

## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS

Country/Region: Ethiopia

Project Title: Ethiopia: Capacity Building for Access and Benefit Sharing and Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants

GEFSEC Project ID: **4091**

GEF Agency Project ID:

GEF Agency: UNEP

GEF Focal Area (s): Biodiversity

GEF-4 Strategic Program (s): BD-4;BD-5;BD-8;

Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$135,000      GEF Project Allocation: \$2,047,000      Co-financing:\$2,500,000      Total Project Cost:\$4,682,000

PIF Approval Date: April 28, 2010

Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: June 08, 2010

Program Manager: Jaime Cavalier

GEF Agency Contact Person: Mohamed Sessay

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	09-29-09 Ethiopia ratified the CBD on 1994-04-05. Cleared	3-20-12 Cleared
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		NA
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	09-29-09 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$2,800,000 dated September 2, 2009. Cleared	3-20-12 Cleared
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	09-29-09 SP5 and SP8 Cleared	3-20-12 Cleared
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	09-29-09 Yes. Cleared	3-20-12 Cleared
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?	09-29-09 Yes. Ethiopia has a BD RAF of \$8.1M and a	3-20-12 Cleared

		<p>balance of \$3.1M as of today. Cleared</p> <p>04-23-10 NOTE: After the composition of the January 2010 Work Program, there were not enough funds in Ethiopia's BD RAF to cover this project, as previously cleared by the PM in September 2009. The total GEF contribution for this project, including PIF, PPG and Agency fees (\$2,400,200) has been reduced to below the balance as of today (\$2,400,400). Ethiopia is no longer in the red. Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal areas?</li> </ul>	<p>09-29-09 Yes. Ethiopia has a BD RAF of \$8.1M and a balance of \$3.1M as of today. Cleared</p> <p>04-23-10 NOTE: After the composition of the January 2010 Work Program, there were not enough funds in Ethiopia's BD RAF to cover this project, as previously cleared by the PM in September 2009. The total GEF contribution for this project, including PIF, PPG and Agency fees (\$2,400,200) has been reduced to below the balance as of today (\$2,400,400). Ethiopia is no longer in the red. Cleared</p>	<p>3-20-12 Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic objectives?</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic program?</li> </ul>	NA	
Project Design	6. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	<p>09-29-09 Yes. This project has the potential to deliver significant GEBs. Ethiopia has around 1000 Medicinal Plant Species. 48 million consumers use some 56,000 tons of medicinal plants per annum, with consumers obtaining their plant material from healers, traders and</p>	

		by direct harvesting. Importantly, the consumption is based on largely wild plant stocks. Some 87% or 49,000 tons are harvested from wild stocks, with only 13% or 7,000 tons being cultivated. Cleared	
	7. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		3-20-12 GEBs will be measurable in the long term. Cleared
	8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	09-29-09  This project is structured around the following components and outputs:  1. In-situ and ex-situ conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants in selected conservation and production sites ((BMNP, south [Borena, South Omo], southwestern forests [Masha, Bonga, Benshangul Gumuz], southeastern lowlands [Babile, Jijiga] and west [Dejene, Kosober]); i) A GIS-based, spatial population density map of endemic and threatened medicinal plant species with high economic and social values made across the project areas, ii) A field survey of levels of "from the wild" collection, on farm propagation, and local market demand for medicinal plants conducted in the same regions, iii) Review and revision of existing policy and legislative framework for Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) collection and sale, iv) Conservation and sustainable use management plans for priority threatened medicinal plants drawn up, agreed and being implemented by community management committees, v) Guidelines for sustainable harvesting for priority species in the 4 in situ sites prepared, based on internationally agreed standards, vi) A ex-situ nursery and stocking programme developed for priority medicinal	3-20-12  The project has the following components:  1. In-situ and ex-situ conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants in selected sites. 2. Enabling Policy & Institutional framework for conservation of medicinal plants biodiversity. 3. Markets for medicinal plants biodiversity. 4. Capacity Building for wider application of ABS measures in Ethiopia. 5. Project monitoring and evaluation.  Cleared

plants to establish "feedstock" supplies for home gardens, replication of field gene banks, etc, vii) A catalogue or compendium of propagation and cultivation methods of selected medicinal plants developed, viii) 1000 home gardens supplied with medicinal plants and linked to market opportunities in the study sites; ix) "Export" potential assessment for selected species currently under-utilized or with potential for large increase in sustainable production, x) An Ethiopian Trade Directory for Medicinal Plant Trade established; Market information system established, xi) Small group trade associations, representing the trade from local levels right up to federal level, established; xii) National bio-prospecting, screening, DNA sequencing, characterization, product development and marketing capacity developed; xiii) Pilot study on ecosystem services as an additional revenue stream for local communities.

