GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**9633**		
Country/Region:	**Guatemala**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening and Expansion of Capacities in Biosafety that Lead to a full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Guatemala**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2 Program 5;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	**$1,369,863**
Co-financing:	**$2,700,100**	Total Project Cost:	**$4,069,963**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Marianela Araya-Quesada**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	9-27-16 Yes. BD-2, Program 5. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	9-27-16 No. Please consider comments under item 6 with special emphasis on Component 3. The outputs do not support the Component on policy and science.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	9-27-16 Yes. Cleared	
	4. Does the project sufficiently	9-23-16	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Design	indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	The issue of sustainability is not clear. Please clearly state the status of the administrative system (staff and offices) and labs to put in effect the provisions of the Cartagena protocol. Not clear if these is already enough investments on the part of the Government to make this sustainable. 11-3-16 Cleared	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	9-27-16 No. The project appears not to have a true baseline as defined by the GEF. On pages 6-8, there is a description of the "background" of this project, that is a recount of what has happened so far. The baseline the GEF requires are the projects and associated investments that will take place whether or not the GEF project is approved. In other words, the projects and $ investments on the Cartagena Protocol for the next 48 months. A solid baseline is a must to build the incremental reasoning. Please list the projects on the Cartagena Protocol (and funding) for the duration of the GEF funded project (48 months). 11-3-16 Cleared	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently	9-27-16 No. Please address the following:	

[1] 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?
[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Component 1 1. The project needs to provide the names of the 2 labs to benefit from investments. This information is needed for one-step MSP as there is no more preparation time. It would have been different if this were a PIF. 2. The budget is not sufficient ($395K). When adding the requests for Lab Supplies and consumables ($210K) and equipment ($175K) as stated in the detailed budget (total of $385K), there would be only $10K for the other outputs. Please consider moving funds from Component 3 to Component 1 (see comments under Component 3 that would justify the move). 3. Please clarify the difference between this component and output 3.2.1 of the previous project PMIS 3630 (Implementation of the NBF). In both, there is strengthening of the labs. Component 2 4. There is an apparent overlap between this component and output 1.3.1. on PMIS 3630. Please clearly state the new request and explain how this complements previous investments. 5. Not clear if budget ($135K) will be sufficient for the three outputs. Should	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		the project concentrate on output 2.1.2 only? Even if the project does only the Digital System, would the budget be sufficient? Component 3 6. This component is all about Public Awareness than about the policy and science. The GEF suggest removing this component and allocate funds to components 1 and 2. The project is overpromising and very likely to under deliver. This needs to be fixed now. Component 4 7. Budget is very low for all 6 outputs. The GEF suggest concentrating efforts on Outputs 4.1.3 and 4.1.4. Component 5 8. The project needs to better justify the request for funding for the creation of the "GM-Maize Free Zone" in the Huehuetenango Region. That request would be more in line with an agro-biodiversity project than one on the implementation of the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol (Component 1-4). The project needs to explain whether or not there is a request for the use of GM-Maize in Guatemala and how the existing provisions will respond to such request. Please review the status of GM-Maize in Mexico (top of page 12). It is the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		understanding of the GEF that GM-Maize is currently banned in Mexico. 11-3-16 Cleared	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	9-27-16 Yes Cleared	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	9-27-16 No. Please review allocation of funds to different components, outcomes and outputs as described in item 6. The project needs to narrow-down the scope to improve the chances of getting tangible results on the ground. Please also review the financials in Tables on pages 1- (Fees -exceed the max, and sum of co-financing). 11-3-16 Cleared	
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	9-27-17 Yes Cleared	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	9-27-16 Most of the co-financing is in-kind (except $24K) from CONAP, making difficult to visualize if the co-financing will materialize during project implementation. Please confirm that the commitments are	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		strong. The Letter of Co-financing from the Ministry of Economy does not state the $ amount listed in the MSP ($200,000). Please request a new letter or remove the co-financing (assuming it is not central to the implementation of the project). 11-3-16 Cleared	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	9-27-16 Yes. Cleared	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	9-27-16 Yes Cleared	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	9-27-16 Yes Cleared	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	9-27-16 Yes Cleared	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	9-27-16	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		The Land Degradation focal area is over-utilized by 1,997,328. However, Guatemala has an allowed marginal adjustment of 2,000,000, so this excess of 1,997,328 must come from the unused resources of the Climate Change ($1.4M) and Biodiversity focal areas ($2.0M), which will in turn reduce their available funds. Please confirm with the Focal Point that no other projects are in the pipeline and potentially using the remaining funds which are just enough to cover this MSP ($1.5M).	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	9-27-16 No. Please address issues under items 4,5,6,8,10 and 16. 11-3-16 This MSP is recommended for approval.	
Review Dates	First Review	September 27, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 03, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		