

# Implementation and institutionalization of a National Monitoring and Management Frameworks for Living Modified Organisms and Invasive Alien Species

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10981

**Countries**

Cameroon

**Project Name**

Implementation and institutionalization of a National Monitoring and Management Frameworks for Living Modified Organisms and Invasive Alien Species

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

4/13/2022

**Review completed by PM**

4/27/2022

**Program Manager**

Adriana Moreira

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**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**

04-25-22: The project is aligned with the Biodiversity focal area priorities (BD 2.6 and 3.8) and Land Degradation (LD 1.4). Please revise the PIF template that is currently showing the BD 1.4 (Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through Sustainable Use of Plant and Animal Genetic Resources) focal area element in place of the LD 1.4 (Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape) element.

## A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements

Programming Directions	Trust Fund
BD-2-6	GET
BD-3-8	GET
BD-1-4	GET
Total Project Cost (\$)	

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

04-25-22: The proposed components and outputs described in Table B are appropriate.

Agency Response

**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

04-25-22: Proposed co-financing is adequate.

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

04-28-22: 1. Please remove the cents and round the numbers from Table D and the Agency fee.

**D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and Programming of Funds**

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNEP	GET	Cameroon	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	1,053,973	100,127.44
UNEP	GET	Cameroon	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	311,552	29,597.44
<b>Total GEF Resources(\$)</b>					<b>1,365,525.00</b>	<b>129,724.88</b>

**Agency Fee(\$)**

**129,724.88**

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-25-22: Proposed financing is within the resources available for the BD and LD focal areas in the Country's STAR allocation.

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-25-22: Proposed financing is within the resources available for the BD and LD focal areas.

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 04-25-22: Proposed PPG request is within the allowable limits for MSPs.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-25-22: Proposed core indicators are satisfactory for PIF stage, refined estimates should be presented after preparation stage.

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  
04-25-22: The proposed project taxonomy is adequate.

Agency Response

**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  
04-25-22: Barriers and threats are adequately described.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
04-25-22: Baseline scenario indicates a good understanding of national circumstance and ongoing related projects and initiatives in the Country.

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  
04-26-22: Alternative scenarios are adequately described.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-26-22: Proposed project is well aligned with focal area strategies.

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

04-26-22: Incremental cost reasoning is adequate.

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

04-26-22: Because this project is to support further development of biodiversity policy and institutional frameworks through the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety there are no targets only for the number of beneficiaries. It would be important to provide a land based indicator after the target communities are properly assessed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-26-22: Description of potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up is adequate for PIF stage.

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

04-26-22: Maps of project area are satisfactory.

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

04-26-22: The proposed project is a continuation of previous investments and allows for strengthening stakeholder engagement processes.

Agency Response

**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

04-26-22: The gender context is adequately articulated.

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

04-26-22: Please include a few examples on the instruments for engagement with private sector entities. Are there any existing links of private sector and the local communities?

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**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

04-26-22: Description of risks and mitigation approach is adequate.



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

04-26-22: Description of proposed institutional arrangements and coordination is satisfactory.

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

04-26-22: Proposed project is well aligned with the country's national strategies.

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

04-26-22: Knowledge management is an important element of the proposed project. Please indicate how the lessons learned from previous projects have been incorporated into the current project design. Will the project include plans for strategic communications?

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: The information provided on the supporting documentation on environmental and social risks assessment (SRIF) is incomplete. Please provide more information in the safeguards risk summary section also describe the proposed grievance mechanism for IPLCs. The project overall ESS risk is classified as "low", which will need further justification given recent issues with IPLCs. The attached SRIF does not have any comments from the safeguard team. Please clarify whether the SRIF for this project has been reviewed and cleared by the safeguard team.

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

04-26-22: The Letter of Endorsement is adequately signed by the current country's GEF Operational Focal Point listed in the data base.

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

05-02-22: Please, address the comments above and resubmit for further processing.  
Thanks!

**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**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**