- Capacity Building for wider application of ABS measures in Ethiopia: i) Within the pilot areas, capacity of local communities and traditional healers to assess, inventory and monitor genetic resources, and related traditional knowledge, enhanced; ii) Pilot initiatives for contract-based export trade in medicinal plants established with ABS agreements in place; iii) Review of existing ABS regulations and recommendations for revision based on the experience of the pilot studies and in the light of the negotiations of the International Regime (post-COP 10), iv) Administrative system for handling ABS contract negotiations strengthened at central government, district (woreda) and local community levels.

		<p>Please clarify the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the areas (hectares) of the 4 pilot sites? How does the area to be piloted in this project compared to the area where the GEF already invested through the WB project entitled "Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants" (Ethiopia)?</li> <li>2. Under Component 1, there are a number of outputs associated with office-lab work (i.e. outputs i, ii, iii, vii, ix, x, xi, xii) and others, associated with the development and implementation of activities on the ground (i.e. outputs iv, v, vi, viii, xiii). How are these two sets of activities going to be connected in reality? Are the communities on the ground capable to fully use the "office-lab" outputs proposed in this project (i.e. GIS, Results of Field Surveys, Policy and Legislation on NTFP, catalogues, export potential assessments, Ethiopian Trade Directory, National bio-prospecting, screening, DNA sequencing, characterization etc.)?</li> <li>3. There is little emphasis on Market forces (p.9 under Incremental Reasoning) and how to address the issue of overall increasing consumption and declining supply as described under Project Justification. What are the proposed activities, outputs and outcomes associated with this issue?</li> </ol> <p>12-14-09  These issues were clarified in the revised PIF dated December 12, 2009.  Cleared</p> <p>04-23-10</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>NOTE: The budget and proposed activities were revised in the PIF submitted 04-23-10. The changes were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The overall GEF PIF request has been reduced from USD 2,500,000 (USD 2,750,000 with IA fee) to USD 2,047,000 (USD 2,251,700 with IA fee) by making reductions in both the medicinal plant and ABS components of the proposal.</li> <li>2. Cost savings from reduced project activities have been distributed in roughly equal proportions across GEF and co-finance, resulting in a reduced total PIF total of USD 4,072,000, excluding PPG and IA fees.</li> <li>3. Component 1 has been reduced in scope by reducing the area of the project interventions from approx. 200,000 hectares to 150,000 hectares, reducing the total cost, including co-finance) of this component from USD2,600,000 to USD 2,060,000.</li> <li>4. Component 2 has automatically been reduced in cost by the reduction in the pilot areas of Component 1 as ABS mechanisms will be rolled out in fewer locations, thus reducing the total cost, including co-finance) of this component from USD2,000,000 to USD 1,540,000.</li> </ol> <p>These changes are all appropriate and justifiable.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?</p>	<p>09-29-09 There is no information regarding the consistency of this project with National/Regional priorities or plans. The</p>	<p>3-20-12 Cleared</p>

		<p>information under item B. (p.8) nicely complements the justification of the project on biodiversity grounds, but tells little about how this project fits with National/Regional plans. Is this project connected in any way to a serious National/Regional Effort on ABS of medicinal Plants, or is this project a stand alone?</p> <p>12-14-09 This issue was clarified in the revised PIF dated December 12, 2009. Cleared</p>	
	10. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>09-29-09</p> <p>Apparently, there is overlap between some of the proposed outputs of this project with those of the WB project PMIS 631 WB Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants (Ethiopia). Please also review PMIS 351 UNDP A Dynamic Farmer-Based Approach to the Conservation of African Plant Genetic Resources.</p> <p>12-14-09 These issues were clarified in the revised PIF dated December 12, 2009. Cleared</p>	<p>3-21-12 Yes. Please see page 10 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>
	11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	<p>09-29-09</p> <p>The cost-effectiveness of this project should become clearer after describing how this project fits with the previous efforts in this matter.</p> <p>12-14-09 These issues were clarified in the revised PIF dated December 12, 2009. Cleared</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		<p>3-21-12 Cleared</p>

