E activity | Responsible Parties | Budget from GEF | Budget co-finance | Time |
|---|---|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents | Project Lead Technical Expert with inputs from partners | 5000 | 25,000 | Annually, annual reports & report |
| TOTAL | | | | |

Agency Response
May 23, 2023

The budgeted M & E plan Table has been modified to include a line for the Total for M&E in section 9 of the CEO Endorsement Document.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Socioeconomic benefits are adequately described.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-12-22: Some tables are off margins, please make sure that all the tables fit within the portal margins so when the documents are downloaded from the portal all the information is readable.

On the budget:

a. The budget show M&E activities charged to the components. Please, use a template similar to the one provided in the guidelines where there is a column for these specific activities. Per the resubmission, we may provide additional comments if appropriate.

b. Project director is being charged across components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Please, revise these costs.

c. Please, provide justification for the vehicles indicated in the budget.

19-12-22: Project Director continues being charged to the components instead of to PMC despite of \$730K co-financing allocated to PMC, of which \$2.7 Million being represented in grants. If it is not possible to allocate PMC co-financing funds to cover this position, please provide a justification and in consistency with Guidelines, also present the Terms of Reference describing the unique contribution (deliverables) to the components that are covering this position.

Agency Response

May 23, 2023

- a) The appropriate budget template is now been used. See Annex F1 ? UNEP Budget in GEF format.
- b) Project Director now being charged to PMC.
- c) Justification for vehicle now provided and reads as follow: The project pilot sites and targeted IPLC in North West and Far North Regions are far away from the capital and hiring of vehicle for regular project activities including awareness raising, trainings and monitoring of pilot site for ABS testing will be: i) more costly to the project; ii) many uncertainty to have adequate vehicle at right time; iii) risky to manage hired vehicles?; iv) unpredictability of hiring cost as result of possible market fluctuation.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-12-22: Please, see comment above on inclusion of target for core indicator 11 in the annex A (results framework) .

19-12-22: The comment is not addressed. The GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A. The core indicator target needs to be mentioned in the Annex A. Please , include that target.

Agency Response

May 23, 2023

Core Indicator 11 now added in Annex A under indicator 11 of Outcome 2.2.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-12-22: Please, address the comments above and resubmit for review. Thanks!

19-12-22: Please, address the comments above and resubmit for review. Thanks!

Agency Response

May 23, 2023

Comments addressed. The Agency is committed to ensure any further guidance for consideration at inception will be adequately considered.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-12-22: Please, see comment above on PPG table.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-12-22: Project maps and coordinates information for the Project's sites are satisfactory.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Review Dates

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---|---|
| First Review | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations