



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5420		
Country/Region:	Costa Rica		
Project Title:	Promoting the Application of the Nagoya Protocol through the Development of Nature-based Products, Benefit-sharing and Biodiversity Conservation		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4962 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$979,566
Co-financing:	\$4,537,809	Total Project Cost:	\$5,517,375
PIF Approval:	May 07, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Santiago Carrizosa

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	4-30-13 Yes. Costa Rica is eligible for funding from NPIF. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	4-30-13 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP in the amount of \$1,100,000 including agency fees. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	NA

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the focal area allocation?	NA	NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	4-30-13 This project is to be funded by the NPIF. Funds are available. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	4-30-13 Yes. This project is aligned with the NPIF Results Framework and related to the Aichi target No. 16. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	4-30-13 Yes. This project will support the achievement of one of the indicative outputs of the country program specified in the draft UNDAF for 2013-2017, namely the compliance with multilateral environmental agreements. In addition, the Country Program document for 2013-2017 indicates that UNDP will focus on providing technical and financial assistance to Costa Rica to strengthen the protection, access and sustainability of its natural heritage, as well as to strengthen the capacity to promote adaptation to climate change, among other elements.	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	4-30-13 During the next three years the baseline project implemented by INBio, CONAGEBio and other stakeholders will invest US\$1.7 m in improving DMDP (a plant derived compound) and strain 468B (A micro-fungus derived compound) as precursors for crop-protection products and increasing the national capacity in order to comply with the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. Specifically, INBio will initiate the process towards: a) scientific validation of formulations for DMDP and strain 468B against one pest; b) standardization of extracts for DMDP and 468B; and c) assessment of activity of DMDP and strain 468B for one crop. CONAGEBio will contribute to the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol by creating awareness among representatives to the legislative assembly and the identifications of gaps in the national ABS framework that must be addressed in order to comply with the Nagoya Protocol	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	4-30-13 Yes. The project has the following components: 1. Proof of concept for nature-based crop protection agents applied to two crops of economic importance in Costa Rica. 2. Optimizing, scaling up and licensing crop protection agents 3. Sharing benefits derived from genetic resources	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		4. Increasing national capacity to ratify and implement the Nagoya Protocol Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	4-30-13 Yes. As stated in the PIF, through the development of nature-based crop protection products and the strengthening of the capacity of the National Authority, Costa Rica can be positioned as an example for practical implementation of the Nagoya Protocol focused on ABS, which will also help demonstrate that it is possible to achieve sustainable and cost-effective use of the biological resources and ensure that the benefits will accrue to the nation and its people. Thus, the project will play a critical role in safeguarding the country's biological resources and their genetic diversity. For Incremental reasoning (Baseline and Alternative Scenario) see pages 4-7. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	4-30-13 List of stakeholders on p. 8-9. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	4-30-13 List of risks and measures on p. 9. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	4-13-30 This project will be developed in coordination with the NPIF project approved in Colombia.	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	4-13-30 Innovation: This is the 4th project funded by the NPIF. This project aims at developing crop protection agents from an innovative perspective, based on the improvement of the plant's general health by activating natural defense mechanisms and stimulating growth and nutrient intake. Additionally, one of the active principles proposed could also be considered as a natural nitrogen source, leading to a potential decrease in the need of chemical pesticides and fertilizers while making the agro-sector more competitive in terms of food safety and quality. Sustainability: This initiative is likely to be sustainable after project closure because there are two important institutions with vested interests in the project: the National Commission for the Management of Biodiversity (CONAGEBio), the National Biodiversity Institute (INBio), and three private sector companies (BIOTÃCNICA, ECOS,	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FORMUQUISA and MONRERI). In addition, this project should generate financial resources from the commercialization of coffee and bananas protection agents derived from plants and micro-fungus agents.</p> <p>Scaling-up: This project has the potential to be scaled up because there is demand for nature-based products as alternatives to synthetic which are expensive to produce, can represent as much as 35% of the production costs of food crops, and raise concerns over their negative impact on the environment and worker's health. Cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	4-30-13 Yes. Assuming co-financing in-kind becomes effective during project implementation. Cash \$3,806,000 and in-kind \$813,309 all from private sector. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line	4-13-30 Yes. There is no co-financing from the agency. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	4-13-30 Yes. It is 10% of the project cost. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	4-30-13 There is a request for a PPG in the amount of \$25K. This is within the limit for an MSP of \$1M. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		NA
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		6-22-14 Yes. Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	5-1-13 Yes. This PIF is technically cleared.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		6-22-14 Yes. This MSP is recommended for CEO Endorsement.
	First review*	May 01, 2013	June 22, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**