



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

GEF ID:	8025		
Country/Region:	Peru		
Project Title:	Effective Implementation of the Access and Benefit Sharing and Traditional Knowledge Regime in Peru in Accordance with the Nagoya Protocol		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,190,000
Co-financing:	\$8,921,778	Total Project Cost:	\$11,311,778
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Marianela Araya,

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 ?	2-2-15 Yes. Cleared	12-19-16 Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	2-2-15 Yes. There is a LoE signed by the OFP in the amount of \$2,507,550. The letter is dated December 22, 2014. Cleared	12-19-16 Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	2-2-15 Yes. Cleared	12-19-16 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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the focal area allocation?	2-2-15 Yes. Cleared	12-19-16 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 ? <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>	2-2-15 There is reference to Aichi Target 16 and this project will contribute toward this target (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"). This project is under BD-3 (Sustainable Use of Biodiversity) and Program 8 (Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing) in the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy. Please amend Table A. 4-10-15 Cleared	12-19-16 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?	2-2-15 Yes. See details on page 18. Cleared	12-19-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>2-2-15</p> <p>There is a good summary of the Legal-, management- and Institutional-scenarios supporting this project. These and the "Associated baseline projects" actually relate to the background, that is, what has already been done. What is expected under the "baseline project(s)" is the description of the activities that will take place over the next 48 months whether or not the GEF project gets approved. These are the activities on which the incremental reasoning needs to be build. The GEF is aware, and there is reference in the PIF, of the upcoming investments of the GIZ. The GEF-Agency should be able to sit down with GIZ and the Government of Peru to determine how the two investments complement each other. It is not enough to mention that there is a GIZ funded project and will participate as co-financier.</p> <p>Are there any other projects to take place over the next 48 months? What are the proposed investments by the Government?</p> <p>4-10-15 properly addressed. Cleared</p>	<p>12-19-16 Cleared</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>2-2-15</p> <p>The project is overambitious considering time and GEF funding. Because of this, the project is likely to under deliver. Reductions and increased precision in the</p>	<p>12-19-16</p> <p>Component 1.</p> <p>1) As stated during the revision of the PIF, it is not clear what the project</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>proposed outputs (leading to outcomes), MUST be made.</p> <p>Comments on outputs by component</p> <p>Component 1.</p> <p>1.a.1. The project needs to deliver the administrative and operational structure (with roles and responsibilities by relevant institutions) to run ABS. Please tidy up language. What does "standardized documentation" mean? Why explanatory guidelines do where there are already some already published (i.e. IUCN)? Please check http://www.cbd.int/abs/instruments/.</p> <p>1.a.2. An "assessment" will take Peru nowhere. What the project needs to deliver is the legal and regulatory frameworks governing ABS. There are sufficient laws and regulations to build on.</p> <p>1.b.1. An official inventory of strategic genetic resources...is virtually impossible to do. Why? Because of the massive biodiversity of Peru, and more important, because although some species may have an strategic value now, nobody knows what species and genes will be strategic in the future. This is likely to give very little return on investment.</p> <p>1.b.2. Unless there are specific research and development projects underway, that could be used as pilots in this projects,</p>	<p>wants to do with Output 1.b.1 [Information on species (wild, cultivated and hydro-biological) containing genetic resources with potential for research and development activities, compiled and systematized in the platform GENES-Peru, including distribution and conservation status], since all species have genetic material and potential for use. Please clarify in CEO Endorsement and Project Document.</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>1) Please provide the list of the materials that were found during project preparation to be available and those that will need to be developed for the purpose of awareness raising as stated in output 2.a.1.</p> <p>2) What are the "interactive training modules" that will be developed for the three target groups (government official, researchers and entrepreneurs) and for the "intercultural training programs" that were identified during project preparation?</p> <p>Component 3.</p> <p>1) For the selected Pilot Experiences (including Alternatives) described in Appendix 16, please add a subtitle describing the Research & Development that will be carried out with the genetic resources to justify the application of the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>this output will not deliver. The project needs to identify existing joint ventures and/or R&D groups that could participate in the pilot(s). Why not to use the typology of benefits in the Annex of the NP?</p> <p>1.b.3. What does "harmonization" mean in the context of the legal and institutional frameworks to implement the NP? What is harmonized with what?</p> <p>1.b.4. Virtually impossible within time and budget. See comment on 1.b.1. and 1.b.2. Suggestion: Remove.</p> <p>1.c.1. This should be part of 1.a.1.</p> <p>1.c.2. What is the National Commission against Biopiracy going to do with this? What provisions of the NP does this output relate to?</p> <p>Component 2.</p> <p>2.a.1. and 2.a.2. Why spent time and funding preparing material when there are significant sources already available. Please see http://www.cbd.int/abs/ and http://www.abs-initiative.info/ The project should concentrate efforts and resources into using/translating/adapting all these materials. The project needs to be more strategic about how it approaches capacity building considering all that has been done. More references available upon request.</p>	<p>4-18-17</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>The GEFSEC is requesting a description of the R&D to be carried by Cosmo (cacao), CENSI (quina) and IIAP (Doncella fish). The GEFSEWC wants to ensure that the pilots presented in this project are indeed subject to the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>2.a.3. When talking about indigenous organizations in Peru, what are you referring to? There are at least 2 large organizations representing indigenous peoples in Peru.</p> <p>2.a.4. What providers are you referring to? You need to narrow-down your target audience. Perhaps providers in a pilot project?</p> <p>Component 3.</p> <p>3.a.1. What are "strategic native genetic resources"? See 1.b.1.</p> <p>3.a.2. A joint venture or a lab carrying out R&D on genetic resources and linked to a value chain connecting users and providers of genetic resources could be use as a pilot.</p> <p>3.a.3. What do you mean by "efficacy and efficiency" of activities in ABS? What is this methodological guideline?</p> <p>4-10-15</p> <p>Please address the following issues:</p> <p>Component 1. Please re-consider the following statement (p. 13): "Finally, systematization of information on species (to be selected during PPG phase) containing genetic resources with potential for research and development activities, including their distribution and conservation status;..." This is undoable</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>as all species have genetic material and all have potential. It will be very difficult to have criteria that is wide enough and doable. Please considering deleting this. Keep the rest: "and the identification, classification and assessment of benefits derived from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge in on-going research and development projects in Peru...." That is fine and doable. On 1.a.3 in Table B, remove "domesticated". That can be tricky an</p> <p>Component 2. Reconsider "Special attention will be put on strengthening of endogenous research and development capabilities". That is undoable with the resources and time available (a multimillion dollar investment).</p> <p>Component 3. The Cosmo Ingredients (with perfumes and cosmetics) sound promising. The Grass-root with cocoa tree producers, not sure fall within the Nagoya protocol. What type of R&D is associated with cocoa anyway? Commit to only one. Suggestion: Ensure the activities with the two ongoing initiatives in negotiation to access to genetic resources (Table B 2.a.4) and those under 3.a.2, are not perceived or become "auditing" case-studies. That will have a negative effect. You may want to modify the language at PIF stage.</p> <p>4-13-15 Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>2-3-15 The GEBs associated with national implementation of the Nagoya Protocol are difficult to determine, as all genetic resources in Peru can potentially benefit from this project. This could be partially addressed in there are clearly defined pilot projects.</p> <p>The Incremental Reasoning is not described appropriately, mainly because there is no clarity on the "baseline" projects (those to take place regardless of whether or not this project gets approved).</p> <p>4-10-15 Cleared</p>	<p>12-19-16 Cleared</p>
	<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?</p>		<p>4-10-15 Cleared</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>2-3-15 Have the Organization listed on page 15-16 been actually consulted on this project or are they simply potential stakeholders? Particularly sensitive for the Indigenous Organizations and those in the field where the proposed trials will take place.</p> <p>4-10-15 Cleared</p>	<p>12-19-16 Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	2-3-15 Yes Cleared	12-19-16 Yes. Pages 18-19 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	2-3-15 Actual coordination needs to take place between this project and the GIZ. This cannot be left for the project preparation phase. Basic elements of coordination need to be negotiated at PIF stage. 4-10-15 Cleared	12-19-16 Please provide a list of the ABS related products developed by the ProAmbiente-GIZ project so far, explaining how the proposed activities in the GEF funded project will complement or reinforce them. 4-18-17 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. 	2-3-15 Innovation may be explored once the pilot projects are determined. Sustainability: Elaborate on the commitments of the Government to sustain the administration needed to run the Nagoya Protocol 4-10-15 Cleared	12-19-16 Cleared
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		12-19-16 Yes. Differences explained (P. 9-10 CEO Endorsement) Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		12-19-16 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?	2-3-15 There is significant co-financing (1:4) with all co-financing in-kind. Is the Project Manager comfortable with these commitments? 4-10-15 Cleared	12-19-16 Yes. Assuming all in-kind co-financing becomes effective during project execution. 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?	2-3-15 With all co-funding in-kind, this project may overpromise and under deliver. Narrow down the activities and pilots. What GIZ's co-funding is in-kind? They are bringing fresh funding. 4-10-15 Cleared	12-19-16 Co-financing figures for SERNANP and Cosmo Ingredients in Table C do not correspond to those in Letters of Cofinancing. Fix figures in Table C and recalculate all numbers. 4-18-17 There are some additional issues with the LoC. 1. In Table C, the Ministerio del Ambiente is contributing with \$2,347,000 but in the corresponding letter, the amount is \$2,340,000. 2. In Table C, CENSI is contributing \$300,000 but in the LoC the amount is \$300,006. 3. In Table C, CNBIO is contributing \$250,000, but there is no LoC. Instead, there are two letters of co-financing

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>from INDECOPI; one for \$350,000 and the other for \$250,000. Is the later the one from CNBIO? The letters from INDECOPI are identical except for the amount and the letter numbers (Carta 250 for \$250,000 and Carta 251 for \$350,000). Please use names of co-financiers as in the ProDoc.</p> <p>Please resubmit Request for Project Endorsement with the correct figures in Table C (including total) and the corresponding Letters of Co-financing.</p>
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	2-3-15 Yes. It is 10%. Cleared	12-19-16 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? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	2-3-15 Yes. \$100K and within the limits. Cleared	12-19-16 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?		12-19-16 Yes. Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		12-19-16 Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		12-19-16 Yes. Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? 		12-19-16 Yes. Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>2-3-15 No. Please address the outstanding issues.</p> <p>4-10-15 No. Please address issues under item 6. Thanks</p> <p>4-13-15 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>12-19-16 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 7, 12 and 17. Thanks.</p> <p>4-18-17 No. Please address issues under items 7 and 17. Thanks.</p> <p>4-28-17 This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	First review*	February 03, 2015	December 19, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2015	April 18, 2017

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 13, 2015	April 28, 2017

*** 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.**