



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9255		
Country/Region:	South Africa		
Project Title:	Development of Value Chains for Products derived from Genetic Resources in Compliance with the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the National Biodiversity Economy Strategy		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5686 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		BD-3 Program 8;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$182,648	Project Grant:	\$6,210,046
Co-financing:	\$22,215,042	Total Project Cost:	\$28,425,088
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Alice Ruhweza, UNDP Technical Advisor, EBD

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	8-20-15 Yes. BD-3 Program 8. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	8-20-15 Yes. Detailed information provided on p. 16-17. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	8-20-15 Partially. No information on	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>innovation or scale-up. Suggest mention what innovations are being pursued for R&D and for scale-up make reference to the numerous other species to benefit from the advances made in this project.</p> <p>9-19-15 Cleared</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>8-20-15</p> <p>No. This is one of the weakest part of the PIF. The project needs to: 1) Establish the appropriate "Baseline", and then elaborate on how the "Alternative Scenario" build on the baseline to deliver tangible and measurable Global Environmental Benefits.</p> <p>The "Baseline" as presented on pages 7-10 is mostly about the "Background" information, that is, what has happen so far. It presents mostly the status of the species and the corresponding threats. Not the "futures". The GEF request adding a column to the species tables on pages 7-10 to describe the true "Baseline" on the two main tracks of the project: :Value Chains and R&D. The baseline is understood by the GEF as the series of activities and investments to take place over the next 60 months,</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>whether or not the GEF project gets approved. Once these activities and investments on R&D and Value Chains has been identifies, the elaboration of the "Incremental Reasoning" should be easier and clearer by explaining how the proposed activities (the "Alternative Scenario"), will result in the expected results.</p> <p>BARRIERS</p> <p>Barrier 2 and 3 appear to be almost the same. Please dissect the two (R&D vs. ABS Agreements.</p> <p>9-19-15 Cleared</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>8-20-15</p> <p>Component 1. (Considering inverting the order, with R&D as Component 1 and Value Chains as Component 2. Makes more sense from the point of view of steps needed to place products in the market.)</p> <p>1. Please align the Outcome with the GEF Outcome 8.1 of the BD strategy. The proposed outcome "Increased number of new benefit...", is the closest to the BD strategy and should be at the top.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>2. Merge the following proposed outcomes into one: "Increase number of bio prospecting...." with "30-50% of bio-prospecting products..." and "Increased number of jobs...". Label it: Bio-prospecting.</p> <p>3. Merge the following proposed outcomes into one: I) "Conservation security of 10 threaten species..." with "500 ha....". label it: Impact on the ground.</p> <p>4. Please regroup the outputs to feed into the new consolidated outcomes. The existing outputs are short in number and substance related to the core objective of the component which is the Development of value chains. It reads as if the necessary discrete steps to achieve this were not known. At the moment, all the outputs are packed into the first output. Un zipped it!</p> <p>5. In the list of baseline per species on page 12, it is not clear if the proposed activities relate to value chains of commodities (i.e. BioTrade) or value chains of products that have resulted from investments in R&D. Please clarify this IMPORTANT POINT as this has implications on the essence</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and should be reflected in the Title of the project. Please add the existing ABS agreements of the target species as appropriate.</p> <p>6. The target of 2,500 ha. of Improving Management of Landscapes, is very small compared to the significant investment \$6M of GEF funding alone + \$22M co-financing. Is this the total area where the target species grow and are harvested in the wild? Look into the Global Environmental Benefits on an area basis.</p> <p>7. What is the "Institution" to be established to ensure that all harvesting and trade follows best practices (p.12)? Please elaborate on what appears to be a very ambitious goal. What are the financial resources needed for that institution to get up and running? Is there already a Gov. institution that can absorb that responsibility?</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>Not clear how the objective of the component on "Research and Development of products..." can be achieved with the proposed soft outputs of and "assessment", an</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>"ethno-botanical report", and "a central information sharing hub". The component needs more "hard" outputs on R&D as the last one on "Clinical studies". Reconsider allocation of financial resources. \$0.9M is unlikely to suffice the needs for R&D even the short list on p.13</p> <p>Elaborate on "Institution in place to support value chain...". A new Government or Private institution? What is the baseline for this output?</p> <p>Should CSIR and the University of Pretoria appear as Executing partners considering the key role on R&D, one of the two core components?</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>Objective of component needs work. Not clear how capacity building of agencies will add value to genetic resources. Are agencies the research centers that add value to genetic resources via R&D? Suggest to focus the target audience for the capacity building or better, INTEGRATE that component under the two main tracks of the project: Value Chains and R&D. That will allow to see how capacity building assist in delivering expected results.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Should the SMEs mentioned in the outcome "Increased number of SMEs be...", be mentioned in the component of Value Chains?</p> <p>OTHER</p> <p>Stakeholders</p> <p>Suggest including only those that will effectively participate in the project. There is a string of names of Universities, of which only one was cited in the project. It would be desirable that the names of Private Sector companies and CSOs be cited in the corresponding parts of the Value Chains or R&D component.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>Refer to the risks associated with the two main components of the project: Value Chains and R&D.</p> <p>9-19-15 Cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>8-20-15 Yes. Cleared</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	8-15-15 Yes. Cleared	
	• The focal area allocation?	8-15-15 Yes. Cleared	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	8-20-15 No. Please address issues under items 3,4 and 5. Thanks. 9-19-15 Yes. The PM recommends the PIF for clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 20, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 19, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.