

## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS<sup>1</sup>

Country/Region: Morocco  
 Project Title: Morocco: MENARID: A Circular Economy Approach to Agrobiodiversity  
 Conservation in the Souss-Massa Drâça Region of Morocco  
 GEFSEC Project ID: **3989**  
 GEF Agency Project ID: 5079 (UNDP) GEF Agency: UNDP  
 GEF Focal Area (s): Biodiversity  
 GEF-4 Strategic Program (s): BD-4;BD-5;  
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$80,000 GEF Project Allocation:\$2,647,272 Co-financing:\$7,500,000 Total Project Cost:\$10,227,272  
 PIF Approval Date: June 14, 2012 Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: June 24, 2009  
 Program Manager: Jaime Cavalier GEF Agency Contact Person: Yves de Soye,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion <sup>2</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	04/23/2009: Yes, Morocco is eligible for GEF funding.  This PIF was resubmitted with UNDP as the GEF Agency.  05-07-12 Cleared	12-10-13 Cleared
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		NA
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	04/23/2009: Yes, the FP has endorsed the project and the use of BD RAF resources.  05-07-12	12-10-13 The LoE from the OFP dated March 6, 2012 is for \$2,647,272. In the Letter from the GEF CEO to the Agency dated June 14, 2012, the project was approved with an

<sup>1</sup> Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. Please do not answer if the field is blocked with gray.

<sup>2</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of PIF of FSPs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. For MSPs, once the PIF is approved by CEO, next step will be to continue project preparation until the project is ready for CEO approval.

		There is a LoE for \$2,647,272 signed by the OFP on Mach 6, 2012. Cleared	indicative GEF grant of \$2,647,272 and an Indicative GEF Agency fee of \$264,727. Cleared
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	04/23/2009: BD SO-2, SP 4and 4  05-07-12 BD SO2 SP-4 and SP-5 Cleared	12-10-13 BD-2 Cleared
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	04/23/2009: Yes, IFAD has the comparative advantage working in production landscapes, agriculture in particular.  05-07-12 This PIF was dropped by IFAD. UNDP agreed on being the GEF Agency, following corresponde between the GEF CEO and UNDP/GEF dated 2 and 16 April, 2012. Communications retrieved and uploaded to the M drive.	12-10-13 Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?	04/23/2009: Yes, this project is a 100% BD FA porject and hence, subject to RAF rules. The project will use the remaining BD RAF allocation for Morocco in GEF-4.  5-07-12 Cleared	12-10-13 Cleared
	• The focal areas?	04/23/2009: see above.  5-07-12 Cleared	12-10-13 Cleared
	• Strategic objectives?	N/A.	NA
	• Strategic program?	N/A.	NA
Project Design	7. Will the project deliver tangible global	04/23/2009:	

	environmental benefits?	<p>Yes, the project will contribute to conserving biodiversity important to agriculture. Selected endemic species will be monitored.</p> <p>5-07-12 Cleared</p>	
	8. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		<p>12-10-13 Yes. Cleared</p>
	9. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	<p>04/23/2009: Yes, the proposed project framework is sound and will focus on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- enabling environment</li> <li>- capacity development</li> <li>- innovative sustainable financing (PES)</li> <li>- on-the ground demonstrations</li> </ul> <p>This approach is consistent with the barrier removal approach to sustainably managing biodiversity important to agriculture through SLM.</p> <p>5-07-12</p> <p>The project has the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enabling environment for the conservation and promotion of PES schemes</li> <li>2. Capacity building on local business development for PES schemes</li> <li>3. Organic and biodiversity friendly businesses involving production, labelling and marketing.</li> <li>4. Pilot PES schemes for agrobiodiversity</li> </ol> <p>These components are not significantly different from the PIF approved in 2009.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>12-10-13</p> <p>The project has the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enabling environment for the conservation and promotion of PES schemes: A general regulatory framework and an administrative structure for PES in the Argan Biosphere Reserve (ABR) submitted for adoption by key stakeholders.</li> <li>2. Capacity building on local business development for PES schemes: Suppliers of Ecosystem Services, technicians and decision makers trained in the designed and implementation of PES schemes particularly in relation to the Argan and honey value chains.</li> <li>3. Organic and biodiversity friendly businesses involving production, labelling and marketing: develop a new Eco-Label for the ABR to certify that the value chains for local agro-biodiversity products are biodiversity friendly and sustainably produced.</li> <li>4. Pilot PES schemes for agro biodiversity: PES pilots developed and adapted to different practices and techniques, economic valuation of ES associated with the conservation of the Argan Ecosystem.</li> </ol> <p>Questions:</p>

			<p>1. What Government Institution will approve and enforce the regulatory framework of the PES scheme in the ABR?</p> <p>2. Who are the buyers of Argan and Honey in the proposed PES scheme? Are these buyers willing to pay \$62/ha per year for 9,715 ha for an annual total of \$612,045/year? Can the market of the Argan oil and Honey coming out of the ABR support that annual "premium"?</p> <p>3. What do land owners have to do to benefit from the PES scheme? How many people will benefit from the PES scheme and what percentage of the payments made through the PES scheme will be used for the conservation and management of Biodiversity in the pilot area?</p> <p>3. What "potential ES buyers" in Table 3 of the ProDoc have expressed interest in buying Ecosystem Services? The list of potential ES and buyers in Table 3 could apply to a myriad of situations around the world. Unless there is a buyer with an explicit intent to buy an ES, this type of exercise render little to no returns on investment. In the world of ES everybody seems to be selling, and nobody appears to be interested in buying. This section should be removed. This is no more than an academic exercise with very low probability of success.</p> <p>NOTE: Please concentrate on adding or modifying the text in the CEO Endorsement rather than providing answers to the questions, unless the answers are already in the text of the ProDoc. To facilitate the</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>revision of the re-submission please highlight in Yellow the changes in the CEO Endorsement and ProDoc. Thanks.</p> <p>2-5-14 Properly addressed in the revised CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>
10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?	<p>04/23/1009: Yes, the project is consistent with priorities outlined in Morocco's NBSAP and the UNCCD NAP.</p> <p>5-07-12 The proposed project establishes direct and clear linkages with the new Green Morocco Plan (Plan Maroc Vert), Morocco national agricultural strategy. Cleared</p>	<p>12-10-13 National priorities of the Bureau for Value Chains (Direction des Filières) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Maritime Fisheries. Cleared</p>
11. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>04/23/2009: Yes, relevant initiatives are listed. Coordination and collaboration potential will be further analyzed during the preparatory phase.</p> <p>05-07-12 See p. 6 of revised PIF Cleared</p>	<p>12-10-13 The selling of Argan oil as a commodity under a certification scheme hinders on any efforts to sell the oil a genetic resource under the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol. Please also consider the UNDP-GEF project 4953 to develop a national framework on ABS. What does the GoM says about this?</p> <p>2-5-14 Properly addressed in the revised CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>
12. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	<p>04/23/2009: Yes, the barrier removal approach is a cost-effective approach to NRM.</p> <p>5-07-12 cleared</p>	

	13.Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		12-10-13 Cleared
	14.Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		12-10-13 Yes. Minor changes made and explained in CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	15.Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	04/23/2009: Yes, the PIF lists major risks, including the impacts of climate change. Mitigation measures have been proposed and will be developed in more detail during the preparation period.  05-07-12 Pages 8 & 9 of revised PIF. Cleared	12-10-13 Cleared
Justification for GEF Grant	16.Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?	04/23/2009: Yes, the value added by involving the GEF has been demonstrated.  05-07-12 Cleared	12-10-13 Yes. Cleared
	17.Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?	05-07-12 Yes. Cleared	12-10-13 Yes. The GEF contribution of \$2.6 million is appropriate. Cleared
	18.How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		12-10-13 This issue needs to be evaluated once the GEB associated with this project are clearly articulated. Cleared
	19.Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	04/23/2009: Yes, 10% of the project grant co-financed at a ratio of 1:2.  05-07-12 Same as before. Cleared	12-10-13 The Project Management Budget needs to be calculated as a percentage (10%) of the Subtotal (\$2.3 million) not as a percentage of the Total Project Cost (\$2.6 million).  2-5-14 Properly addressed in the revised CEO Endorsement

			Cleared
	20. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		12-10-13 Yes. Cleared
	21. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	04/23/2009: Co-financing is anticipated at \$5.5million.  05-07-12 As in the original PIF, co-financing is estimated at \$5.5million. Not clear who are the Private Sector co-financiers.	
	22. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		12-10-13 Yes. Co-financing letters were provided by the GoM and UNDP. Cleared
	23. Has the Tracking Tool <sup>3</sup> been included with information for all relevant indicators?		12-10-13 The Tracking Tools need to be submitted in the Excel Template.  2-5-14 Properly addressed in the revised CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	24. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		12-10-13 Yes. Cleared
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP	Please respond when received.	
	Convention Secretariat	Please respond when received.	
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		Please respond when received.
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
<b>Secretariat Decisions</b>			
Recommendation at PIF	<b>25. Is PIF clearance being recommended?</b>	04/23/2009: Yes, the PIF is recommended for WPI.	
	26. Items worth noting at CEO	Please submit BD FA TT for SO-2.	

	Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	<b>27. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?</b>		12-12-13 No. Please address questions under items 9,11 & 19. Please concentrate on adding or modifying the text in the CEO Endorsement rather than provide answers to the question, unless the answers to the questions are already in the text of the ProDoc. Thanks.  2-5-14 Yes. This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review	April 23, 2009	December 12, 2013
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review	May 08, 2012	February 05, 2014
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review		

### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	November 19, 2009  Yes, the proposed activities will contribute to a stronger and more focused project document.  Cleared  05-08-12 Yes. The components of the PPG are:  1. Assessment of the legal, institutional and policy context and practical recommendation to promote PES. 2. Assessment of potential for organic food promotion, production and labelling of selected products of the SMDR. 3. Assessment of PES schemes and sustainability models to be applied to agrobiodiversity

<sup>3</sup> At present, Tracking Tools apply to Biodiversity projects only. Tracking Tools for other focal areas are currently being developed.

		<p>and Argan conservation.</p> <p>4. Technical inputs to project design</p> <p>5. Preparation of the project cost tables and implementation manual.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>November 19, 2009</p> <p>Yes, all activities are fully justified and essential for delivering the full sized project. Contribution from co-financing is also consistent with the budget proposed.</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>05-08-12</p> <p>Yes. Local travel, meetings and translation costs are all acceptable.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	<p>November 17, 2009</p> <p>Yes, all consultant costs including international travel are reasonable.</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>05-08-12</p> <p>GEF is contributing \$1750/week for local consultants and \$2833/week for international consultants.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Recommendation	<b>5. Is PPG being recommended?</b>	<p>November 19, 2009</p> <p>Yes, PPG is being recommended for CEO Approval.</p> <p>05-08-12</p> <p>Yes. The PPG is recommended for CEO Approval.</p>
Other comments		
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review	November 04, 2009
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review	November 19, 2009
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review	May 08, 2012

wb21049  
C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf  
8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM