



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

GEF ID:	9481		
Country/Region:	Uganda		
Project Title:	Institutional Capacity strengthening for Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS and Awareness on Biosafety in Uganda		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-3 Program 7; BD-3 Program 8;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$2,892,009
Co-financing:	\$9,235,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,127,009
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Jane Nimpanya

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	6-2-16 Yes. BD-2 program 5 and BD-3 Programs 3 and 7. But see comments under item  7-28-16 BD-3 programs 7 and 8. Aichi Targets on p.14 Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies	6-2-16 Cleared	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	6-2-16 Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	6-2-16 Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	6-2-16  Please address the following issues:  COMPONENT 1.  1. There is an overlap between Output 1.1 and 1.2 on Administrative implementation. 2. Material Transfer Agreements (MATs) are not used in the Nagoya Protocol.  COMPONENT 2.  1. What does "improved facility and capacity for documentation" actually mean? 2. The project should not mix investments in the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocol. Make the project about the Nagoya Protocol only. 3. What does "mechanisms and	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>methodologies for ABS and traditional knowledge operationalized" actually mean?</p> <p>COMPONENT 3.</p> <p>1. Investments in the Cartagena (BCH and Biosafety Bill 2012) and Nagoya protocols (ABS-Clearing House) should not be mixed. Separate projects need to be submitted for the CP and the NP.</p> <p>COMPONENT 4.</p> <p>1. What does "Appropriate Community structures" mean in the context of ABS management?</p> <p>2. What are "community libraries on TK"?</p> <p>3. What is the proposed value addition for sandalwood?</p> <p>4. Unless the "value addition" for Sandalwood is clearly stated and justified, the proposed work on Sandalwood does not relate to the Nagoya Protocol. Extraction of oil from Sandalwood is already taking place at industrial scale and oil exported as a commodity around the world. A simple Google search show you how global the production and commercial trade of sandalwood oil is. Unless the project embarks in</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>research and development on the oils, these investments are not justified under the Nagoya Protocol. This project is actually about NTFPs, not ABS. Communities may get a better deal with the companies extracting and exporting oil to China without invoking the Nagoya Protocol. Distillation is a routine process being used to extract oils from numerous plant species, including oil palm.</p> <p>5. What is so particular about "traditional knowledge and practices associated with harvesting of sandalwood"?</p> <p>Financing and Co-financing:</p> <p>1. The funds requested for this project are too high for what is being proposed.</p> <p>2. Table C. Only list the co-financiers that, at least in principle, have agreed on providing the co-financing in cash and in-kind listed in the table. As part of the financial due diligence, the GEF Secretariat will contact the institutions in the revised PIF to verify they know they have been listed in the project with the corresponding indicative amounts.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p style="text-align: center;">—</p> <p>7-28-16</p> <p>GEF comments made on 6-12-16 were partially addressed. There are still a number of places where the PIF requires critical thinking of the implications of proposed intervention and precision in the use of language. At times, the PIF reads as an assortment of activities not properly articulated.</p> <p>COMPONENT 1.</p> <p>Table B. Output 1.1. The Nagoya Protocol is not under the International Treaty. Please review language and intended use of bringing together the NP and the IT.</p> <p>Spell-out acronyms first time used (i.e. CNAs).</p> <p>COMPONENT 2.</p> <p>Why to separate the national legislation on ABS from the Nagoya Protocol? [page 11 of PIF            ".....implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRA) and the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>national legislations on ABS"]</p> <p>"Various local stakeholders will be capacitated in the districts of Napak, Moroto and Nakapiripiti, where the project will implement community initiatives on ABS" (p.11 of PIF). What are these community initiatives on ABS?</p> <p>"The project also will support institutions that manage depository collections, for example the zoological collections at Makerere University and the Uganda Museum, by helping them to upgrade facilities to better organize and preserve materials that can be accessed under the benefit sharing arrangements of the ITPGRFA, establish databases to facilitate tracking and monitoring utilization of genetic resources and compliance to PIC and MAT" (p.11). Do these institution have seed banks equipped share genetic materials using MTAs? to Why is there reference to "zoological collections" in relation to a treaty on plants (ITPGRFA)? Please be precise on what this request is about.</p> <p>Outcome 2.2. The true storage of genetic resources is Nature. Rephrase.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Is Uganda sure about creating all those NCAs? How is Uganda going to create an NCA for "Indigenous Knowledge and practices" (also on p. 11) when these are intimately associated with the genetic resources? This makes no sense.</p> <p>Output 2.4.1. What are the "tools for valuation of genetic resources"? What do you understand by "valuation"? In the context of the Nagoya Protocol is about Research and Development.</p> <p>Output 2.4.2. How can you develop capacity for "valuation" of genetic resources when there is no R&amp;D?</p> <p>Output 2.4.4 What is "priority taxonomic information checklists"? Priority based on what criteria?</p> <p>COMPONENT 3</p> <p>Since there is no case of R&amp;D in line with the Nagoya Protocol (no "valuation") and no clear opportunities for ABS agreements between users and providers of genetic resources, this component is really all about management of Protected Areas where there are communities making use of plants and animals following traditional practices. In this regard, constructs</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>like "However valuation of these medicinal plants is needed to help the Batwa in negotiating better benefit sharing arrangements by users of their traditional knowledge" make very little sense. Other expressions that are being forced into the components include: 1) "the project will seek to establish an effective working model for ABS at the community level that can be replicated in other parts of the country and that includes: an empowered community effectively participating in ABS; district governments and communities with technical skills in ABS valuation and negotiations", and 2) "the project will establish the quantities and economic value of biological resources in and around these protected areas; establish collaborative forest management; and put in place ABS arrangements". The GEF Secretariat suggest structuring this component around the conservation and management of the genetic resources with elements of traditional knowledge that are worth preserving whether or not these communities engage in ABS Agreements in the future. See your own list of Aichi Targets on page 14.</p> <p>Output 3.1.2. What skills and negotiation capacity for local</p>	



