



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

GEF ID:	5796		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	A Bottom Up Approach to ABS: Community Level Capacity Development for Successful engagement in ABS value chains in Cameroon (Echinops giganteus)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5387 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4; BD-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$40,000	Project Grant:	\$900,000
Co-financing:	\$1,100,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,040,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Delfin Ganapin

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	4-11-14 Yes. Both Cameroon and Namibia are eligible for funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	4-11-14 The project was submitted with the LoE from Cameroon. Expecting the LoE from Namibia.  6-10-14 Namibia did not submit the LoE within the time available to process this project within GEF-5. A decision was taken to have this project with Cameroon only. Cleared	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	<p>4-11-14 The project is requesting \$438,000 from NPIF and \$ 547,500 from the BD Focal Set Aside. Nevertheless, the figure for the Grant Amount in Table D (\$900,000) is not the same as the figure for the Total Project Cost in Table B (\$927,727). Please address this difference (see also inconsistencies in figures for co-financing under item 16).</p> <p>6-10-14 The project requests \$438K from the NPIF and \$547K from the BD Set Aside. Cleared</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>4-11-14 The project is requesting \$438,000 from NPIF and \$ 547,500 from the BD Focal Set Aside. Nevertheless, the figure for the Grant Amount in Table D (\$900,000) is not the same as the figure for the Total Project Cost in Table B (\$927,727). Please address this difference (see also inconsistencies in figures for co-financing under item 16).</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>At the top of the page select: Type of Trust Fund:</p> <p>6-10-14 The project requests \$438K from the NPIF and \$547K from the BD Set Aside. Cleared</p>	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><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></p>	<p>4-11-14 Yes. See details on page 10 and 11. Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>4-11-14 Yes. BD-4 and Aichi 16. Cleared</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>4-11-14 Basic information on Value Chain and R&amp;D are provided for the target species on pages 5-7. During project preparation, the GEF will require a detailed description of the value chain and state of the art in R&amp;D, as well as the proposed activities along the value chain and valorization of the GR. Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>4-11-14</p> <p>This objective of this project is to build the capacity of local communities in Cameroon and Namibia to better engage in the negotiations with users of genetic resources. Once the value chains, the R&amp;D and the proposed activities are fully described in the MSP, it would be possible to narrow down the outputs and outcomes of this project.</p> <p>In the meantime, please try to focus on the specific outputs that will result from interventions in the two value chains and in the R&amp;D agenda. Based on the language of the Project Description Summary (Table B of PIF) it is not clear what the GEF funding will do related to the value chains in particular. General capacity building activities are unlikely to influence change in product-specific value chains.</p> <p>6-10-14</p> <p>Issues properly addressed in the revised PIF.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>4-11-13</p> <p>As stated in the PIF, "The contributions of the project compared to the baseline are the improved participation of the concerned communities in the selected value chains, through increased capacity both at the local and national level. While ABS activities are ongoing both in Cameroon and Namibia, there is a lack of resources and of expertise to genuinely integrate ILCs in existing and emerging</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ABS value chains". The detailed description of the value chains, baseline investments and proposed interventions in the the two pilot projects will allow a clearer description of the incremental reasoning in the MSP.</p> <p>In the meantime, please elaborate on the most likely type of interventions in the two value chains and in the R&amp;D agenda. Based on the language of the Project Description Summary (Table B of PIF) it is not clear what the GEF funding will do in relation to the pilot value chains. General capacity building activities are unlikely to influence change in product-specific value chains.</p> <p>6-10-14 Properly addressed in the revised PIF. Cleared</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>4-11-145 Yes. This project is all about building the capacity of ILCs. Cleared</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient</p>	<p>4-11-14 Yes. See details on page 9 and 10. Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	4-11-14 Yes. Please see details on page 10. Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	4-14-14 Please elaborate on Innovation, Sustainability and potential for scale-up. This is item 6 in Part II, A. Project Objective in PIF Template.  6-10-14 Properly addressed in the revised PIF. 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 approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to	4-11-14  Please review the following dollar	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	figures:  1. The Total Project Grant in Table B is \$ 972,727 and \$900,000 in Table C. 2. Need co-financing for Project Management. 3. Co-financing in Table B is \$1,100,000 and \$1,200,000 in Table C. 4. Determine if contribution of Natural Justice is Cash or in-kind.  6-10-14 Properly addressed in the revised PIF. 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?	4-11-14 Yes. Co-financing is provided by the Private Sector, Bilaterals and CSOs. Cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	4-11-17 Yes. 8% 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?	4-11-14 Yes. \$40,000 Cleared	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	reflows included?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> 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	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	4-14-14 No. Please review issues under items 2,3,7,8,13 and 16. Thanks.  6-10-14 Yes. This PIF is recommended for approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	4-11-14  For MSP Approval, the GEF expects the following:  1. Detailed description of the value chains, state of the art in R&D and baseline projects (those to take place whether or not the GEF project gets approved) in the two value chains.	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		2. Detailed interventions and expected results following the analysis and identification of "entry points" for improving the capacity of local communities to engage in ABS Agreements.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	April 14, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 10, 2014	
	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.**