GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9926**		
Country/Region:	**Congo DR**		
Project Title:	**Effective National Implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol and Valorization of Botanical Plants (Medicinal, Cosmetic and Neutraceutical) in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-3 Program 8;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$45,662**	Project Grant:	**$2,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$6,750,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$8,750,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Adamou Bouhari**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	9-18-17 Yes. BD-3 Program 8 (Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol) Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	9-18-17 Yes. See details on page 15 of PIF. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	9-18-17	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. See details on page 11 of PIF. Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	9-18-17 The Baseline scenario includes Legal-, Institutional and associated baseline projects. While the Baseline Projects are not that many, there is sufficient support at the National Level to move the ABS Agenda forward. See also pages 10-11 for description of incremental reasoning. Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	9-18-17 Yes. The project includes components for putting in place basic provisions of the Nagoya Protocol as well as to promote the valorization of genetic resources. The PIF is very focus and to the point allowing to see what is going to come out of it. This PIF is the result of a long consultation process and it shows. An example. Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	9-18-17 The Gender issues are discussed at length on pages 1-15. Cleared	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?
[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	9-18-17 Yes. There are sufficient STAR Funds as of today.	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	9-18-17 Yes. The PIF is recommended for Technical Clearance only. To be consider for an upcoming WP.	
Review Date	Review	September 18, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.