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

GEF ID:	**5172**		
Country/Region:	**Global**		
Project Title:	**Global Support for the Entry into Force of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$1,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$627,500**	Total Project Cost:	**$1,627,500**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Mohamed Sessay**

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?		9-28-12 This is a Global project for GEF eligible countries. As stated in the document "Outstanding issues related to the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund" (GEF/C.40/11/Rev.1), "the Fund will initially focus its support on assisting signatory Parties and those in the process of signing the Nagoya Protocol, and that intend to ratify the Protocol in order to accelerate the ratification and implementation of the Protocol". Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point	9-28-12	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsed the project?	UNEP will select the 30 participating countries based on submission of the formal letter of endorsement after project approval, and capacity to ratify the Nagoya Protocol after completion of the scoping study and awareness raising activities. Up to date, 21 countries have expressed interest in participate in this project, 10 have submitted letter of endorsement and 3 are seriously considering the case. In view of the interest of Parties in Ratifying the Nagoya Protocol expressed at ICNP-2, it is estimated that the 30 Letters of Endorsement will be obtained within 60 days after the approval of the project. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		9-28-12 Yes. UNEP through its mandate as a convener and coordinator for the environment promotes regional and multi-country cooperation to achieve global environmental benefits, focusing on diagnostic analyses and cooperative mechanisms, and associated institutional strengthening. Cleared
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		9-28-12 As the CBD is a UNEP-administered Convention, it largely draws support for ABS legal and policy issues at global and regional levels through UNEP's Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELC). While

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			UNEP-DEPI will maintain its role as implementing agency with oversight functions, UNEP-DELC will assume the coordinating and overall executing functions in the proposed project. Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		NA
	• the focal area allocation?		NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		9-28-12 Yes. Funds for this MSP are available at the NPIF. Cleared
	• focal area set-aside?		NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		9-28-12 Yes. This PIF is aligned with the GEF Council document of June 2011 "Outstanding issues related to the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund" (GEF/C.40/11/Rev.1). Specifically, this project fulfills the primary objective of the NPIF: to facilitate the early entry into force and create enabling conditions at national and regional levels for implementation of the Protocol. Cleared
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		9-28-12 Yes. BD-4 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		9-28-12 Participating countries would include those that have included ABS measures and/or objectives in their NBSAPs. In addition, participating countries would need to certify that they can potentially ratify the Nagoya Protocol by carrying out these two types of activities and that a complete legal and regulatory framework is not needed for the legislature to consider ratification. Countries that require a complete legal and regulatory framework need to apply for a stand-alone ABS project using BD STAR allocations. Cleared
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		9-28-12 This MSP aims at assisting 30 countries to ratify the Nagoya Protocol. No sustainability issues need to be considered for this objective Cleared
Project Design	11. 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?		9-28-12 Up to date 92 countries have signed the Nagoya Protocol but only 6 have ratified it (Ethiopia, Gabon, Jordan, Mexico, Rwanda and Seychelles). This MSP should enable another 30 to ratify, bringing the total to 36. Cleared
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		9-28-12 Yes. Providing financial support directly to those in charge of the process is the most cost-effective mechanism to support ratification. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		9-28-12 Yes. Without a GEF-supported intervention, the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol will be significantly delayed, with global environmental benefits taking much longer to accrue. Without effective policies, legislative frameworks and demonstrated measures for ABS implementation, such as stakeholder awareness-raising and broad-based engagement agreements or partnerships, the participating countries will continue to fall short in deriving benefits from their genetic resources, allowing access for inequitable exploitation by external parties. Cleared
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		9-27-12 Yes. This MSP is for countries can potentially ratify the Nagoya Protocol by carrying out the following activities: Rapid Capacity Needs Assessment, and Stakeholder Engagement. Countries that require a complete legal and regulatory framework need to apply for a stand-alone ABS project using BD STAR allocations. The project has the following three components: Rapid Capacity Needs Assessment: Outcome: Institutional, policy, legal and regulatory frameworks properly evaluated to allow decision-makers to take informed decisions on the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			implication of acceding and implementing the Nagoya Protocol. Stakeholder Engagement: Key stakeholder groups (particularly policy makers) are fully aware of the implications and opportunities that result from acceding to the Nagoya Protocol. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Cleared
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		9-28-12 This MSP is based on the assumption that participating countries could ratify the protocol after an initial assessment of the legal and administrative implications of ratifying the protocol, and public awareness campaigns. Participating countries in this MSP would need to certify that they can potentially accede to the Nagoya Protocol by carrying out these two types of activities and that a complete legal and regulatory framework is not needed for the legislature to accession. Cleared
	16. 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?		9-28-12 Yes. See p.8. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		9-28-12 Public participation will take place as part of Component 2. Nevertheless, the main target for awareness campaigns will be the legislature. Cleared.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)		9-28-12 Yes. See Table B.4 page 9. Cleared
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		9-28-12 Yes. This project will coordinate with the GEF-supported project Capacity Building for the Early Entry into Force of the Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (PMIS 4342). UNEP is the GEF Agency. Cleared
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		9-28-12 UNEP-DELC will assume the coordinating and overall executing functions in the proposed project, and can thus provide expertise needed to ensure quick implementation and the linkage to regional and international expert networks. As executing agency, UNEP-DELC will sub-contract the respective national executing partner organizations for the implementation of the respective national activities. Cleared
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		NA.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		9-28-12 Yes. It is 5% of the GEF project. Cleared
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		9-28-12 This MSP is the GEF contribution to the ratification process of the NP. Co-financing will be provided by countries in-kind during the political process leading to Ratification. Cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		9-28-12 While co-financing is expected from Governments, the Agency and other partners, it is not critical for the execution of the project. This MSP is in support to a political process leading to a clear target: the ratification of the NP. Cleared
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		9-27-12 See above. Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		NA
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		9-28-12 Yes. Cleared
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		9-28-12 Yes. This MSP is recommended to approval. Cleared
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 28, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	
	4. Other comments	

Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.