



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

GEF ID:	5730		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Information into the Heart of Government Decision Making		
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-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$15,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$20,120,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Mohamed Sessay

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	March 21, 2104  Global project, thus NA.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	March 21, 2104  Global project, thus NA for now. Please describe your planned outreach/engagement strategy in the revised PIF.  March 26, 2014  Adequate revisions.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the STAR allocation?	March 21, 2104 Global project, thus NA.	
	• the focal area allocation?	March 21, 2104 Global project, thus NA.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	March 21, 2104 NA.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	3/20/2014 Yes. There are adequate resources remaining in the BD FA set-aside.	
	<b>Strategic Alignment</b>	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <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>	3/20/2014 Yes. The project is aligned with the GEF BD strategy results framework and identifies the relevant Aichi Targets.  As the project is developed, and the 3 pilot countries selected, TT for BD objective two should be completed for the 3 countries. Please conduct upstream discussion with GEFSEC to ensure that the tool is completed correctly.
5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports		3/20/2014 Once the project identifies the three	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	countries, please include the linkage of the proposal with each country's NBSAP. For now, presentation is adequate.	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	3/20/2014  Yes. This project describes the current problems and status of efforts well. At CEO endorsement narrow this down to the three countries.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	3/20/2014  Yes for the most part, however, we would like to see the outcomes adjusted to measure changes in policy frameworks such that these frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations. The changes would be realized due to targeted use of information that is provided through the actions of the project. Component three may be the best place for these outcomes. Please revise this in the PIF.  Please restate the objective into one objective statement. Delete the second sentence. The objective needs to reflect the aim of the project to enhance the status of biodiversity. Information etc are the means to the end, not the end.  March 26, 2014  Adequate revisions.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	3/20/2014  For now, this is adequate. However, once the three countries are identified in the design stage, please describe the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>global benefits more clearly for each circumstance and link the reduction of drivers of BD loss to the biodiversity context of each country and the measurable global biodiversity benefits that will ensue.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>3/20/2014</p> <p>While this project discusses engagement with CSOs on the global level, the PIF does not discuss the engagement with CSOs at the national level. For the PIF, briefly describe the strategy for engagement with CSOs at national level. It is likely that CSOs in addition to environmental organizations could be important partners, including agricultural unions, development organizations, etc. At CEO endorsement, this will have to be fully detailed once pilot countries are identified.</p> <p>In addition, the role of the private sector needs to be identified and described more robustly in the PIF and they should be included as a key stakeholder.</p> <p>Please also strengthen the description and strategy in the PIF for how the project will engage with sectors outside of the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>traditional NRM sectors and beyond those that are listed in the stakeholder section. These public sector actors (energy, transport, economic development, extractives, etc.) are also critically important stakeholders.</p> <p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>March 21, 2104</p> <p>The PIF operates under an assumption that is unfounded, i.e, that information will create behavior change and there is little in the literature that supports this assumption. This is a very high risk that requires an intelligent and robust mitigation response. The PIF must discuss how this risk could be mitigated and the design needs to reflect a more sophisticated understanding of behavior change and incentives for decision makers.</p> <p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions for now, but full strategy should be evident in the CEO endorsement document.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>Adequate for now, but once countries are selected, please amplify this for the CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for</b></p>	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>The project is taking a careful and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><b>scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	targeted approach to inserting information into decision-making processes in order to influence policy change in productive sectors that impact biodiversity. The targeted nature of the intervention is unique and increases its likelihood of developing a viable proof of concept that may be upscaled to other situations.	
	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?	March 20, 2014  Yes.	
	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?	March 20, 2014  Yes. For the cofinancing in table C, the cash and in-kind contributions from agencies contributing both types of financing has to be reported as a separate line item.  March 26, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Adequate revisions.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	March 20, 2014 Yes.	
	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?	March 20, 2014 Yes and within norms.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	March 20, 2014 NA.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> 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 PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	March 20, 2014 No. Please address above issues and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		resubmit.  Please use 12 point font in the revised PIF.  March 26, 2014  Adequate revisions. Project is recommended for CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	March 21, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 26, 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.**