	13. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		3-21-12 Yes. There was an increase in co-financing from \$2,025,000 to \$2,500,000 Cleared
	14. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	09-29-09 Yes. Please review and comment on the Risks and Mitigation Measures taken by other GEF funded projects on this subject. Any lessons to be learned from those investments?  12-14-09 These issues were clarified in the revised PIF dated December 12, 2009. Cleared	3-21-12 Yes. See page 11 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared
Justification for GEF Grant	15. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?	09-29-09 Although the proposed activities make when reading them in isolation, it is not clear how those activities fit with the current situation. Perhaps a few paragraphs with a side-by-side comparison between the WB project and this project, will facilitate understanding what this project brings new or different to the efforts of conserving medicinal plants in Ethiopia.  12-14-09 These issues were clarified in the revised PIF dated December 12, 2009. Cleared	3-21-12 Yes. Cleared
	16. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?	09-28-09 Yes. Cleared	3-21-12 Yes. Cleared
	17. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		3-21-12 Yes. Projects and GEBs will be significantly affected. Cleared
	18. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	09-28-09 Yes. It is 10% of GEF contribution. Cleared	3-21-12 It is 9.6% Cleared
	19. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.)		3-21-12 For technical assistance, the GEF is



	appropriate?		providing on average \$559/week for local consultants and \$1500/week for international consultants. For project management, the GEF is providing \$357/week. Cleared
	20. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	09-29-09 Yes. This is a \$4,945,455 project with GEF providing \$2.4M Cleared  04-23-10 In the revised PIF, the total project is \$4,072,000 with GEF contributing \$2,047,000. Cleared	
	21. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		3-21-12 There is a LoC from the Ministry of Agriculture for \$2.5 M (Part of PAD). Cleared
	22. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators?		3-21-12 Yes. Appendix 15 of PAD. Cleared
	23. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		3-21-12 Yes. Pages 5-6 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		
	Convention Secretariat		
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
<b>Secretariat Decisions</b>			
Recommendation at	<b>24. Is PIF clearance being recommended?</b>	09-29-09 No. Please address outstanding issues.	

PIF		<p>12-14-09 Yes. This PIF is recommended by PM for CEO clearance.</p> <p>04-23-10 NOTE: This PIF was re-submitted with a reduced budget, within the balance for Ethiopia's BD RAF. The PIF is recommended by the PM for CEO clearance. Cleared</p>	
	25. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.	<p>12-14-09 At CEO Endorsement, please address the following issues:</p> <p>1. A detailed description of the stakeholder participation and institutional structure to ensure the efficient flow of information between the scientific, legal and ground-level (farmers) activities. Of particular interest how the farmers on the ground will benefit from the office and lab work proposed in this PIF.</p> <p>2. A clear account of the project's outcomes that are above and beyond those obtained by the WB and UNDP projects on ABS in Ethiopia</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	<b>26. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?</b>		3-21-12 Yes. This CEO is recommended.
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review	September 29, 2009	March 21, 2012
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review	December 14, 2009	
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review	April 23, 2010	

### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	04-23-10 Yes. All activities are appropriate for a PPG.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	04-23-10 The overall PPG GEF request has been reduced from USD150,000 (USD 165,000 with IA fee) to USD135,000 (USD148,500 with IA fee) to reflect the reduced overall scope of the full-sized project. The reductions arise from reducing total national consultant inputs from 48 to 42 personweeks, and from reducing total international consultant inputs from 6 to 5 weeks. No reduction has been made in the national co-financing input to the PPG, making a new total PPG total cost of USD325,000. 2. PPG implementation dates have been changed to reflect these delays, as have the milestones for the subsequent project in the PIF.  Cleared
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	04-23-10 Yes. Cleared
Recommendation	<b>5. Is PPG being recommended?</b>	04-23-10 This PPG is recommended by the PM for CEO Approval. Cleared
Other comments		
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review	April 23, 2010
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review	
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review	

wb21049  
C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf  
8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM