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

GEF ID:	**5605**		
Country/Region:	**Morocco**		
Project Title:	**Developing a National Framework on Access to and Benefit-Sharing of Genetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge as a Strategy to Contribute to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Morocco**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**4953 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$812,785**
Co-financing:	**$1,250,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,062,785**
PIF Approval:	**November 19, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Yves de Soye,**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	10-22-13 Yes Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	10-22-13 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for $890,000. The letter is dated 10-1-13. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	10-22-13 Yes. There is a balance of $1,200,000 for this $890,000 project. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared

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

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the focal area allocation?	10-22-13 Yes. There is a balance of $1,200,000 for this $890,000 project. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	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).*	10-22-13 Yes. BD-4 and Aichi Targets 1, 13,18 and 20. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. 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?	10-22-13 Yes. The National Strategy for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared
	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?	10-22-13 Yes. The Government and GIZ are planning investments on ABS in the amount of $400,000 and $1,000,000. See details on p.4 of PIF. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	10-22-13 Yes. The project components and outcomes are: 1. Developing a national framework on ABS consistent with the CBD and the Nagoya Protocol: i) National Law on ABS, ii) institutional and regulatory frameworks in place, iii) system for protection of traditional knowledge. 2. Building capacity to implement the ABS framework: i) improved capacity of new or existing institutions including establishing coordination mechanisms between in-country institutions, ii) trained Competent Authoritys, Focal Point and related agencies staff, iii) development of templates, guidance and training programmes on the national ABS framework, iv) ABS model agreements to facilitate negotiations between users and providers, v) public awareness materials and campaigns. Note: Morocco is in the final stages of ratifying the Nagoya Protocol and the process is likely to be completed during the PPG phase of this PIF. This is why PIF does not include activities needed for the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	10-22-13 The impact of this capacity building project will be realized as a result of the implementation of the measures under the Nagoya Protocol funded by this project.	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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 benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		5-15-14 Yes. Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	10-22-13 Expected to participate in project design and benefit from project implementation (outputs 2.3 to 2.7 of PIF). Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. 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)	10-22-13 Yes. See pagews 7 and 8 of PIF. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	10-22-13 Yes. See page 8 of PIF. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. 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	10-22-13 Innovation: This is an innovative project at the National Level because there was no previous efforts on the part of the Government of Morocco to implement the basic measures of the Nagoya Protocol. Morocco signed the NP on 2011-12-09. Sustainability: The financial and institutional sustainability of this project	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	resides in the insterest and capacity of the Government of Morocco to absorb and make use of the technical assistance to be provided to comply with the basic measures of the Nagoya Protocol. The investment of BD$890K in this project is a sign of interest on the part of the Government. Scaling up: The lessons learned from the development and future implementation of this project are being used by the Agency and neighbouring countries (i.e Egypt) to fullfil their obligations as parties to the CBD. Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		5-15-14 Yes. Cleared
	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?		5-15-14 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?	10-23-13 Yes. There are GEF $890K and $1.4M in co-financing. Sufficient to achive the proposed goals. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. 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-	10-23-13 Yes. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. All LoC filed with CEO Endorsement. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	10-23-13 Yes. It is 10% of Subtotal cost. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. 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?	10-23-13 No PPG requested. Cleared	5-15-14 Yes. Cleared
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		NA
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		5-15-14 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?**	10-23-13 Yes. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	10-23-13 1. Provide a table describing the activities that will be carried out using GIZ and GEF resources.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	October 23, 2013	May 15, 2015
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.**