

Promoting Beneficiation and Value Addition from Genetic Resources through Enhanced Capacity for Research and Development and the Protection of Traditional Knowledge in Botswana

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11035

Countries

Botswana

Project Name

Promoting Beneficiation and Value Addition from Genetic Resources through Enhanced Capacity for Research and Development and the Protection of Traditional Knowledge in Botswana

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

2/9/2023

Review completed by PM

2/14/2023

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

13-2-23: The project remains well aligned with the Biodiversity focal area priorities (BD 2.6 and 3.8).

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

13-2-23: The proposed project design has improved meaningfully from PIF stage and the proposal has addressed the comments received satisfactorily in relation to better elaboration of expected outcomes and outputs.

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

13-2-23: The project co-financing was incremented from USD 8,650,000 to USD 10,165,000 (co-financing ratio more than 6:1. The co-financing sources and amounts are adequately documented.

Agency Response

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 13-2-23: The financing presented in Table D is satisfactory.

Agency Response

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

27-2-23: Please, review the numbers provided in the table. If the Project development leader was budgeted for \$40,000 and only \$6,809 have been spent to date then the amount committed should be **\$33,191**. If the \$10,000 for the workshop and travel have not been spent yet please include them in the amount committed.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 50,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes			
Project Development Specialist (GEF PPG Team Leader)	40,000	6,809	32,400
Validation Workshop and Report			
Workshop & Travel	10,000	0	0
Total	50,000	6,809	32,400

Agency Response

UNDP response, 8 March 2023:

We acknowledge and appreciate the feedback and guidance provided. The utilization of the PPG has been updated as suggested.

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 50,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes			
Project Development Specialist (GEF PPG Team Leader)	40,000	35,680	4,320
Validation Workshop and Report			
Workshop & Travel	10,000	0	10,000
Total	50,000	35,680	14,320

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

13-2-23: Given the project interventions in specific areas, please indicate the possibility of including land-based targets under indicator 4 of landscapes under improved management of biodiversity.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 8 March 2023:

We acknowledge the feedback and guidance on this matter. Since the PIF stage, this project was designed primarily for developing national and local capacities for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS in Botswana, including for advancing R&D. Therefore, no activities are planned on the ground to possibly result in global environmental benefits related to indicator 4 on landscapes under improved management of biodiversity. Any global environmental benefits at the landscape level would be indirect and for that reason we have chosen not to include this indicator as we will not be able to track and monitor it. Additional benefits are expected to be delivered as part of the demonstration R&D initiative that will be designed through the project and for which funding will be secured through the National Environment Fund, the National Transitional Development and/or international donors (Output 2.3.5); however, this will only be accomplished after the GEF-7 project completion.

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

13-2-23: The proposal presents satisfactory elaboration on threats, root causes and impacts of environmental degradation to be addressed by the project.

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

13-2-23: Baseline scenario and associated projects are adequately described and has been satisfactory enhanced since PIF stage.

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

13-2-23: Component description and proposed 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

13-2-23: The alignment with the strategies of the BD focal area is satisfactory.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

13-2-23: Incremental reasoning is satisfactory.

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

13-2-23: Project's expected contributions to Global Environment Benefits are adequately elaborated.

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

13-2-23: Description of innovation, sustainability and scaling up aspects is adequate. The project represent a good opportunity to promote and influence policy on ABS at national and subnational level.

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
13-2-23:: Map of Project's sites is 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
14-2-23: Project includes adequate stakeholders engagement plan.

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

27-2-23: Project Level Outcome 2.3 Opportunities created for the sustainable utilization of GR and associated TK to sustainably support community livelihoods for women, men, youth, and other vulnerable communities, please select ?Yes? to the below item *Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women*.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? ⓘ

Yes

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making ⓘ Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women ⓘ



Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? ⓘ

Yes

Agency Response

UNDP response, 8 March 2023:

Thank you for the feedback and guidance. A gender analysis was undertaken during PPG and the option ?Yes? for the item *Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women* has been selected.

If possible, indicate in which result areas the project is expected to contribute to gender equality.

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources ⓘ

Improving women's participation and decision making ⓘ

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women ⓘ



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

14-2-23: Engagement with private sector is expected to increase during the implementation phase, particularly in the development and funding of a demonstration ABS project, which

will promote R&D in Botswana considering a species of interest for R&D and with high potential for commercial value.

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

14-2-23: Risk analysis and proposed mitigation measures are adequate.

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

14-2-23: Institutional arrangements are adequate with clear indication of roles and responsibilities. Coordination with other relevant projects/initiatives is also described.

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

14-2-23: The alignment with the national strategies and plans is satisfactorily described.

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

14-2-23: Proposed knowledge management approach is adequate.

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

14-2-23: Environmental and social risks are adequately described and consistent with the GEF guidelines.

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

14-2-23: Project includes adequate M&E plan with specific budget.

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

14-2-23: Socioeconomic benefits are adequately described.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

14-2-23: Proposal includes all the required annexes.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

14-2-23: Project results framework is satisfactory.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2-2-23: Please respond to the comments above, revise and resubmit the CEO Endorsement package for further review and 4-week circulation to Council. Thanks!

Agency Response

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

14-2-23: The status and utilization of the PPG resources is reported in Annex C.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

14-2-23: Project maps and coordinates information for the Project's sites are satisfactory.

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

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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