

Effective Implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing of the Nagoya Protocol and Integration into Planned co-management Arrangements in the Nyambai Forest Park of The Gambia

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10677

Countries

Gambia

Project Name

Effective Implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing of the Nagoya Protocol and Integration into Planned co-management Arrangements in the Nyambai Forest Park of The Gambia

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

9/29/2020

Review completed by PM

10/26/2020

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

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

October 6, 2020:

In addition to the Biodiversity objective BD 3-9, we note that there is also the Biodiversity objective BD 2-7. Please clarify the rationale for adding the Biodiversity objective BD 2-7.

October 18, 2020:

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

The addition of BD 2-7 objective is as result of the misinterpretation of the status of Nyambai Forest Park which was wrongly considered as Protected Area.

Ref: see Table A of the PIF document

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

October 6, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

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

October 6, 2020:

Yes, there is a significant expected co-financing of \$5,5 million as grant and investment mobilized. Nevertheless, the total co-financing is relatively low for a FSP (1:2 ratio with GEF resources). Please consider the possibility to increase the co-financing.

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for increasing the expected co-financing. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

Additional source of co-financing has now been identified which increase the ratio to more than 1:3. The national executing partners committed to put extra efforts during PPG to bring more cofinancing particularly from private sector and other donors.

Ref: Table C – Indicative cofinancing and section 1 a.2) on baseline scenario.

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

October 2, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 2, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 2, 2020:

No, but the country uses its marginal adjustment flexibility to allocate \$1.5 million from the Climate Change focal area to the Biodiversity focal area. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

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

October 6, 2020:

Yes, the PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap. 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

October 6, 2020:

Considering the project also includes with a significant investment the Biodiversity objective BD 2-7 (Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and Improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate), we can expect to obtain corresponding Global Environmental Benefits reported in terms of hectares under improved management/practices. Please consider adding the appropriate result in the Core Indicator worksheet.

October 16, 2020:

1. Thank you for the clarification. Considering improved management is expected (92,549 ha where piloting ABS measures will be implemented), please consider the relevance of adding the core indicator related to an area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (4.1).
2. In addition the number of beneficiaries is extremely low as compared to similar projects (10 times less than an MSP). Please explain and increase significantly this expected result. Please note also that the number of beneficiaries is not the same in the Portal description and in the Annex B of the uploaded PIF. Please ensure the information is consistent throughout the documents provided.

October 25, 2020:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared. Please note that the Annex B of the uploaded PIF has not been updated with the new number of beneficiaries. Please ensure the expected results will be consistent throughout the documents elaborated during the PPG phase.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

The objective 2.7 of the BD Focal area is now dropped as the Nyambai Forest (92,549ha) do not have Protected area status. However, the use of the site as pilot for ABS measures implementation will help to applied good landscape management in that area, thereby generating GEB.

23-10-2020

1. The core indicator 4.1 is now completed with the 92,549 ha to benefit of the improve management practices as pilot site for ABS measures.
2. The number of beneficiaries has now been increased based on the estimate of those people to benefits from capacity building and awareness-raising on ABS.

Ref: Table F. Project's Target Contributions to GEF 7 Core Indicators

29-10-2020

The Annex B; Core indicators are now updated. Furthermore, UNEP would like to confirm that the expected results will be obtained from direct outputs and outcomes of Component 2 of the project. Thus, this Global Environment Benefit (GEB) will be generated from direct investment from the project.

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

October 6, 2020:

The Annex C of the PIF "Project Taxonomy Worksheet" is missing. Please provide this Annex.

October 16, 2020:

Thank you for providing the Annex C. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

Annex C is now included

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

October 6, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

1. The description is vague regarding the private sector and related stakeholders and activities using the biodiversity that could be valorized. In particular who are the potential genetic resource providers and users? Please elaborate further on this aspect and the current use of biodiversity presenting potential for valorization in the project targeted area.
2. To better understand the context and how the project will articulate with it, please provide concise information of the existing institutional framework responsible for biodiversity conservation, including at local level, and the associated role of research institutions (if any) as some will be involved in the project implementation.
3. The baseline scenario is presented as very limited (little attention that has been paid to genetic resources, benefit sharing mechanisms, co-management of genetic resources and comprehensive understanding of the genetic resource diversity in the country, ... no policy guidance yet on mechanisms to guide the implementation of ABS). Adding to the identified projects, it seems that the GEF activities are nearly stand-alone. Please clarify how the baseline situation and co-financing opportunities are concretely contributing to the project activities and its results.

October 18, 2020:

1, 2 and 3. Thank you for the clarification and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

1. On private sector: More information is now provided on private sector, opportunities in the Gambia and the potential in project area.

Ref: Section 4 on Private Sector Engagement

2. On the institutional Framework for ABS implementation: Additional information on institutional context is provided in section 6. Coordination

3. On baseline scenario: More background information is now provided.

Ref: Section 2. Baseline Assessment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

The Theory of Change is welcome, proposing a pathway for change, including assumptions and intermediate states. Thank you.

1. Corruption and land conflicts are highlighted to be among the factors that threaten conservation in the Nyambai Forest Park. Please clarify how this constraint can affect the implementation of operational co-management Arrangements (notably the identification of the the genetic providers) and how the project will address this issue.
2. The Component 2 refers to the Gambian national ABS monitoring system. Nevertheless, such system is not described elsewhere in the PIF notably, in the baseline. Please explain what this system is and how it is managed of being set up.

October 18, 2020:

Thank you for the added information. Nevertheless, it relates mainly to the baseline and we don't see clearly how it addresses the specific comments made:

1. In the added information, there is no reference to corruption, land conflicts and operational co-management Arrangements. Please address the comment 1 made above. Please note that the so-called "operational co-management Arrangements" are only mentioned in the title of the project and there is no further reference throughout the project description, this needs to be clarified.
2. There is no further reference made to the "Gambian national ABS monitoring system". If this system already exists, it should be presented in the baseline. If it doesn't exist, will it be an outcome of the project? Please clarify.

October 25, 2020:

- 1 and 2. Thank you for the additional information and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

To address both item 1 and 2 above, additional information is now provided in Component 1 description

See 1 a.3) alternative Scenario

23-10-2020

1.

- The corruption and Lands conflicts situation in the country are now added in the background section 1 a.1)
- Corruption and Land conflicts are now included as Risks in Section 5 Risk section and how the project will mitigate it is included

2. Information on The Gambia National ABS Monitoring System is now included in the baseline section

1 a.2).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

Yes, if the comment above (on the alignment with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A and under the core indicators section) is addressed. 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

October 6, 2020:

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

October 6, 2020:

The project is expected to contribute to combat the introduction of invasive and alien species. Nevertheless, this outcome is not clear in the project description. Please explain what activities will lead to such a benefit.

October 18, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

The policy framework for ABS will include review of Invasive Species Action Plan to specifically include the mitigation of possible impact on genetic resources.

Ref: See Component 1 description.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 6, 2020:

Yes, 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

October 6, 2020:

Yes, 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

October 6, 2020:

We note that IPLCs, CSOs and private sector entities have been consulted. Nevertheless there isn't any description of the consultations that took place for the design of the project. Please describe the consultations that took place with all the stakeholders, including the IPLCs, CSOs and the private sector entities. In addition, please indicate how they will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement in the project implementation.

October 18, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

The consultation mechanism has been explained in the section 2 on stakeholders. More reference of stakeholders' consultation will be provided at CEO endorsement as part of stakeholders' engagement plan.

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

October 6, 2020:

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

October 6, 2020:

The description is generic about the private sector entities. Please provide the names of the private sector companies (domestic or international) that are currently or potentially interested in ABS agreements. If there isn't any private sector engagement for the moment, please clarify it.

October 18, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

Section 4 on Private sector is now amended. Current few private sector institution engaged in Natural Resources Management are Tourism oriented and no recorded entities dealing with ABS issues directly. The PPG process will be used to conduct a deep assessment and possible ones or those potentially interested in engaging in the ABS issues if probably incentives are available.

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

October 6, 2020:

1. The climate risk is not well identified. The proposal says "Climate change impacts on biodiversity". At this stage, more clarification on threats and impacts are needed to be able to consider appropriate mitigation measures. Please outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location or at country level if not available at local scale (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available) and list key potential hazards for the project that are related to the climate scenarios. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.
2. In the proposal, the risks analysis related to the COVID-19 pandemic is lacking. Nevertheless, the pandemic can affect important elements of the project and some risk and opportunity analysis needs to be undertaken at this stage. Please add a the risk analysis and consider eventual opportunities this project can provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics.(it can be a specific separate note after the risk table). For further clarification, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14.

October 18, 2020:

1. There is still no consideration about the threats and possible impacts of climate change in the project area, neither about appropriate mitigation measures. Please elaborate further.
2. Thank you for the added information. Cleared.

October 25, 2020:

1. Thank you for the additional consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

1. Background information on climate change in Gambia is now provided in the Project background.

Section 1 a.1)

2. The Risk analysis related to COVID 19 is now included both in the risk section and risk table

Ref: see Section 5 on Risk.

23-10-2020

1. Consideration about the threats and possible impacts of climate change in the project area and appropriate mitigation measures are now more elaborated.

Ref: Baseline section 1 a.2)

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

October 6, 2020:

The description is unclear. It begins with the coordination with other on-going GEF funded projects in the country and the distinct functions and coordination between the implementing and the executing agencies are not mentioned. Whereas the paragraph refers to the Department of State for Forestry & the Environment as the national executing agency, the project description in its very beginning says it is the National Environment Agency... Please clarify what will be the different entities intervening in the project implementation, their respective role (including management, monitoring and evaluation) and how they will be coordinated.

October 18, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

The Coordination mechanism is now reviewed and clear roles for key entities are explained

See Section 2 on Stakeholders

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

October 6, 2020:

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

October 6, 2020:

Please provide an overview of existing lessons and best practices that inform the project concept and how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability.

