

Effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing from the Use of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in Madagascar

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10316

Countries

Madagascar

Project Name

Effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing from the Use of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in Madagascar

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

2/8/2021

Review completed by PM

3/17/2021

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

3-12-21 AM: Proposed project is aligned with BD Focal Area strategy.

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 3-12-21 AM: The revised project structure/design is satisfactory.

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

3-12-21 AM: Yes, the project will be financed by a GEF grant of USD 1,685,160.00 with a total co-financing of USD 4,512,881. 00 from a variety of public and private sources.

3-21-21AM; Please, all the cofinancing letters (except for GIZ) are in French. Unofficial translated letters are needed as per requirements of the GEF co-financing policy.

- Co-financing from CI should be labeled as source ?CSO? and not ?other?.
- Co-financing letter from Malagasy Institute of Applied Research indicates ?in-kind? co-financing, and not grant.
- Co-financing letter from Jean Claude Ratsimivony (JCR) Group indicates ?in-kind? co-financing, and not grant.
- The letter from WWF does not specify the type of co-financing, please amend (can be done by email).
- The letter from Homeopharma does not specify the type of co-financing, please amend (can be done by email).

Pleaser revise and resubmit. Thanks!

Agency Response

26/04/2021

Thank you for the comments. We had prepared an unofficial translation as appendix 12a to the prodoc that has been uploaded separately to avoid confusion. The other comments have been addressed and reflected in the prodoc and CEO ER:

- Co-financing source from CI has been labeled as Civil Society Organisation

- Co-financing source from Malagasy Institute of Applied Research has been indicated as ?in kind? in conformity with the co-financing letter

- Co-financing source from Jean Claude Ratsimivony (JCR) Group has been indicated as ?in kind? in conformity with the co-financing letter

The emails confirming the in-kind co-financing from WWF and Homeopharma have been merged into the appendix 12 to the prodoc and uploaded separately on the portal to avoid confusion.

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

3-12-21 AM: Yes, the proposed project financing is adequate.

3-21-21 AM :It seems that $\$84,245 + \$334,007 = \$418,252$ have been allocated for the PMC but kindly note that only the GEF portion has been distributed in the Budget Table. As per the available information, it is not possible to know whether the 334,007 are planned to be used.

Project Management Cost (PMC)			
	GET	84,245.00	334,007.00
	Sub Total(\$)	84,245.00	334,007.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	1,685,160.00	4,512,881.00

Appendix 2 to the prodoc. Furthermore, A summary of the co-financing budget by component (including M&E + PMC) has been included in the ProDoc as Table 9.

For the other comments please refer to the Appendix 1 to the prodoc that has been uploaded separately. The mentioned costs (office equipment, vehicle, office furniture, technical field materials, maintenance of vehicles and other office equipment, audiovisual and printed production costs, office furniture as well as audio-visual and printed production costs) have been charged to the PMC as the 10% threshold had not been fully utilized.

The justification for the procurement of a vehicle has been duly made in the budget notes (2nd tab of the excel file) and its costs have been integrated under PMC as requested. Please also note that the purchase of the vehicle as shown in Appendix 1 was technically cleared in the GEF response of March, i.e. *"An all-terrain vehicle for field works to engage regularly with local communities and stakeholders is listed in the Budget Table. Justification is technically accepted."*

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

3-12-21 AM: The proposal indicates that a PPG was requested for the development of a series of products, but the resource utilization is not documented in Annex C. Please revise and include the requested report.

3-17-21 AM: The PPG utilization is adequate and has been reported in Annex C.

Agency Response

•03/15/21: Annex C is indeed part of the CEO ER submission on the portal as well as the word file.

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

3-12-21 AM: Yes, the proposed core indicators are adequate.

Agency Response

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

3-12-21 AM: Yes, the analysis is technically sound.

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

3-12-21 AM: Yes, the baseline is adequately reported.

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

3-12-21 AM: Project description, components and expected 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

3-12-21 AM: Yes, the proposed project is aligned with the BD focal area strategy.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-12-21 AM: Yes, incremental analysis is technically adequate.

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

3-12-21 AM: Yes, GEBs are well analyzed and presented.

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

3-12-21 AM: Yes, the project has been designed to build on the achievements and recommendations of previous GEF investments and demonstrates scaling up potential and innovations.

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

3-12-21 AM: Maps provided are 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

3-12-21 AM: Proposal includes adequate stakeholders analysis and engagement.

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

3-12-21 AM: The project includes gender analysis and gender-sensitive indicators.

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

3-12-21 AM: Private sector role and engagement are adequately addressed in the proposal.

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

3-12-21 AM: Risk analysis and proposed mitigation measures are technically sound.

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

3-12-21 AM: Proposed institutional arrangements are adequate.

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

3-12-21 AM: Project is fully aligned and consistent with National priorities.

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

3-12-21 AM: Project proposed KM approach is comprehensive and technically sound.

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

3-12-21 AM: ESS risks and impacts are adequately analyzed and described.

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

3-12-21 AM: Project's proposed M&E approach is technically sound.

Agency Response

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

3-12-21 AM: GEBs and national socioeconomic benefits are well described.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-12-21 AM: The proposal is missing Annex C on PPG status.

Please, include justification for proposed vehicle acquisition with GEF funds in the budget presented in Appendix 1 (4202).

3-17-21 AM: PPG Status utilization is adequate and included in Annex C.

An all-terrain vehicle for field works to engage regularly with local communities and stakeholders is listed in the Budget Table. Justification is technically accepted.

Agency Response

03/15/21: The justification for the vehicle is indicated in the budget notes that refer to the budget line for the vehicle in Appendix 1.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-12-21 AM: Project results framework is adequate.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-12-21 AM: Project is technically sound.

3-21-21 AM: Please address the comments above relative to co-financing and budget tables and resubmit. Thanks!

Agency Response

04/26/2021

The comments related to the co-financing and budget tables have been addressed as indicated.

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

3-12-21 AM: Report on status of PPG utilization is missing in project documentation.

3-17-21 AM: Status of PPG utilization reported in Annex C.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-12-21 AM: Project maps are adequate.

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

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

3-12-21 AM: Proposal is technically sound. Please include report on status of PPG utilization in Annex C of project documentation, as required. Also, please include justification for proposed vehicle acquisition with GEF funds. Thanks!

3-17-21 AM: Responses provided by agency are satisfactory. Proposal is technically approved.

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)

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations