

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 PIF 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

Agenices

UNEP

Date received by PM

5/13/2019

Review completed by PM

9/10/2019

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

6-3-19

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

6-3-19

Component 1

Reconsider Outputs 1.1.6 and 1.1.7. Are the guidelines needed at this early stage in the process of accessing the NP? What is SS going to report on the implementation of the NP if it has not even accessed it? The budget for the component may not be enough for all other outputs. Consider resizing the project. Output 1.1.5?

Component 2

Output 2.1.2. Are all the institutions listed in the PIF doing R&D on GR? Please include only the ones actively working on R&D and the GR they are working on.

Output 2.1.5. What is the project proposing on doing with the ABS CH? SS should make use of the ABS CH housed at the Secretariat of the CBD first.

Component 3

Output 3.1.1. is it realistic to think that the project can distribute the materials to IPLCs scattered around the country? How is that going to happened and at what cost? Do isolated IPLCs really need to receive this material now or when the time comes to engage on matters related to the NP? The experience of the GEF in SS is that reaching these communities is really hard and spending funds on something that is not an immediate priority should be reconsidered.

Output 3.1.3. Suggest removing the development of community protocols. The PIF suggest implementation. What implementation if there is not even a national framework?

Output 3.1.4 and 5. Reconsider the scope of the training. If the project is going to be executed in Juba only as stated in the project, is it realistic and practical to say that 100 trainers will be trained? What is the cost of bringing the trainers from remote areas for a training on something that is so unlikely to be used at least in those remote areas in the short term?

Output 3.2.2 Please remove. The country is not prepared to tackle this pilot, much less when the target GR are unknown.

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

<p>Component 1</p> <p>Reconsider Outputs 1.1.6 and 1.1.7. Are the guidelines needed at this early stage in the process of accessing the NP? What is SS going to report on the implementation of the NP if it has not even accessed it? The budget for the component may not be enough for all other outputs. Consider resizing the project. Output 1.1.5?</p>	<p><u>Section : B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY</u></p> <p>Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer</p> <p>Outputs 1.1.6 and 1.1.7 removed</p>
---	--

<p>Component 2</p> <p>Output 2.1.2. Are all the institutions listed in the PIF doing R&D on GR? Please include only the ones actively working on R&D and the GR they are working on.</p>	<p><u>Section : B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY</u></p> <p>Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer by listing only insititutions actively doing R&D.</p>
<p>Output 2.1.5. What is the project proposing on doing with the ABS CH? SS should make use of the ABS CH housed at the Secretariat of the CBD first.</p>	<p><u>Section : B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY</u></p> <p>Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer. Output 2.1.5 has been re-worded. South Sudan will first make use of the ABS CH housed at the CBD Secretariat</p>
<p>Component 3</p> <p>Output 3.1.1. is it realistic to think that the project can distribute the materials to IPLCs scattered around the country? How is that going to happened and at what cost? Do isolated IPLCs really need to receive this material now or when the time comes to engage on matters related to the NP? The experience of the GEF in SS is that reaching these communities is really hard and spending funds on something that is not an immediate priority should be reconsidered.</p>	<p><u>Section : B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY</u></p> <p>Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer.</p> <p>We agreed that the distribution of the awareness materials to the IPLCs will be hard in the short term. This could be deferred to a later stage in the implementation of the Nagoya in the country. The distribution of materials will be limited to stakeholders in the main towns which are enjoying relative peace.</p>
<p>Output 3.1.3. Suggest removing the development of community protocols. The PIF suggest implementation. What implementation if there is not even a national framework?</p>	<p><u>Section : B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY</u></p> <p>Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer by removing the development of community protocol at the stage of the Nagoya Protocol in SS.</p>
<p>Output 3.1.4 and 5. Reconsider the scope of the training. If the project is going to be executed in Juba only as stated in the project, is it realistic and practical to say that 100 trainers will be trained? What is the cost of bringing the trainers from remote areas for a training on something that is so unlikely to be used at least in those remote areas in the short term?</p>	<p><u>Section : B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY</u></p> <p>Corrected as suggested by the reviewer :</p> <p>The scope of the training is reconsidered to reduce the trainers to 50. The project will include Juba and other states which are not engulfed in the recent conflict</p>
<p>Output 3.2.2 Please remove. The country is not prepared to tackle this pilot, much less when the target GR are unknown.</p>	<p><u>Section : B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY</u></p> <p>Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer and output 3.2.2 removed.</p>

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

6-3-19

Co-financiers:

Thirteen Ministries are listed contributing either \$50,000 or \$100,000. What Ministers are aware that their names are listed in the PIF and have agreed to co-finance the project? It is difficult to understand why some Ministries want to provide co-financing; like Petroleum, Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, and Justice. Please only list the relevant and informed co-financiers in Government.

It is not easy to understand why institutions like FFI, WCS and IUCN (among others) would be interested in co-financing this project. Please explain

Please list only the Ministries and Institutions that have agreed, at least in principle, to co-finance the project. Amounts need to reflect reality and the GEF will make additional consultations about these co-financiers.

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

Section C. Indicative sources of Co-financing for the project by name and by type, if available

Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer

All the ministries were approached at the beginning of the project concept note development and they had agreed in principle to co-finance the project. However, we reduced the list to the ministries and institutions which agreed to co-financing the project.

The listed Conservation organisations are working in landscapes where most of the genetic materials are found. And they were interested in co-financing the project. However, from the recent communication only IUCN agreed to co-finance

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

6-3-19

Agency fee is 9.5%.

Cleared

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

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

6-3-19

Yes. It is 50,000.

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

6-3-19

Please re-evaluate these figures after taking into account comments made above.

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

Section F. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GEF 7 CORE INDICATORS

Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer: The number was reviewed from 100 to 50.

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

6-3-19

Please provide table G. Thanks.

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

Section G. PROJECT TAXONOMY

Corrected and Table G provided

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

6-3-19

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6-3-19

There is no baseline project. Because of this the issue of co-financing needs to be clarified. See above

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

Section A.1.2) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

Corrected, the co-financing was clarified above

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6-3-19

See above

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

The expected outcomes and components have been adjusted as explained above and in the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6-3-19

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

6-3-19

Since there is no baseline project, this MSP is a stand alone Capacity Building project

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

6-3-19

This project has no specific GEBs because it is designed to allow SS to be a Party to the Nagoya Protocol and comply with the basic provisions of the protocol.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6-3-19

Please elaborate on the financial sustainability of this project. This is important as there is no precedent on SS investing in the Nagoya Protocol.

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

A 1.7. Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer. Financial sustainability of the project elaborated.

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

6-3-19

A map of SS was provided.

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

6-3-19

Please only include those institutions that will have a direct role in the development and implementation of the project

Ministry of Environment and Forestry: The proposed inventory of TK for sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources is not justifiable. It is massive and will use of the financial resources of the project.

Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism: What is its specific role related to the management of GR inside PAs in so far as this project is concerned?

Ministry of Finance and Planning: What is the consultations about and how do they relate to the proposed activities?

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation: This project is in support of the NP and not of the ITPGRFA. Assume no GEF funds will be used for the latter.

South Sudan Seed Council. The GEF does not support the establishment of seed banks. Please remove

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

<p>GEF Review: 6-3-19</p> <p>Please only include those institutions that will have a direct role in the development and implementation of the project.</p>	<p><u>22 August 2019</u></p> <p><u>Section: 2 Stakeholders</u></p> <p>Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer</p> <p>Non-relevant institutions were removed</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Forestry: The proposed inventory of TK for sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources is not justifiable. It is massive and will use of the financial resources of the project.</p>	<p>Corrected as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>Inventorizing of traditional knowledge for sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources has removed, see section 2 on stakeholders on page 15 in the PIF.</p>

Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism: What is its specific role related to the management of GR inside PAs in so far as this project is concerned?	Cleared The Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism will contribute to managing genetic resources in protected areas (national parks and game reserves) by facilitating access to genetic resources in the protected areas for research institutes, individual researchers and bio-prospectors.
Ministry of Finance and Planning: What is the consultations about and how do they relate to the proposed activities?	Corrected as suggested by the reviewer
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation: This project is in support of the NP and not of the ITPGRFA. Assume no GEF funds will be used for the latter.	Corrected as suggested and ITPGRFA was removed accordingly
South Sudan Seed Council. The GEF does not support the establishment of seed banks. Please remove	Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer Soud Sudan Seed Council was removed

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

6-3-19

Please consult the "GEF Guidance on gender Equality" and adjust this section accordingly.

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

The section on gender Equality adjusted.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6-3-19

The Private Sector is mentioned but no specifics on what companies will be involved. Mention by name only those that will have a role in this project.

9-03-19

Suggest removing engagement with private Sector if there are no companies already working on R&D in SS and willing to participate in the project.

In the response it says "At moment, we don't have the specific names of private companies and their specific roles in the project. However, consultations will be made during the PPG phase to identify specific private sector companies working on genetic resources which will be involved in the project implementation."

And in the project it says

There are many private companies involved in harvesting and utilization of South Sudan genetic resources and their involvement will be determined at PPG stage.

4. Private sector engagement.

Private sector entities including pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, food industries, universities and research institutes, are key development partners in access and utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge to genetic resources. They will play key role in the conservation, sustainable use of genetic resources and the preservation, protection of traditional knowledge associated to genetic resources. The project's awareness-raising and capacity-building activities under Component 3 will include the private sector as a key target group. The project will work to identify key private sector stakeholders interested in the use of the native genetic resources in South Sudan that will be actively consulted and engaged in project development during the PPG phase.

Feels like there are no Private Sector companies in SS that could effectively engage in the project.

Please remove Private Sector from the PIF (mentioned 18 times without any specific references). It raises the expectations. The project will not suffer because it is all about getting the Nagoya Protocol up and running.

9-10-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

4. Private sector engagement

At moment, we don't have the specific names of private companies and their specific roles in the project. However, consultations will be made during the PPG phase to identify specific private sector companies working on genetic resources which will be involved in the project implementation.

05 September 2019

The text to private sector engagement has adapted as advised and reference to private sector deleted as appropriate.

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

6-3-19

The Mitigation measures of the risk "Possible resumption of armed conflict" (i.e. all project activities will be undertaken in Juba), are in contradiction to the mitigation measures of the next risk. How is the project going to do participatory community consultations etc. when the activities are all in Juba?

How can the uncontrolled exploitation of biological resources can be counteracted with "Awareness raising..."?

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

Section: 5. Risks.

Corrected and we reworded this section. The project will not be implemented only in Juba, some of the activities will be implemented in the other states which are not engulfed in the recent conflict

Awareness-raising and capacity development on sustainable harvesting will provide all stakeholder groups with knowledge on the importance of economic value of genetic resources and the opportunities of the Nagoya Protocol reducing the anthropogenic pressure on the biological resources

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

6-3-19

There is reference to the project Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) for the Member Countries of the Central African Forests Commission COMIFAC. The GEF ID is 5454, not 1144. Amend that in the PIF

The PIF states that the project will be executed by the Department of Biodiversity from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, through the Law Division of UNEP. Please clarify the role and responsibilities of the Law Division in the execution of the project.

The relationship between this project and 9551 is not clear. Please remove unless a direct link and relationship can be made.

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

<p>Coordination</p> <p>6-3-19</p> <p>There is reference to the project Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) for the Member Countries of the Central African Forests Commission COMIFAC. The GEF ID is 5454, not 1144. Amend that in the PIF</p>	<p><u>22 August 2019</u></p> <p><u>Section: 6. Coordination</u></p> <p>Corrected as suggested by the Reviewer</p> <p>The GEF ID 5454 was amended</p>
<p>The PIF states that the project will be executed by the Department of Biodiversity from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, through the Law Division of UNEP. Please clarify the role and responsibilities of the Law Division in the execution of the project.</p>	<p>The Law Division will provide technical and legal expertise to SS through its links with various expert's network to review national legislation and policy to ensure the execution of activities during the PPG and the implementation to the project. The Law Division's role has been requested by the Ministry.</p>
<p>The relationship between this project and 9551 is not clear. Please remove unless a direct link and relationship can be made.</p>	<p>A direct link between the two projects is that the capacity building component and legislative framework could incorporate some provisions of the Nagoya Protocol into the wildlife institutional and legislative frameworks</p>

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

6-3-19

Please provide the link to SS's NBSAP. The GEF is interested in reading the doc. Thanks.

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

22 August 2019

Section: 7. Consistency with National Priorities

We reworded the section and provided the link to the Fifth National Report to the Convention of Biological Diversity 2015

The proposed project is fully consistent with South Sudan's national priorities as laid out in its Fifth National Report to the Convention of Biological Diversity 2015 and the Draft National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan [1],

<https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/ss/ss-nr-05-en.pdf> also see page 87 of the Fifth National Report to the CBD

[1] <https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/ss/ss-nr-05-en.pdf> also see page 87 of the Fifth National Report to the CBD

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

6-3-19

What KM products of the projects in Gabon Democratic Republic of Congo and Kenya is UN Environment Planning to use in the SS project?

How are the lessons learned on the execution of the project in these three countries have been used?

Output 3.1.1. makes reference to the development of public awareness and communications materials. Why not use the materials that have already been produced by the numerous GEF projects funded by the GEF?

9-3-19

Cleared

Agency Response

<p>Knowledge Management</p> <p>6-3-19</p> <p>What KM products of the projects in Gabon Democratic Republic of Congo and Kenya is UN Environment Planning to use in the SS project?</p> <p>How are the lessons learned on the execution of the project in these three countries have been used?</p> <p>Output 3.1.1. makes reference to the development of public awareness and communications materials. Why not use the materials that have already been produced by the numerous GEF projects funded by the GEF?</p>	<p><u>22 August 2019</u></p> <p><u>section 8. Knowledge Management</u></p> <p>KM products developed in the three countries such as training and awareness raising materials can be adopted to suit South Sudan’s needs.</p> <p>These lessons learned from the current ABS projects is to review the existing legislation regarding genetic resources (Kenya) and strengthening the institutional framework, stakeholder consultations and awareness raising (Gabon) could be used to support the implementation of the current project in South Sudan</p>
---	---

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

6-3-19

Yes.

Cleared

NOTES ADDED ON 9-18-19 AFTER REVIEW OF 6-3-19

1- Executing Partner Type is shown as GEF Agency.

The GEFSEC requires an explicit request signed by the GEF OFP(s) of the participant country indicating the specific roles and responsibilities of all partners, including any execution activities to be provided by a GEF Agency.

The request should provide a sound justification for the execution activities that the GEF Agency may perform.

Countries South Sudan	Agency(ies) UNEP
Other Executing Partner(s) Ministry of Environment and Forestry/Department of Biodiversity through UNEP's Law Division	Executing Partner Type GEF Agency

2- Some in-kind co-financing are categorized as investment mobilized (see screenshot below). In-kind co-financing must be categorized as recurrent expenditures. Please amend accordingly.

