



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	9860		
Country/Region:	Cuba		
Project Title:	Creation of Additional Biosafety Capacities that Lead to A Full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Cuba		
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-2 Program 5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$1,826,484
Co-financing:	\$1,920,443	Total Project Cost:	\$3,746,927
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavellier	Agency Contact Person:	Marianela Araya-Quesada

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	7-2-17 Yes. BD-2 Program 5. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	7-2-17 The project is well structured. While most of the outputs are relevant, the GEF believes the project is trying to do too much with the funds allocated to the project. Of the 5 core components, investments in	

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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>component No. 1 (and 2) are no doubt of the highest priority to fulfil the basic obligations under the CPB.</p> <p>While Components 3,4 and 5 are all valid, they are using significant financial resources (\$2.6K) that could be used to increase the depth and breath of Component 1 and 2 significantly. By having so many outputs in this project the Government of Cuba is using an "incremental" approach to build the capabilities. What about pressing with more resources for Components 1 and 2 and leave the rest for a future project? There are the outputs that the GEF suggest looking at for the second time to evaluate the need to be included in this project and the budget allocation if they were to remain.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2. Does it need \$ resources? Output 1.1.3. Aren't there any toolkits/guidelines/protocols and SOP developed already in Latin America and that could be used outright or adjust at a reduced cost compared to new developments?</p> <p>Component 3. While the rationale for this component is made in the MSP, it is really necessary at this stage, when the technical capacities are still under development? Could the price tag be reduced?</p> <p>Component 4. Could this component left for a separate MSP on the N-K Protocol in GEF-7?</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>Component 5. This is the component that the GEF has the most doubts about. While no doubt education is key, is it really necessary to spend \$99K in primary and secondary education? That is a high order price tag for what is being proposed.</p> <p>All in all, the GEF suggest reviewing the scope of the MSP. Other wise Cuba runs the risk of continuing building capacity for the CPB using an incremental approach on all fronts.</p> <p>7-14-17 Cleared</p>	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>7-2-17 Yes. Pages 20-21 of MSP Cleared</p>	
	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>7-2-17 Yes. See pages 14-15 of MSP. Cleared</p>	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>7-2-17 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>7-2-17 Relevant comments under item 2. Cleared</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Design	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	7-2-17 Cleared	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	7-2-17 No. Please read and consider comments made under item 2. Please also review \$ figures and sums in MSP template when adjusting the budget as appropriate. 7-14-17 Cleared	
	9. 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)	7-2-17 Cleared	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	7-2-17 Yes. Cleared	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	7-2-17 Yes Cleared	
	12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	7-2-17 Yes. Cleared	
	14. Does the project include a	7-2-17	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Is it necessary to spend \$141K in a project whose results are so simple to track? 7-14-17 Cleared	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	7-2-17 Yes Cleared	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	7-2-17 Cuba has enough STAR funds available (\$4.6M) as of today. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	7-2-17 No. Please address outstanding issues under item 2. Thanks.	
		7-14-17 Yes. This MSP is recommended for Approval.	
Review Dates	First Review	July 02, 2017	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 14, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		