



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

GEF ID:	5688		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	UNEP-GEF Project for Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the BCH		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,699,684
Co-financing:	\$9,725,680	Total Project Cost:	\$14,425,364
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavelier	Agency Contact Person:	Alex Owusu-Biney

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?	<p>Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion 2-17-14</p> <p>Yes. Participating countries listed in Annex 1 are all eligible for GEF funding. Nevertheless, not all the countries listed in the Annex 1 fulfil the criteria for eligibility stated on p. 11 of the PIF. For instance, according to the CBD CHM Portal, 33 of the 76 countries have not posted anything under the selection factor "Regulatory Summary/national biosafety framework" (https://bch.cbd.int/database/laws/). The criteria that countries should have used the BCH central portal "to at least enter</p>	

*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)
		<p>the information on National Contacts" sets the bar very low. When a search is done in the BCH Portal on other factors under "Country's Decisions and other communications", the number of countries not using the portal is significant. This reinforces the view that the countries are making very little or no use of the BCH. This conclusion with the supporting evidence was sent to UNEP on September 12 and December 4 of 2013, as part of upstream consultations with GEFSEC. Same conclusion was reached by the UNEP Evaluation of the BCH2. Please reduce the number of countries to those that comply with the criteria in the PIF, make use of the CHM beyond entering the names of the National Contact, and have sufficient institutional capacity to benefit from this project.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	2-17-14 No LoE needed for Global projects. 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	
	• the focal area allocation?	NA	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund • focal area set-aside? 	<p>NA</p> <p>2-17-14 The PIF is requesting \$6,000,000 for capacity building in the Biosafety CHM for 76 countries (approx. \$79,000/country). This is 56% higher than the amount requested for BCH2 (\$50,000/country). The justification provided in Annex 2 does not hold because most of the proposed activities in BCH3 will take place in groups or are implemented using on-line tools. These activities have economies of scale that should reduce the cost not increase it. UNEP may want to provide the spread sheet used to calculate the cost of the project. Having those numbers on hand, would allow a more rigorous evaluation of the budget requested for BCH3.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	<p>NA</p>
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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></p>	<p>2-17-14 Yes Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports</p>	<p>2-17-14 No information was provided to determine if the participating countries</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>have identified Biosafety and the CHM as a priority in their NBSAPs (It is not sufficient that the countries are Parties to the CBD and the CP). Please only include the countries that have language in their NBSAP that prioritizes Biosafety and the implementation CHM.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p> <p>It is not possible to determine what participating countries have developed and implemented their NBFs. Selection criteria (as in BCH-II) include the consideration on whether or not the country has an NBF. Please remove the countries that do not have a NBF. See also comment under item 1.</p> <p>Since BCH2 was to provide support "above and beyond" BCH1, for this BCH3 (i.e. add on to BCH2) the countries should be select based on the criteria used in BCH2 and in light of the independent evaluation.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>2-17-14</p> <p>The PIF has been put together following the Decision of the COP to "...to provide support to all eligible parties for capacity building in the use of the BCH...". In order for the GEF to follow this guideline, it is necessary that this project provides with the necessary information regarding the baseline for the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>participating countries including: i) Government-endorsed strategies (e.g. Biosafety and BCH reflected in the NBSAP), ii) investments in programs and infrastructure (the investments that will occur whether or not this project is approved), iii) legislative framework (whether or not there is a functional NBF), and iv) international agreements and funding relevant to the BCH. The GEF knows that not all the 76 participating countries have these requirements. Thus, the GEF request that the list of countries be reduced to those that have a true baseline and where investments have a chance to make a difference in the short- (during the time and budget of the project) and long term (after completion of the project).</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>2-14-17</p> <p>The project is built around providing capacity building for a number of stakeholders: BCH Focal Points (Component 1), the civil society using e-learning (Component 2), Regional Advisors (Component 3), and Government officials (Component 4). Component 5 deals with the sustainability of the system.</p> <p>1) The structure of the project assumes that there is enough institutional capacity (i.e. human resources and infrastructure) where training is going to take place. Not</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>all the 76 participating countries have such capacity and there will be no investments in this project to build it.</p> <p>Please reduce the list of participating countries to those that have the capacity to absorb the investments in capacity building. It makes very little sense for the GEF and the GEF Agency to invest funding and time in countries that do not have the minimum requirements.</p> <p>2) Component 4. Output ii) No. of National Records in the BCH increased by 70% at end of the project.</p> <p>UNEP's evaluation of BCH stated that: "There has been an increase in the number of records submitted by the BCH II participating countries as compared to non-BCH countries in the central BCH as per the Project reports and PIRs. However, these records were posted mainly by 34 of the 49 BCH II countries".</p> <p>The report also makes reference to the number and quality of records uploaded to the BCH: "A total of 194 new records were updated by all the BCH II countries, out of which 136 were updated by 9 countries in AP region, 28 records by 13 countries in Africa region and 30 records by 12 countries from LAC region. However, the increase in the number of records updating at the central BCH may not necessarily reflect the quality of the information available with BCH that the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>IAC has been emphasized".</p> <p>The report mentions some of the reasons why the low participation in the BCH: "Lack of updating of records could be due to several reasons. It is worth noting that several of the BCH II countries have not taken any decision on LMOs so far, which could be simply due to the fact that NBFs in these countries are not fully functioning or that there is a moratorium in on field trials and deployment of LMOs, etc. (e.g. India and Peru)".</p> <p>In short: BCH-II did not have the expected results in terms of use of the BCH. Considering that the 50 countries in BCH-II have superior capacities than the 76 participating countries in BCH-III, it is very unlikely that the investment in this project will have significant impact in the number of records in BCH.</p> <p>Please reduce the number of countries that have the capacity to absorb the capacity building investments that this project will make and reflect that in an increased number of records in the BCH.</p> <p>3) The GEF does not provide financial resources for Academic training at the Graduate and Postgraduate levels. Please remove this part.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	2-14-17 Yes. What is not clear is if this project will deliver incremental benefits when there is very little capacity in country to move forward the Biosafety agenda. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	2-14-17 Yes. The CSO and indigenous peoples (when appropriate) will benefit from this project, particularly with component 2. Cleared	
	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)	2-14-17 The information is the current PIF is very difficult to read. Please build a table with two columns: Risks and Mitigation measures. There is no reference to the following risks: 1) No human and institutional capacity (e.g. physical infrastructure including computing capacity). 2) Governments reluctance to upload records to the BCH. 3-27-14 Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>2-14-17 To the extent possible. Cleared</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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. 	<p>2-17-14</p> <p>The UNEP Evaluation of BCH-II stated (Point 6 of Executive Summary):</p> <p>"Continued capacity building of stakeholders after the project period is over remains a major challenge in several of the BCH II countries as only 10% of the BCH II countries have established sustainability plans BCH operations. About 50% of the countries have a sustainability plan to support BCH activities after the project period is over but the available budget may not be sufficient to support all BCH operations. In the remaining 40% of the countries national budget allocation for BCH operations does not exist and BCH operations are mainly project driven or rely on alternative support systems".</p> <p>The current proposal will most likely suffer the same result. 1) Based on the information provided in the PIF, it is not possible to know if this project has Government support. The project appears to be driven more by the decisions from COP (listed on page 6 of the PIF) than by the participating countries' interests and priorities.</p> <p>Component 5 (\$320,000) included the output of "Sustainability and Training</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Plan developed in synergy with the NBF". With this budget is virtually impossible to provide financial support to the 76 participating countries (\$4,210/country).</p> <p>Please reconsider the number of participating countries and the reallocation of funds to be able to ensure that these plans are developed and implemented</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	<p>2-14-17</p> <p>The GEF financing is more than enough. Indeed, it is significantly higher per country than in BCH-II. Please address the issue of the number of participating countries (mentioned throughout the review) and investment per country.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate?	<p>2-14-17</p> <p>There is co-financing (in-kind) from the participating countries in the amount of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>\$59,000/country. Is that all the countries are going to provide? Do the participating countries know they are being included in the proposal and that is the level of co-financing they have the potential to offer?</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>2-14-17 No. It should be up to 5% for projects like this.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	2-17-14 No. Please address outstanding issues. 3-27-14 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	February 18, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2014	
	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.**