October 18, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

16-10-2020

Some lessons and best practices are now included in section 8 on Knowledge management

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

October 6, 2020:

Yes, the overall risk is assessed as Low and a ESS risk screening note is uploaded in the Portal with the PIF. Cleared.

Agency Response

29-10-2020

We confirm that the SRIF has been reviewed by the UNEP Safeguard team and the signed version has now been uploaded to the portal.

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

October 2, 2020:

Yes, the project has been endorsed by the current country's OFP Mr. Dodou Trawally. 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

N/A

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

October 6, 2020:

Not yet. Please address the comments made above.

October 18, 2020:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments

October 27, 2020:

Thank you for addressing the comments. Nevertheless the following comments still need to be addressed:

1- The LoE specifies that the executing partner is the Office of National ABS Focal Point at the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources. However, in Portal the Executing Partner is the Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (please note that in some countries the Department that manages Parks is not within the Ministry of Environment). Please amend accordingly so that the information in the LoE matches the one in the Portal.

2- Core indicators: Project focuses on national enabling environment for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, mostly through technical assistance, and as such the target for Core Indicator 4 seems relatively important this project. Please note that as GEF Core Indicators are designed to capture only direct outputs and outcomes and 1- confirm that the expected results are actually obtained from direct outputs and outcomes; or 2- adjust the Core Indicators accordingly.

3- Environmental and social safeguards: UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) and overall ESS risk of the project is classified as low. However, it is not clear whether the SRIF attached has been reviewed by the safeguard team and there are no safeguard review summary and Safeguard recommendations by the safeguard team in SRIF. Please clarify if PIF has been reviewed by the safeguard team and, if possible, attached the safeguard review summary.

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	10/6/2020	10/15/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/18/2020	10/16/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/27/2020	10/23/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/29/2020	10/29/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Context:

The Gambia is endowed with a rich heritage of biodiversity and genetic resource base. The medicinal properties of diverse plant and animal species provide enormous health benefits. In rural production for food and nutrition about 80% of the rural populations are engaged in biodiversity-driven activities and depend on traditional medicine. Their livelihoods are tied to the integrity and functioning of biodiversity. Nevertheless, the country's biodiversity endowment that underpins livelihoods of rural populations, but also helps to maintain the resilience of the ecosystems, is under constant threats. These threats are principally linked to invasive alien species, unsustainable agricultural practices, increasing pressure on coastal and marine areas, overgrazing, ecosystem degradation and conversion, and bush burning. Coupled with these factors is forest loss and degradation from land conversion – shifting cultivation, clearance for agriculture due to high population pressure, bushfires, and illegal exploitation.

The Gambian government ratified the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) in July 2014. However, The Gambia has limited capacity and lacks effective enforcement and follow up mechanisms for the implementation of the ABS. The government recognizes the need to develop a legal framework to facilitate the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, a needed development to protect and valorize the biodiversity meeting the needs of rural populations.

Project:

To address this issue, the project will build on the existing national roadmap and seek to create the enabling environment for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol ABS in the Gambia. It will also pilot testing of some promising genetic resources in Nyambai Forest Park, one of the first forest reserves established in The Gambia with promising genetic resources. To achieve this, the project will focus on enhancing national policy and regulatory frameworks; supporting value addition and commercialization of genetic resources; and building capacities and partnerships.

The project is structured with three components: 1- Enhancing The Gambian national policy, regulatory framework, institutional capacity and knowledge base needed to implement the Nagoya Protocol; 2- Supporting research for valorization, value addition and commercialization of selected genetic resources in Nyambai Forest Park; and 3- Enhancing partnerships among relevant actors to improve equitable access to genetic resources and traditional knowledge.

The GEF support will complement efforts underway that are related to biodiversity conservation that also support genetic biodiversity conservation. The project will enable the country to effectively increase the capacity and raise awareness among stakeholders in alignment with the Nagoya Protocol. With this project, the country will be able to build on on-going and previous interventions to consolidate their contributions and address the biodiversity challenges and the threats on the genetic resource base that the country is facing.

Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up

The innovation of this project lies in the fact the project is charting a new legal institutional path that brings together the different involved stakeholders to create the needed enabling environment. The sustainability will rely on the establishment of an enduring network of collaboration between the stakeholders. The potential for scaling up is at two levels: national, from the Nyambai Forest Park pilot and regional, through the ABS regional initiatives related to intellectual property rights, monitoring of the use of genetic resources, compliance with legislation and cooperation on transboundary issues.

Global Environment Benefits:

GEF incremental funding will contribute to biodiversity conservation through the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. In particular, 92,549 ha of landscapes are expected to be brought under improved management to benefit biodiversity and the project will benefit to 110,000 stakeholders.

Co-financing:

The expected co-financing amount of \$10.5 million is provided by national institutions and the GEF Agency IFAD. \$9 million will be provided as grant and investment mobilized, including \$5 million from IFAD.

