



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

GEF ID:	5454		
Country/Region:	Regional (Burundi, Central African Republic, Congo, Cameroon, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Chad, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol for the member countries of the Central African Forests Commission COMIFAC		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$63,927	Project Grant:	\$1,762,557
Co-financing:	\$8,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,126,484
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Mohamed Sessay

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 ?	7-03-13 Yes. All 10 country members of COMIFAC are eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	7-03-13 Yes. There is one LoE from each of the 10 participating countries signed by the OFP, and one from COMIFAC, signed by the Executive Secretary. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	

	• the focal area allocation?	NA	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	7-03-13 Yes. There are funds in the NPIF to support this \$2M project. Cleared	
	• 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>	7-03-13 Yes. As stated in the PIF, This project fits with the strategic priorities of the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF) as described in the document "OUTSTANDING ISSUES RELATED TO THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION FUND" (GEF/C.40/11/Rev.1)". 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?	7-03-13 Basic information was provided in the original PIF. Please add the following: 1. There is no information for the Democratic Republic of Congo. 2. Please consult the NPFEs of Cameroon and the Democratic Republic of Congo and check if ABS and or the Nagoya Protocol were cited and are within the priorities of the countries. 8-19-13 Cleared 8-16-13 Addressed in the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared	

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>7-03-13 Please provide the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please consult with the CBD Secretariat and get the list of countries that benefited from the GEF-UNEP-CBDSEC project Capacity building for the early entry into force of the Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (PMIS 4415). Please add the activities carried out in these countries under the country information on p.6. 2. Please consult with the ABS Capacity Building Initiative and get the information on the past-present and future investments in the countries of COMIFAC (there is reference to "ABCBI under Cameroon (Is that the "ABS Capacity Building Initiative"?) and of Rwanda and Gabon on p.5. Please include that information under Baseline. 3. Please include the Charts on the Baseline that were generated by the "ABS Capacity Building Initiative" and provided by the GEF Secretariat during upstream consultation. That is the most complete assessment of the ABS baseline in the African countries and COMIFAC in particular <p>8-16-13 Addressed in the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>7-03-13 Please address the following:</p> <p>Component 1:</p>	

		<p>the same as in text (p.4). Please make them consistent, ii) Please check spelling of Gabon (not gabion, p.4).</p> <p>Component 2.</p> <p>i) Why is this component for Rwanda only?. Please explain why the other 9 countries (except Gabon that is receiving funding through the GEF-WB project "Sustainable Management of Critical Wetlands Ecosystems", PMIS 5264) will not carry out any of the measures needed for implementation. Does this mean that the countries not implementing any of the measures for implementation, is because they need the 24 months budgeted in this project to ratify and no parallel activities can be carried out for implementation? Is the expectation to use \$750,000 for Rwanda only?</p> <p>Component 3.</p> <p>i). Please elaborate on this regional component, including the role of the COMIFAC Secretariat. Please state that Gabon will participate in these regional activities using funds from either this project or the GEF-WB project, if they are available at the time.</p> <p>8-16-13 Addressed in the Response to GEF Comments. 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>7-3-13 At CEO Endorsement, please elaborate, in detail, on the plans of the 10 Governments to use this project as the mean to "appropriate" the ABS agenda at</p>	

		<p>expects full engagement and endorsement of Governments.</p> <p>8-16-13 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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>7-03-13 The role of the CSOs and public participation at large will be determined during project implementation. Cleared</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>7-3-13 Please elaborate on the risk of private sector investors to run away from the countries of COMIFAC if implementation of the Nagoya Protocol is carried out by building a monumental structure of laws and regulations that is virtually impossible to penetrate, vs. a lean system that attracts investors interested in doing business.</p> <p>8-19-13 Cleared</p> <p>8-16-13 Addressed in the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>7-3-13 Please establish direct contact with the "ABS Capacity Building Initiative" to work on the development of the PIF, and later, for Execution of the project. This</p>	

		Partners. 8-16-13 Addressed in the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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. 	<p>7-3-13 Innovation: First Regional project in support of the Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. Sustainability: TBD at CEO Endorsement. Scaling-up: Potential with other African countries. Cleared</p>	
	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?	<p>7-3-13 Please review allocation to component 2 in light of the comments made about Rwanda being the only country to benefit from this component.</p> <p>8-16-13 Allocation for component 2 is no longer</p>	

		Cleared	
	<p>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?</p> <p><u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>7-03-13</p> <p>There is co-financing from the participating countries, the COMIFAC Secretariat, the GEF Agency and the CBD SEC. Please work with the "ABS Capacity Building Initiative" to see how much co-financing could be potentially leveraged with their investments in Cameroon, Gabon and Rwanda.</p> <p>8-16-13</p> <p>As stated in the PIF (p. 7), This GEF-UNEP project in support of the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, will coordinate activities with the project under development by the GIZ in support of ABS activities for the COMIFAC countries. Based on preliminary conversations with the GIZ, there is potential for coordination and collaboration around all three components, with emphasis on the following activities and outputs i) Ratification of the NP, ii) Sub regional coordination, sharing information / experiences, iii) Public Awareness of key stakeholders, and iv) Implementation of Nagoya Protocol measures including laws and regulations and ABS Administrative structures. During project development, a detailed matrix of activities of common interest sand potential for coordination will be developed between the GIZ and UNDP. At PIF stage the total GIZ investment will be included, with the understanding that this figure will most likely be reduced as the result of the analytical work to be carried out and synthesized in</p>	

		Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	7-03-13 Yes. It is 10% of the project cost (subtotal). 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?	7-03-13 Yes. There is a request for \$PPG below the limit of \$100K for projects under \$3M. Cleared	
	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?	8-19-13 Yes. The PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO		

Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	July 03, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 19, 2013	
	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.