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

GEF ID:	**5283**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Angola, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Congo DR)**		
Project Title:	**Multi-Country Project to Strengthen Institutional Capacity on LMO Testing in Support of National Decision-making**		
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):		**BD-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$115,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,860,000**
Co-financing:	**$6,546,500**	Total Project Cost:	**$10,521,500**
PIF Approval:	**April 01, 2014**	Council Approval/Expected:	**May 01, 2014**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Alex Owusu-Biney**

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**?	3-11-13 All countries are eligible for GEF funding. Please remove from PIF all the information of non-participating countries, especially in Annex 1,2 and 3 1-27-14 1. Mozambique was not included in the list on Part I of the PIF (Country(ies)). 2. Angola does not appear as a founding member of SANGL when created back in 2009. It is not clear if the country is a Partner in SADC (http://www.raein-	

*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)
		africa.org/about-us). Lesotho, Madagascar and DRC are not in the list of member countries of SANGL when created (http://www.raein-africa.org/administrator/media/uploads/idv-4206790-b70d2124551008d1a3f6be3bbecb3634.pdf) or are members of the Board of RAEIN-Africa (Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe). Please provide the list of member countries of SANGL and a source of information for further consultation (i.e. website). Please also clarify the relationship between SANGL and RAEIN-Africa. 3. Please remove from PIF all the information of non-participating countries in this project, especially in Annex 1 (South Africa), and 3 (South Africa and Zimbabwe). 4. Please remove from Baseline information (p.6) non-participating countries (i.e. South Africa, Tanzania, Swaziland, and Zambia). 3-13-14 Properly addressed in responses to GEF comments. Cleared	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	3-11-13 Yes. There is a LoE from each of the OFPs from the participating countries.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		The funding requests in the letters are the same as in the PIF. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	3-11-13 DRC (BD STAR balance is -$30K) and Namibia (BD STAR balance is $42K) do not have enough BD STAR funds for this project. 1-27-14 DRC has an overall GEF-5 STAR Balance of -$151,000. With a marginal allocation of $848,138, the new balance is $848,138 sufficient to cover DRC's contribution to this project ($770,880). Namibia has an overall GEF-5 STAR Balance of -$150,000. With a marginal allocation of $200,000, the new balance is $49,000. Assuming all the marginal allocation is taken from CCM, the funds ($49,000) + BD balance of $42,000 = $91,000 are not sufficient to cover Namibia's contribution to this project $770,000. 3-13-14 Properly addressed in responses to GEF comments. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	• 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**? *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).*	3-11-13 Yes. BD-3. Nevertheless, there is no reference to the Aichi targets. 1-27-14 Yes. Aichi Target 13 (see p.12) 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?	3-11-13 DRC is not a member of the "Southern Africa Network on GMO Detection Laboratories" (SANGL). If the project is presented as a regional program under SANGL, only member countries should be included. Country-specific information is needed regarding country's national strategies and plans. None of the participating countries have functional NBFs (see item 6). 1-27-14 1. Please provide complete list of member countries of SANGL (see question under item 1)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		2. Please provide country-specific information regarding country's national strategies and plans related to the CPB and GMOs. 3. This project makes very little sense when NBFs are non-existing (Angola), are under development (DRC), or advanced but not fully functional (Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique and Namibia). Why to push for a project in support of a network of laboratories that can not serve a system because the countries do not have functional NBFs? (See related comment under item 6). 3-13-14 Properly addressed in responses to GEF comments. Cleared	
Project Design	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?	3-11-13 There are no country-based baseline projects. Without that information is impossible to determine if GEF funding is additional or incremental. None of the participating countries have functional NBFs. Lesotho, Namibia, Madagascar and Malawi have "Advanced" NBFs (not fully operational), DRC is under development and Angola does not have on. What is the purpose of enhancing the labs in the regions when there are no fully functional NBFs? An standalone investment in labs does not make much sense as they should be serving a proper policy, legal, regulatory	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		and administrative framework on GMOs. Information on labeling GMOs is only available for Namibia and Madagascar. Information on Capacity Building Plans is only available for Malawi and Madagascar. 1-27-14 1. There is no information on baseline projects. These are the investments to be carried out by the countries whether or not the GEF approves this project. Baseline projects are those on which the GEF funding will stand and contribute with incremental investments. Baseline is not the background information as in previous investments or state of the art. 2. The following has not been addressed: None of the participating countries have functional NBFs. Lesotho, Namibia, Madagascar and Malawi have "Advanced" NBFs (not fully operational), DRC is under development and Angola does not have on. What is the purpose of enhancing the labs in the regions when there are no fully functional NBFs? An standalone investment in labs does not make much sense as they should be serving a proper policy, legal, regulatory and administrative framework on GMOs. 3-13-14 Properly addressed in responses to GEF comments.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	3-11-13 The outcome of Component 1 makes little sense in light of the status of NBFs in the participating countries. What does it mean to "……..support National Decision Making process and related post approval monitoring activities" when there are no functional NBFs? What does it mean "to develop thresholds and sampling methods for GMO detection" when the countries have very different GMO Lab capabilities (Annex 3). There is no information on the status for the labs in Angola, DRC, Lesotho, and Madagascar. Please provide information. For those countries where there is information on the status (Functionality, Equipment, Quality Management and Personnel), the scores ranged from 1 to 4 (1 being high) for all parameters. This variability would make very difficult to carry-out regional activities like in Component 2 (E-Platform and collaborative network on GMO Detection). Please address. 1-27-14 Please point to the paragraphs where the issues raised during the review dated 3-11-13 or address afresh. 3-13-14	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Properly addressed in responses to GEF comments. Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	3-11-13 No GEBs are expected for a capacity building project on BS. Only comprehensive and long term investments in BS would result in tangible GEBs. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	3-11-13 Not needed in a project designed to increase the capacities on laboratories, assuming the Government is OK with the GEF investments (all LoE were submitted). 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)	3-11-13 Cleared	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	3-12-13 There appear to be no related initiatives in the region. Please clarify by providing the names of those initiatives.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		1-27-14 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 based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	3-11-13 The sustainability of the project is in question. What are the commitments of the participating countries to build the proper legal, administrative and scientific capabilities to comply with the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol in full? 1-27-14 The question made in the previous review was not addressed. The commitments refer to the sustainability of this project, not the standard language and assumptions stated in the legislations and NBFs (most of which are incomplete).In other words: Have the Governments of participating countries agreed on sustaining the investments that this project is proposing? Is there a written commitment on the part of these governments? 3-13-14 Properly addressed in responses to GEF comments. 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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	3-11-13 The co-financing should be sufficient, assuming that the in-kind contributions become effective. They represent more than 50% of the co-financing. Please confirm. 1-27-14 In the Response to Comments to the GEF, there is reference to "...governments are dedicating resources to strengthen laboratories as an ongoing national process". These are the efforts that should be presented in the baseline (item 6). 3-13-14 Properly addressed in responses to GEF comments. 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-financing been confirmed?	3-11-13 No Agency co-financing. 1-27-14 Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	3-11-12 Yes. It is 7.9%. Cleared	
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency	1-27-14 Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
	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?**	3-12-13 No. Please review outstanding issues under items 1,3-7,12,13,16,17 and 19. 1-27-14 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 1,3, 5, 6, 7, 13 and 16. The GEF Sec suggests having a conference call to discuss these issues before resubmission.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3-13-14 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance. Cleared	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	December 03, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 28, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 13, 2014	

* **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.**