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>communities is the project talking about? These are totally sector specific. Without a real case in hand, this makes very little sense.</p> <p>Output 3.1.3. What are these "Community Education Centers of Excellence on TK" to be established in 5 regions? Has the Government and Agency put thought into the cost of such centers, not only for set up but for running them? This is a far-fetched idea.</p> <p>Output 3.3.1. What "gender mainstreaming in ABS for local communities"? Please elaborate on the concept and provide role models.</p> <p>Outcome 3.4 and Output 3.4.2. What is the number of target sites? There is reference to 3 Central Forest Reserves and also of 8 collaborative Forest/wildlife management structures. Please clearly state the actual target.</p> <p>COMPONENT 4.</p> <p>Outputs 4.1.2 and 3. Countries do not need to develop a national ABS CH in order to respond to the requirements of the Nagoya Protocol. Under the Nagoya Protocol, Parties have the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>obligation to make certain information available to the CBD-ABS CH (ABS NFPs, CNAs, ABS measures, permits) and in order to do so they need to establish a publishing authority. Please elaborate on your understanding of a national ABS CH and what is Uganda planning on using it for.</p> <p>NOTE: There is reference to the ABS Capacity Development Initiative implemented by the GIZ. Has the UNEP-Uganda Team coordinate with them the proposed activities? By coordination, the GEF means sitting together to discuss who is going to do what. Please do so as Uganda is a prime target for the Initiative. Thanks.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	6-2-16 Cleared	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	6-2-16 As of today, Uganda has BD \$3.4M available for this \$3.1M project. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>6-2-16 No. This PIF is not eligible in its current form. It has significant structural and substantive matters that require a complete overhaul of the concept. See outstanding issue under item 5. Thanks.</p> <p>7-28-16 No. Please address outstanding issues under item 5.</p> <p>9-4-16 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	June 20, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 28, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 04, 2016	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.