CSO	South Sudan Wildlife Society (Wsoc)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	50,000
CSO	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	100,000
CSO	South Sudan Nature Conservation Organisation (SSNCO)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	50,000

3- Programming of funds should be filled in for both Table D and E:

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		913,242	86,758	1,000,000
Total GEF Resources(\$)					913,242	86,758	1,000,000

E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Amount (\$) 45,662	PPG Agency Fee (\$) 4,338						
Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	South Sudan	Biodiversity		45,662	4,338	50,000
Total Project Costs(\$)					45,662	4,338	50,000

4- LOE authorize only \$1,000,000 BD STAR, while project financing and PPG and fees add up to \$1,050,000 (see screenshot below). The Agency needs to either request a new LoE or reduce the funds request to the amount allocated in the current LoE.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFT	UNEP	Biodiversity	50,000	855,000	95,000	1,000,000
Total GEF Resources			50,000	855,000	95,000	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).



David Bahali Oliver
 GEF Operational Focal Point
 Director General for Environmental Planning & Sustainable Development
 Ministry of Environment & Forestry, RSS, Juba

10-21-19

Some problems remain:

1. Best if "...through UNEP's Law Division" is removed to avoid the potential confusion that UNEP's Law Division is an Executing Partner.

Other Executing Partner(s)
 Ministry of Environment and Forestry/Department of Biodiversity through
 UNEP's Law Division

2. The Project Amount in the LoE on file is \$855,000 and \$867,500 in the Portal. They should be the same

3. -The Agency fee for as the Project of \$855,000 should be \$81,225. But since the Project Amount in the Portal (\$867,500) is incorrect, so is the Agency fee entered in the Portal (\$82,420).

Please address these issues. Numbers in the PIF uploaded to the Portal also require fixing.

Duration

36

In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

82,420

Submission Date

8/23/2019

A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-3-9	GET	867,580	4,250,000
Total Project Cost (\$)		867,580	4,250,000

11-19-19

The Project Cost and Agency fee (same as for PPG) are now correct

PIF	\$863,242	\$82,008	\$945,250
PPG	\$50,000	\$4,750	\$54,750
Fee	\$86,758		
	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000

Cleared

Agency Response

1. **Executing Partner Type** cell was corrected to read as **Government**

2. **In kind co-financing by CSOs** has been corrected to read as **re-current expenditure**

3. **Programming of funds for table D and E** has been filled as **BD STAR Allocation**

4. Since the LOE authorized \$1,000,000, the total project financing including PPG has been revised to \$1,000,000

Agency response on 07 November 2019

GEF Review Comment	Agency response
1. Best if "...through UNEP's Law Division" is removed to avoid the potential confusion that UNEP's Law Division is an Executing Partner.	UNEP Law Division has been removed as suggested by the reviewer
2. The Project Amount in the LoE on file is \$855,000 and \$867,500 in the Portal. They should be the same	A new LOE has been secured with updated figures reflecting the same as those in the portal and in the PIF
3. The Agency fee for as the Project of \$855,000 should be \$81,225. But since the Project Amount in the Portal (\$867,500) is incorrect, so is the Agency fee entered in the Portal (\$82,420).	With the new LOE, the agency fee is now \$86,758 while the project cost is now \$863,242 and this has been harmonized in both the portal and the PIF accordingly.
4. Please address these issues. Numbers in the PIF uploaded to the Portal also require fixing.	The above issues have been addressed and the numbers in the PIF uploaded in the portal have also been fixed accordingly

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

6-3-19

No. Please address the outstanding issues described above.

9-3-19

No. Please address outstanding issue under item "Private Sector Engagement". In addition, in session "A1.4. Alignment with GEF focal area", mention only BD-3-9. This is a basic Nagoya Protocol project.

9-10-19

This PIF is recommended for technical clearance

9-18-19

ADDITIONAL ITEMS WERE RAISED DURING THE REVIEW PROCESS.

Please address the 4 items listed under "Part III- Country Endorsements. Thanks.

10-21-19

No. Please address outstanding issues under "Part III- Country Endorsements".

11-19-19

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

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

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval