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

GEF ID:	**5626**		
Country/Region:	**Kenya**		
Project Title:	**Developing the Microbial Biotechnology Industry from Kenya's Soda Lakes in line with the Nagoya Protocol**		
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:	**$1,775,116**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,775,116**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?		11-19-13 Yes. Kenya is elegible for GEF and NPIF funding. Cleared
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?		11-19-13 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP dated August 27th, 2012 for $1M. 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		NA

	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		NA
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		11-19-13 Yes. Funds are available in the NPIF as of today. Cleared
	• focal area set-aside?		NA
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*		11-19-13 Yes. BD-4 and Aichi Target 16 (Target 16: By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation). Cleared
	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?		11-19-13 Cleared
Project Design	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?		11-19-13 Yes. Pages 7-9 of MSP. Cleared
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project**		11-19-13 Yes. The project has the following

	sound and appropriately detailed?		Component 1: To enhance legal and regulatory framework on ABS in Kenya: Policy, legal and regulatory frameworks on ABS upgraded in compliance with the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol; ABS institutionalized in protected areas as a tool for enhanced conservation and livelihood improvement including improved infrastructure within the soda lakes to enhance research and tourism (e.g Nature trail in Lakes Bogoria, Elementaita and simbi Nyaima) for KWS and adjacent communities improved. Component 2. Systematic discovery of natural products for bio-pesticides and industrial enzymes: At least 500 samples collected at different seasons from the Soda lakes and 20 pure strains isolated with cellulase, protease and Phytase activities for agro-processing, starch and fuel, textile, food and beaverage and protein hydrolysis and deposited in culture collection centers at JKUAT, DSMZ and Verenium Corporation; At least 5 isolates producing biaoctive secondary metabolites as biopesticides for seed and seedling treatment characterized and deposited in the culture collection centres in JKUAT and DSMZ Component 3. Technology Transfer between resource provider and user operationalized; Technology transfered (including equipment, know-how and training) from DSMZ and Verenium Corporation to local research institutions

			An effective bioinformatics system in Kenya at KWS for Soda lakes microbial discovery to act as a system for monitoring and evaluation established. Component 4. ABS agreements developed to build the capacity of the Kenyan authorities to engage with users of genetic resource; At least 1 ABS agreement between provider (KWS and Soda lakes communities- county government), local Kenyan institutions (KIRDI, Rivatex, University of Nairobi Science and Technology Park Ltd and the JKUAT Enterprise Ltd), DSMZ and the industrial partner, Verenium Corporation) resulting from research and development of microbial samples taken from the Soda lakes executed; Prior Informed Consent (PIC), Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) and Material Transfer Agreements (MTA) developed and operationalized in line with the Nagoya Protocol. Cleared
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?		11-19-13 Benefits will include both monetary and non-monetary forms where they will be used to enhance capacities of local Kenyans to conserve the Soda lakes landscapes and biodiversity and royalties generated will also contribute to improved livelihoods of communities around the Soda lakes. 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		11-19-13 Yes Cleared

	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?		11-19-13 Yes. See page 24 of MSP. 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)		11-19-13 Yes. See page 22-23 of MSP. Cleared
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		11-19-13 Yes. See page 28 of MSP. Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • 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.		11-19-13 Cleared
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		NA

	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?		11-19-13 Yes Cleared
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?		11-19-13 Co-funding is in the amount of $1.7M. Cleared
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?		11-19-13 UNEP brings $114K. Yes. All LoC were included with the MSP Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?		11-19-13 Yes. It os less than 10%. Cleared
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		NA
	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		NA

	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		11-19-13 Yes Cleared
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?**		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		11-19-13 Yes. This project is recommened for Approval. Cleared
	First review*		November 19, 2013
Review Date (s)	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.**