



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

GEF ID:	5731		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Strengthening Human Resources, Legal Frameworks and Institutional Capacities to Implement the Nagoya Protocol		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5381 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$12,000,000
Co-financing:	\$12,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,300,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
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 ?	3-18-14 This is a Global project and the participating countries would need to be eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	3-18-14 This is a Global project. LoE will be needed for CEO Endorsement. 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	

*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	3-18-14 This project is submitted to the BD FAS. Subject to funding availability.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/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>	3-18-14 BD-4 and Aichi Target 16. Cleared	
	<p>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?</p>	3-18-14 ABS and the Nagoya Protocol (to the extent possible) need to be explicitly mentioned in the participating countries' national strategies-plans and/or NBSAPs or National Reports. Please include that provision in the PIF. 3-27-14 Cleared	
	<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</p>	3-18-14 Participating countries will need to provide proof of a "baseline project", that is, the investments over the duration of this project, that will take place weather	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?	<p>or not this GEF project is funded. This "baseline project" is not the history of investments so far. Please include that provision in the PIF.</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>3-18-14</p> <p>The PIF does not make reference to the ABS Clearing House. Please consider adding this element under Component 1 for countries that: i) desire to do so, and have at least ii) a legal framework in place (laws and regulations) that can be advertised in the CHM.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>3-18-14</p> <p>The GEBs derived from this project, will become tangible and measurable with the implementation of the NP by all interested parties.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	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?	<p>3-18-14</p> <p>Yes. This is the focus of Component 3. Please add ILCs in the Stakeholder Table.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

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)	3-18-14 Cleared	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	3-18-14 Yes. This information is summarized in Annex 1. For CEO Endorsement, please provide a table identifying the specific gaps to be filled by this project in the participating countries. The information needs to be country-specific and derived from the scoping study carried out to identify the gap. In addition, please obtain from the CBD Secretariat the necessary information on the countries and activities carried out with the GEF-MSP in support of the early entry into force of the NP (PMIS 4415). Please include that provision in the PIF. 3-27-14 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. 	3-18-14 Sustainability: In the text, please include the requirement for participating countries to provide documentation on the Government's interest on ABS and the NP, and the plans to sustain the effort behind the time and budget of this project. This can be in the form of "streamlining" of ABS into Government's business (i.e. budget lines in national budget, staffing, etc.). Without this explicit commitment, institutional and financial sustainability of this GEF	

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"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>project would be seriously compromised. Please include that provision in the PIF.</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>3-18-14 For CEO Endorsement, please try to increase co-financing ratio to 1:2. Please also review the allocation of financial resources especially between Components 1 and 2. It is important that this grant provides significant financial and technical assistance to the participating countries to fulfill their obligations with the NP.</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? 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>3-18-14 The GF + Co-financing (especially if 1:2) should be sufficient to achieve the goals of this project. Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	3-18-14 Yes. It is 5%. 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?	3-14-18 PPG is requested in the amount of \$200,000. If the Agency were to allocate equal fractions for the scoping study for each of the participating countries in order to determine the gaps this project aim at completing, that means \$4000/country. Is that enough or should the Agency consider max the allocation to PPG (\$300K)? 3-27-14 Cleared	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
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?	3-19-14 No. Please address outstanding issues	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		under items 5,6,7, 12,14 and 19. Thanks. 3-27-14 Cleared	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 19, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 24, 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.**