

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

Review PIF 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

Agenices

UNEP

Date received by PM

8/5/2019

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

9-9-19

Yes. BD-3-9

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

9-9-19

Component 1

REGARDING 1.1.4 Feasibility study^[2] (to identify requirements for financial mechanism to apportion revenue to communities and biodiversity conservation) carried out and made available to relevant national stakeholders

1) Is it worth the investment in the Feasibility Study for the financial mechanism when there is no funding to carry out even a pilot? Doesn't the country run the risk of doing the study and then finding out later that it is outdated and has to be done again?

2) Is this mechanism really necessary? Shouldn't the sharing of the direct financial benefits derived from an ABS Agreement discussed among the stakeholders on a case by case?

Component 3

REGARDING: 3.1.2. National database on genetic resources created in line with PIC/MAT principles

What does this actually entail? A national database on genetic resources of Madagascar is a monumental task and very unlikely to be carried out with this project.

What does actually mean "on genetic resources"? What information on the GR will be collected? Please clarify, or remove.

REGARDING 3.1.3 Feasibility study[2] to scale-up database into a traceability system carried out.

Same comment as in the case of "financial mechanism". Shouldn't this be done when the time comes and the funding is available to test the traceability system? Please consider this carefully

10-9-19

Cleared

Agency Response

20 September 2019

Outputs 1.1.4. and 3.1.3. have been deleted.

Output 3.1.2: this output has been deleted. However, the original Output 3.1.1 has been split in two to clarify that Community Genetic Resources Registers/databases will be carried out at project sites.

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

9-9-19

Yes. There is a combination of Investment Mobilized (\$3.2 M) and Recurrent costs (\$1.0 M). The co-financing comes from a variety of donors.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

9-9-19

No. The project cost in the Portal (\$1,685,160) is different from the LoE (\$1,679,000). Please address

Source of funds	GEF Agencies	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFTF	UN Environment	Biodiversity	50 000	1 679 000	171 000	1 900 000
Total GEF Resources			50 000	1 679 000	171 000	1 900 000

10-9-19

The project cost in the Portal needs to be identical as the Project cost in the LoE (i.e. 1,679,000). Since the fee is incorrect in the LoE, a new LoE needs to be provided so the numbers in the Letter and the Portal match. If the project wants to remain at \$1,900,000 calculate the corresponding amounts for Project and Fees and request a new LoE.

Duration	Agency Fee(\$)	Submission Date
36	160,090	8/2/2019
In Months		

A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)
BD-3-9	GET	1,685,160
Total Project Cost (\$)		1,685,160

Duration	Agency Fee(\$)	Submission Date
36	160,090	8/2/2019
In Months		

A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)
BD-3-9	GET	1,685,160
Total Project Cost (\$)		1,685,160

11-19-19

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFTF	UNEP	Biodiversity	50,000	1,685,160	164,840	1,900,000
Total GEF Resources			50,000	1,685,160	164,840	1,900,000

The numbers are now the same in Portal as in the LoE

PIF	\$1,685,160	\$160,090	\$1,845,250
PPG	\$50,000	\$4,750	\$54,750
Fee	\$164,840		
	\$1,900,000		\$1,900,000

Cleared

Agency Response

20 September 2019

While the overall commitment from the country's STAR allocation remains the same (\$1.9 million), the calculation in the LoE is not correct because it used a 9.8% fee rate. Using the commitment of \$1.9 million and the correct fee rate of 9.5%, the project grant has been adjusted accordingly in the portal to \$1,685,160.

15 October 2019

The LoE for a total of \$1,900,000 has been revised accordingly and is uploaded in the GEF Portal.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-9-19

The requested \$1.6 million are available.

Cleared

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

9-9-19

Yes. It is \$50,000 and the associated fee at 9.5%

Cleared

E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Amount (\$) PPG Agency Fee (\$)

50,000 4,750

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	Madagascar	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	50,000	4,750	54,750
Total Project Costs(\$)					50,000	4,750	54,750

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

9-9-19

Yes.

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

9-9-19

Please indicate where Table G is.

10-9-19

Cleared

Agency Response

20 September 2019

Table G has been added to the GEF Portal.

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

9-9-19

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-9-19

There are baseline investments from Government, Green Climate Fund and GiZ.

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

9-9-19

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-9-19

Yes

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

9-9-19

Yes

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

9-9-19

Because this project is in support of the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol there are no targets, except the number of beneficiaries. No land area indicator is provided at PIF stage. This should change at CEO Endorsement when the target communities are properly assessed.

Please confirm or provide estimated land area of the target communities.

10-9-19

Cleared

Agency Response

20 September 2019

We confirm that land area will be provided at CEO Endorsement.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-9-19

Yes. Addressed on item 1a.7.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

9-9-19

Yes. Maps are provided in Annex A in Portal.

Cleared

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

9-9-19

There is a pretty comprehensive table of stakeholders in the Portal. For each of the stakeholder state if they were consulted for this PIF or consultation will be required at CEO Endorsement. This can be added in the cell "Role in project". Only true stakeholders (directly linked to proposed activities) should be included in the PIF.

10-91-19

Cleared

Agency Response

20 September 2019

The table has been revised and information added to clarify if stakeholders were consulted for this PIF or will be required at CEO Endorsement.

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

9-9-19

Yes

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

9-9-19

Yes. Four (4) private sector companies are identified at PIF stage.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

9-9-19

Yes

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

9-9-19

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

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

9-9-19

Yes

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

9-9-19

Yes

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

9-9-19

Yes. Letter signed by the current OFP.

Cleared

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

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

9-9-19

No. Please address outstanding issues. Thanks.

10-9-19

No. Address issue of the financials on item 4.

11-19-19

This PIF is recommended for technical 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