

Capacity support for accession to and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization in South Sudan

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10228

Countries

South Sudan

Project Name

Capacity support for accession to and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization in South Sudan

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

2/5/2021

Review completed by PM

5/17/2021

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: Proposal is aligned with BD focal area objectives.

Agency Response [Cleared on 12 March 2021](#)

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: Proposed structure and design are technically appropriate

Agency Response [Cleared on 12 March 2021](#)

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 [N/A](#)

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: Proposed co-financing level is satisfactory. Please, include the information on ?type of co-financing? in table C for co-financing contributions from (i) Ministry of Agriculture, (ii) Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and (iii) Central Equatorial state.

5-20-21 AM: Cleared

Agency Response

[Response17/05/2021](#)

?the type of co-financing? in table C for co-financing contributions from (i) Ministry of Agriculture, (ii) Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and (iii) Central Equatorial state, has been included.

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: Proposed financing is adequate. However, there discrepancies in the figures presented. The MSP


approval request asks for an increase in GEF financing and related agency fee for the project of \$4,338 and \$412 respectively, in comparison with PIF and OFP's LOE that is different from the amounts indicated in the LOE. Please, a revised LOE with the correct amounts is required.

- OFP's LOE:

The total financing (from GEFTF) being requested for this project is US\$ 1,000,000 inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG) and Agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF grant. The financing requested for South Sudan is detailed in the table below.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEF TF	UNEP	Biodiversity	50,000	863,242	86,758	1,000,000
Total GEF Resources			50,000	863,242	86,758	1,000,000

I consent to the utilization of South Sudan's allocations in GEF-7 as defined in the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR).




Mr. David Butali Oliver
National GEF Operational Focal Point and
Director General for Environmental Planning and Sustainable Development
Ministry of Environment and Forestry, RSS, Juba

The total financing (from GEFTF) being requested for this project is US\$ 1,000,000 inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG) and Agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF grant. The financing requested for South Sudan is detailed in the table below.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEF TF	UNEP	Biodiversity	50,000	863,242	86,758	1,000,000
Total GEF Resources			50,000	863,242	86,758	1,000,000

I consent to the utilization of South Sudan's allocations in GEF-7 as defined in the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR).



Mr. David Butali Oliver
National GEF Operational Focal Point and
Director General for Environmental Planning and Sustainable Development
Ministry of Environment and Forestry, RSS, Juba

- At PIF stage:

D. Indicative 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	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	South Sudan	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	863,242	82,008	945,250.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					863,242.00	82,008.00	945,250.00

E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

PPG Amount (\$) 50,000 PPG Agency Fee (\$) 4,750

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	South Sudan	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	50,000	4,750	54,750.00
Total Project Costs(\$)					50,000.00	4,750.00	54,750.00

D. Indicative 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	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	South Sudan	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	863,242	82,008	945,250.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					863,242.00	82,008.00	945,250.00

E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

PPG Amount (\$) 50,000 PPG Agency Fee (\$) 4,750

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	South Sudan	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	50,000	4,750	54,750.00
Total Project Costs(\$)					50,000.00	4,750.00	54,750.00

- At CEO approval stage (current document):

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	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNEP	GET	South Sudan	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	867,580	82,420
Total Grant Resources(\$)					867,580.00	82,420.00

5-20-21 AM: Cleared.

Agency Response

[Response17/05/2021](#)

The figures in the CEO ER and in the portal have been corrected to match the figures in the LOE and the PIF.

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: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant is appropriately reported in Annex C.

Agency Response [Cleared on 12 March 2021](#)

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 3-18-21 AM: Target for indicator 11 should include only direct beneficiaries, and based on the PDO this would include the number of beneficiaries participating in the training activities. Current estimate of 10,000 beneficiaries seems quite high and the target has been substantially revised from the PIF estimate (3,500). Please, revise.

5-20-21 AM: Cleared.

Agency Response

[Response17/05/2021:](#)

The target for indicator 11 has been revised to 1,750 men and 1,750 women making a total of 3500

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: Description is technically sound.

Agency Response

[Cleared on 12 March 2021](#)

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: Baseline is appropriately described.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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 proposed outcomes are technically sound.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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: Proposal is well aligned with Focal Area strategy.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-12-21 AM: incremental reasoning is satisfactory.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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: Proposal is for enabling activities and GEBs are addressed satisfactorily.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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: Proposal presents satisfactory description of innovations and potential for scaling up.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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: Map is satisfactory.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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 N/A

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

3-18-21 AM: The information provided in lieu of a stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) is partly insufficient. Please include a more comprehensive stakeholder analysis, where all stakeholders are listed and their interests as well as their expected roles throughout the project cycle are clearly identified. Please, check the Guidelines for the Implementation of the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement, where information about a SEP can be found. (i.e. a description of the expectations and interests per stakeholder group and how the project is going to address them; a description of the activities and means of engagement and communication with the different stakeholders to ensure effective consultation and engagement; roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan; the timing and locations of the engagement throughout the project cycle; the budget for stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle and, where applicable, for related capacity-building.)

