



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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$812,786
Co-financing:	\$1,400,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,212,786
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	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 ?	10-22-13 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	
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	

		Yes. There is a balance of \$1,200,000 for this \$890,000 project. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• 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 ? <i>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).</i>	10-22-13 Yes. BD-4 and Aichi Targets 1, 13,18 and 20. 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	
	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	

	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>10-22-13 Yes. The project components and outcomes are:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>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. Cleared</p>	

	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?		
	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	
	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	
	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	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	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 resides in the interest 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	

		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 fulfil 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?		
	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?		
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 achieve the proposed goals. Cleared	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : 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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	10-23-13 Yes. Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	10-23-13 Yes. It is 10% of Subtotal cost. Cleared	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , 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?	10-23-13 No PPG requested. Cleared	

	if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	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 indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
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	
	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	
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.**