GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**9119**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bahamas, Belarus, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Moldova, Montenegro, Macedonia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Paraguay, Slovenia, Suriname, El Salvador, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, Uruguay, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Venezuela, Serbia)**		
Project Title:	**Support to Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - GRULAC and CEE REGIONS**		
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-EA;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$1,152,950**
Co-financing:	**$1,025,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,177,950**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	5-07-15 There is no specific Aichi Target for the CPB. The closest will the CBD Strategic Goal C and Target 13. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	5-7-15 Yes. The project will provide financial and technical assistance to the participating countries to fullfil their	

[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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		obligations with Article 33 ofthe CPB. Cleared	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	5-7-14 Yes. The 41 participating countries are Parties fo the CPB, elegible for GEF funding and all of them submitted the 2nd National Report. Cleared	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	5-7-14 To Assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and make timely submission of their Third National Reports on measures that each party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33. Cleared	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	5-7-15 Yes. Participating countries will be supporting this project with co-financing in-kind in the amount of $1,225,000. Cleared	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	5-7-15 Yes. The Components in Table B summarize the Technical and Financial investments for GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and make timely submission of their Third National Reports on measures that each party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33 of the CPB. Cleared	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	5-7-15 These will addressed as part of the 3rd National Report, when describing activities under Article 23 of the CPB (Public Awareness and Participation). Cleared	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	5-17-15 Yes. Countries will receive an average of $25,000 and financial assistance as per country request. Cleared	
	9. 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)	5-07-15 Risks associated with the preparation of the 3rd National Report have been addressed. Cleared	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	5-7-15 Co-financing will be on average of $25,000. A 1:1 Ratio. Cleared	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	5-7-15 Does not apply. Cleared	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	5-7-15 Does not apply. Cleared	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	5-7-15 The preparation of the report will require the participation of the national entities that have and need to provide the information. Cleared	
	14. Does the project include a	5-7-15	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes. See item 12 in MSP. Cleared	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	5-7-15 Yes. Included in Component 2. Cleared	
Availability of Resources	16. 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	
	• Focal area set-aside?	5-7-15 Yes. Cleared	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	5-7-15 Yes. This MSP is recommended for approval.	
Review Dates	First Review	May 08, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		