5-20-21 AM: Cleared

Agency Response

[Response17/05/2021](#)

The stakeholder engagement plan (Appendix 12 attached) has been updated and now includes all the required information, where applicable, such as

1. ? description of the expectations and interests per stakeholder group and how the project is going to address them;
2. ? description of the activities and means of engagement and communication with the different stakeholders to ensure effective consultation and engagement;
3. ? roles and responsibilities of all the stakeholders, and
4. ? timing and locations of the engagement throughout the project cycle
5. The revised stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) has been uploaded in the portal

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

3-18-21 AM: As this is a technical assistance project it is understandable that gender consideration will be incorporated in planned assessments and capacity building efforts. The submission states that the project will carry out project-specific gender analysis during implementation to help identify and support opportunities to include women in the project activities. The GEF Policy on Gender Equality requires projects to complete a gender analysis prior to approval with the aim to ensure that components and activities take into account gender considerations early in the planning. The stated activities to address gender issues are not fully developed and lack certain level of details. In addition, the project has ticked all GEF gender tags indicating that it expects to contribute to (i) Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; (ii) Improving women's participation and decision making; and (iii) Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women. The actions outlined in the submission as well as the indicators included in the results framework suggest that this project, however, will only contribute to improving women's participation. Please, provide further clarity on the gender analysis to date and or any justifications on the delayed gender analysis as well as to review the gender tags.

5-20-21 AM: Cleared

Agency Response

[Response17/05/2021](#)

The gender mainstreaming plan of the project has been developed (attached as Appendix 16). All the actions to mainstream gender equality and the participation of women and men have been elaborated for each activity of the project. This gives a clear outlook of the standing of women and men in the implementation of all the project activities.

The gender mainstreaming plan has been uploaded in the portal

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: The project will help to establish a capacity building program to expedite implementation of the national ABS framework with a focus on strengthening the institutional capacity of the government and private sector agencies.

Agency Response

[Cleared on 12 March 2021](#)

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: Project risks are adequately described.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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: Institutional arrangements and coordination with other agencies is adequately described.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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: Proposal alignment with national strategies is satisfactory.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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: Knowledge management approach is technically satisfactory.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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 are adequately described.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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: M& E plan is technically satisfactory.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

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: Socioeconomic benefits are adequately described.

Agency Response

Cleared on 12 March 2021

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-18-21 AM: Please, in the budget table, audit cost should be charged under PMC and not under M&E:

UNEP Budget Line		Expenditure by project component/activity					Expenditure by calendar year				Budget	
10 PERSONNEL COMPONENT		1	2	3	M&E	PMC	Total	2021	2022	2023	Total	Note
1300	Administrative Support						10,000	3,300	3,400	3,300	10,000	15
	Sundry (bank charges)		5,000	5,000			10,000	3,300	3,400	3,300	10,000	15
1301	Audit				20,000		20,000	6,600	6,500	6,600	20,000	16
1399	Sub-total	-	5,000	5,000	20,000	-	30,000	9,900	10,200	9,900	30,000	

UNEP Budget Line		Expenditure by project component/activity					Expenditure by calendar year				Budget	
10 PERSONNEL COMPONENT		1	2	3	M&E	PMC	Total	2021	2022	2023	Total	Note
1300	Administrative Support						10,000	3,300	3,400	3,300	10,000	15
	Sundry (bank charges)		5,000	5,000			10,000	3,300	3,400	3,300	10,000	15
1301	Audit				20,000		20,000	6,600	6,500	6,600	20,000	16
1399	Sub-total	-	5,000	5,000	20,000	-	30,000	9,900	10,200	9,900	30,000	

Similarly, office supplies, furniture and fitting, office equipment, solar lighting equipment/generator for office, repair and service of office equipment should be charged under PMC. If the current PMC threshold funded by GEF source has been maximized, then it is recommended increasing co-financed PMC to meet the increase demand as needed. Please also note that the current co-financed PMC (8.74%) is slightly less than the GEF-funded PMC level (9.95%):

Sub Total (\$)	789,080.00	5,931,415.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)		
GET	78,500.00	518,585.00
Sub Total(\$)	78,500.00	518,585.00
Total Project Cost(\$)	867,580.00	6,450,000.00
	9.95%	8.74%
Sub Total (\$)	789,080.00	5,931,415.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)		
GET	78,500.00	518,585.00
Sub Total(\$)	78,500.00	518,585.00
Total Project Cost(\$)	867,580.00	6,450,000.00
	9.95%	8.74%

Also, there is one vehicle purchase proposed under component 3. According to the guidelines, the preferred practice is for the co-financing resources to finance the purchase of motorized vehicles.

5-20-21: Budget table in Portal is out of margins, please amend.

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table
Please attach a project budget table.

Project title: Capacity support for accession to and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising
Project number: 10228
Project executing partner: Ministry of Environment and Forestry
Project implementation period: Three years
From: 2022
To: 2024

UNEP Budget Line	Expenditure by project component/activity							Expenditure by i	
	1	2	3	M&E	PMC	Total	2021	2	
PERSON									
10 NEL CO									
MPONE									
NT									
1100 Project personnel						36,000.0	36,000	12,000	
1101 Project Manager					0	0			

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table
Please attach a project budget table.

Project title: Capacity support for accession to and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising
Project number: 10228
Project executing partner: Ministry of Environment and Forestry
Project implementation period: Three years
From: 2022
To: 2024

UNEP Budget Line	Expenditure by project component/activity							Expenditure by i	
	1	2	3	M&E	PMC	Total	2021	2	
PERSON									
10 NEL CO									
MPONE									
NT									
1100 Project personnel						36,000.0	36,000	12,000	
1101 Project Manager					0	0			

An all-terrain vehicle is listed in the budget table to be purchased with GEF funds. The proposed project activities for field work and regular engagement with local communities and stakeholders technically justifies the proposed purchase. The PM concurs with the justification and approves the request.

Office supplies and bank charges should be charged to PMC, not project component. Please revise.

M&E budget of \$155,900 which is 18% of the project budget is too high (per Guidelines, 5% is the average M&E cost of the GEF-funded part of project financing for projects up to USD 5 million). Please revise.

A

Agency Response
[Response17/05/2021](#)

- 1.The audit costs have been removed from the M&E budget line and is now charged under PMC
- 2.Similarly, office supplies, furniture and fitting, office equipment, solar lighting equipment/generator for office, repair and service of office equipment have been removed
- 3.The co-finance PMC has been increased from 8.74% (518,585) to 9.92% (\$650,000)
4. With regard to procurement of the vehicle, the project activities will require regular stakeholder consultations and local community engagement as was demonstrated during the PPG consultation process.

The project team and consultants will require a vehicle for implementing the ABS Project in South Sudan since activities will be conducted at both national and sub-national levels and hiring a vehicle every time to move/travel in these areas, will pose a high cost on the project by looking at the distances and the terrain.

Also, South Sudan is the youngest country after attaining independence in 2011 after a long civil war of almost 50 years. In addition, South Sudan is the poorest country in the Africa and in the world

(<https://www.visualcapitalist.com/mapped-the-25-poorest-countries-in-the-world/>) .

Therefore, this young poor nation is still struggling in many aspects and especially in the Environment Sector that is given less attention within the current competing priorities. There are few vehicles for the executive in the Ministry of Environment and Forestry at the moment, but the technical staff have one pool transport vehicle which is meant for the use of all the directorates in the ministry. It is against this background that we strongly suggest that the Biodiversity Department be allowed to procure this one all-terrain vehicle such that the movement at the national and sub-national level of project staff and consultants can be facilitated in order to execute the project successfully.

The cost of the vehicle has been put under PMC.

Agency Response on 25 May 2021

1. The budget excel sheet has been attached in the supporting documents in the portal as Annex E - GEF project budget revised on 25 May 2021B
- 2.Office supplies and bank charges have been moved to PMC as requested
- 3.M&E budget has been reduced from \$155,900 (18%) to \$43,162 (5%) as suggested

Project Results Framework

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

Agency Response [Cleared on 12 March 2021](#)

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Agency Response [Cleared on 12 March 2021](#)

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: Status of PPG utilization is reported in Annex C.

Agency Response [Cleared on 12 March 2021](#)
Project maps and coordinates

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

Agency Response [Cleared on 12 March 2021](#)
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 N/A
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 N/A

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-18-21 AM: Please provide responses to the comments above and resubmit the proposal. Thanks!

5-20-21 AM: Please address minor comments on project budget above. Thanks!

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