



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9799		
Country/Region:	Lesotho		
Project Title:	Promoting conservation, sustainable utilization and fair and equitable benefit-sharing from Lesotho's Medicinal and Ornamental Plants for improved livelihoods		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5891 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-3 Program 8;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,913,699
Co-financing:	\$4,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,413,699
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Phero K. Kgomotso,

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	4-2-17 Yes Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	4-2-17 Yes Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	4-2-17 Please further elaborate on the issues of value chains and markets. Please	

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.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>be analytical and critical about these issues, as they may well be the hardest barriers to overcome for ABS agreement to work on the ground.</p> <p>9-25-17 Cleared</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>4-2-17</p> <p>In order to better understand the incremental reasoning, please prepare a synthesis table with the following information: Baseline, alternative scenario and incremental reasoning, for the objectives of the three components. Such table should allow the reader to understand the value of this project at a glance.</p> <p>9-25-17 Cleared</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>GENERAL</p> <p>1. The Results Framework is far too long (5 pages). Indeed, it is longer than the description of the components in the text. Please reduce it to 2 (max 3) by removing unnecessary language describing the components, outcomes and outputs (e.g. ...to avail data for scientific based decision making – output 2.1.2).</p> <p>2. The outputs need to be as specific as possible. Outputs 2.1.4 and</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>2.1.5 are examples of an "all inclusive" approach that cast doubts about the viability of the project.</p> <p>3. For the different outcomes (and outputs as relevant), please indicate the relationship with the articles of the NP.</p> <p>4. Please break down budget by outcome. As currently presented, it is not possible to determine the financial viability of the proposed interventions. Component 2 should be mostly INV if this project is serious about fostering ABS agreements.</p> <p>5. Please check the \$ figures and math in the different Tables. The GEFSEC is finding some errors when entering the numbers in PMIS.</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>1. Output 1.2.1. List of skills and tools should be specific and appropriate. For instance, what does "restructuring" mean? Strategic plans? Include them in the text, not in the Results Framework.</p> <p>2. Output 1.2.3. What is the nature of the "National ABS</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Institutional coordination mechanisms?</p> <p>3. Output 1.2.4. What is the nature of the "National ABS information system"? How does this relate to the CHM?</p> <p>4. Output 1.3.1. What is the "Management plan for selected biological and GR"?</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p> <p>1. Output 2.1.2. What labs are already doing R&D in Lesotho? How can a GEF project train on R&D technologies when these are highly specific to the valuation of specific GR in the different sectors (i.e. pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, food and drinks, etc.). This makes no sense.</p> <p>2. Output 2.1.2. This information should already be in the hands of those working on the Medicinal and ornamental plants (MOP).</p> <p>3. What is the relationship between ornamental plants and the NP?</p> <p>4. The business models of the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>different sectors are already known. No need to spend time and resources on these studies.</p> <p>5. Output 2.1.4 What are Labs to benefit from investments? What specific facilities are to be upgraded? What are the main lines of research (and status) that these labs are undertaken?</p> <p>6. Output 2.1.5 Needs to narrow down the objective of the output. The string of ideas makes it difficult to understand (as well as implement). There are so many items listed under this output that it will consume the entire budget of this project.</p> <p>7. Outcome 2.2. Not clear how the proposed outputs will result in supporting "value chains". Please clearly described the proposed interventions to support "sustainable value chains". This terms is being used loosely.</p> <p>8. Output 2.2.1. What type of support is suggested? Be specific. Language used here is of an objective, not an output.</p> <p>9. Output 2.2.1. No ex-situ conservation supported by the GEF.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>What does "alternative livelihoods options" means here?</p> <p>10. Output 2.2.3. Community protocols are not species-specific (unless species occur in quite dissimilar ILCs).</p> <p>11. Output 2.2.4. Why to develop a certification system different than prescribed in the NP?</p> <p>12. Outcome 2.3. This outcome requires proper justification as it is not clear if the proposed cases necessarily relate to the Nagoya Protocol. Please remove Table 1 and elaborate the following table: Sites, species, local communities, PIC and MAT (status), R&D objective, R&D Investments requested from the GEF (\$), National R&D institution, International partner institution in R&D, commercial users (that have expressed interest in the results of the R&D), status of commercialization (for those ABS products that are supposed to generate revenues). Please provide this information on a separate Excel Table annexed to the PIF. The reading of the annex should make clear to the reader that these are true cases for ABS agreements and that have a path (at least in theory) to</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>result in products for the markets.</p> <p>13. Output 2.3.2. Does the project need "model ABS agreements" or simply to draft specific ABS agreements between users and providers for the corresponding ABS agreements? Remove unnecessary language (i.e. including sound resource management.....and guidelines).</p> <p>COMPONENT 3</p> <p>1. Does Lesotho really need a national ABS Clearing House? Why not start using the CBD Central Port?</p> <p>2. What does "mainstreaming gender" mean in reality, and how is the project planning on "implementing the plan"?</p> <p>9-25-17 Cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>4-2-17 These issues will be addressed with comments under window 5. Cleared</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>4-2-17 The STAR resources requested (\$3.1</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		M) are available as of today. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>4-2-17 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 3,4 and 5. The GEFSEC remains available for consultation on this review.</p> <p>9-25-17 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	April 02, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 25, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. 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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.