

GEF - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

Document Generated by: GEF Coordination Office CO

At: 2024-09-13 10:56:11

Table of contents

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION	3
1.1 Project Details	3
1.2 Project Description	4
1.3 Project Contacts.....	5
2 Overview of Project Status.....	6
2.1 UNEP PoW & UN.....	6
2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators	10
2.3. Implementation Status and Risks	11
2.4 Co Finance	14
2.5. Stakeholder	14
2.6. Gender	15
2.7. ESSM	17
2.8. KM/Learning.....	18
2.9. Stories	22
3 Performance.....	23
3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes	23
3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)	31
4 Risks.....	35
4.1 Table A. Project management Risk	35
4.2 Table B. Risk-log.....	35
4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks.....	37
5 Amendment - GeoSpatial.....	40
5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM).....	40
5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)	41

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2024
Reporting from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1.1 Project Details

GEF ID: 10584	Umoja WBS: SB-021491
SMA IPMR ID: 133074	Grant ID: GFL-11207-14AC0003-SB-021491
Project Short Title: SINBF/FSP	
Project Title: Strengthening the Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Southern Africa (SINBF)	
Duration months planned:	48
Duration months age:	11
Project Type:	Full Sized Project (FSP)
Parent Programme if child project:	
Project Scope:	Regional
Region:	Africa
Countries:	Madagascar, Namibia
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity
GEF financing amount:	\$ 2,858,390.00
Co-financing amount:	\$ 9,000,000.00
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	2022-10-28
UNEP Project Approval Date:	2023-05-26
Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force):	2023-06-20
Date of Inception Workshop, if available:	2023-08-15
Date of First Disbursement:	2023-06-14
Total disbursement as of 30 June 2024:	\$ 428,759.00
Total expenditure as of 30 June:	\$ 452,102.00

Midterm undertaken?:	n/a
Actual Mid-Term Date, if taken:	
Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken:	2025-07-31
Completion Date Planned - Original PCA:	2027-05-26
Completion Date Revised - Current PCA:	
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	2027-12-31
Expected Financial Closure Date:	2028-06-30

1.2 Project Description

Global concerns about the risks of LMOs led to adoption in 2000 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which came into force in 2003. Since the adoptions of the Protocol, there have been many interventions particularly from the GEF to assist Parties develop and implement their National Biosafety Frameworks to enable Parties meet their obligations to the Protocol.

The overall goal of this project is to assist the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Madagascar and Namibia to enhance and/or strengthen national capacities through cooperative facilitative mechanisms for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and have a workable and transparent national biosafety framework by 2026.

In the project preparatory phase, the project reviewed the biosafety related policies and legislation in each of the participating countries and analyzing each country's strategic focus on biosafety. The highlighted the strategic importance that biosafety issues are assuming in each country's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), other strategic policies and development plans have served as inputs into the design of the project.

The project is therefore designed to help the participating countries to overall: a) Integrate biosafety into the national biotechnology strategies; b) Put in place a fully operational and responsive regulatory regime in line with their existing national laws and other international obligations; c) Establish an efficient national system for handling requests and decision-making; d) Put in place an effective national system for follow-up activities, namely monitoring, inspections and enforcement; and e) Establish an active national system for public awareness and participation.

The project consists of three components. The first two, A and B are technical components whilst the third Component C is for project administration. The three components are as follows:

Component A - Biosafety Regulatory Regimes and Policy;

Component B - Biosafety institutional systems; and

Component C - Project Administration, Monitoring and Evaluation.

The envisaged results of the project in the three participating countries are enhanced, strengthened and operational National Biosafety Frameworks.

1.3 Project Contacts

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division
Name of co-implementing Agency	
Executing Agency (ies)	Regional Agricultural and Environmental Innovations Africa (RAEIN-Africa), Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (CONGO DR); Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADAGASCAR); and the Biosafety Council of the National Commission on Research, Science and Technology of Namibia (NCRST), NAMIBIA)
names of Other Project Partners	
UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Johan Robinson
UNEP Task Manager(s)	Alex Owusu-Biney
UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Paul Vrontamitis
UNEP Support Assistants	Evelyn Machaiso
Manager/Representative	Doreen Mnyulwa
Project Manager	Alice T. Maredza
Finance Manager	Shepherd Kapayapundo
Communications Lead, if relevant	

2 Overview of Project Status

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

UNEP Current Subprogramme(s):	Thematic: Nature action subprogramme, Foundational: Environmental governance
UNEP previous Subprogramme(s):	
PoW Indicator(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature: (i) Number of national or subnational entities that, with UNEP support, adopt integrated approaches to address environmental and social issues and/or tools for valuing, monitoring and sustainably managing biodiversity. • Governance: (ii) Number of international legal agreements or instruments advanced or developed with UNEP support to address emerging or internationally agreed environmental goals
UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages	<p>NAMIBIA</p> <p>Namibia’s United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF) 2019-2023 - A Partnership for the Eradication of Poverty and Inequality - support to the realisation of the country’s Vision 2030 (Policy Framework for Long-Term National Development) through the implementation of the Fifth National Development Plan (NDP 5) 2017/18 - 2021/22, the Harambee Prosperity Plan (HPP) and the Blueprint for Wealth Redistribution and Poverty Eradication other relevant sector strategic plans. In addition, the global 2030 Agenda, integrated into the continental Agenda 2063, a strategic framework for socioeconomic transformation of the African continent and sub-regional development agendas align with the four pillars articulated in the NDP 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pillar 1: Economic Progression - Achieve inclusive, sustainable and equitable growth, • Pillar 2: Social Transformation - Build capable and healthy human resources, • Pillar 3: Environmental Sustainability - Ensure a sustainable environment and enhance resilience, • Pillar 4: Good Governance - Promote good governance through effective institutions <p>One of the major principles on which Namibia’s Vision 2030 is based is “partnerships, which is recognised as a key prerequisite for the achievement of dynamic, efficient & sustainable development. The Strengthening the Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Southern Africa (SINBF) project’s main objective: <u>To strengthen institutional, human, and regulatory capacities and promote cooperative measures in the implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs)</u>, aligns with the UNPAF’s joint work plans as articulated in the UNPAF 2019-2023 document.</p> <p>Capacity development is a major strategy for the SINBF project. Component 2: Strengthening Biosafety Institutional Systems, Output 2.1 - <u>Multidisciplinary teams of national experts from project countries trained and backstopped to train government officials and their stakeholders in the implementation of biosafety and thematic areas</u>, is expected to promote good governance through effective institutions (Pillar 4 of the NDF) and contribute to the overarching goal of <u>Pillar 2</u> - to “Build Capable and Healthy Human Resources”. The</p>

SINBF project's Training of trainers (ToT) strategy aims to support capacity building of the various strata of duty-bearers involved in the biosafety regulatory chain. The project works through national task teams and draws expert advice from the SINBF Inter-country Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The national task teams lead national-level project implementation and train in-country stakeholders on the requisite skills, achieving a multiplier effect on capacity development. Where possible, on capacity development, efforts will be made to ensure a balanced representation of women and men in the selection of workshop participants, also ensuring training of young employees who may be at lower management levels.

The focus on capacitating national expert teams on the establishment of administrative and institutional frameworks and on the skills necessary for effective implementation of NBFs (Component 2) is expected to contribute to sustainable, resilient, and well-performing public institutions. Sustainable capacity development will contribute to Pillar 2 on Social Transformation - Build capable and healthy human resources. The SINBF project will impart skills that will contribute to improved transparency in decision-making processes related to environmental management. The range of skills imparted through the project is vital as biosafety, being a cross-cutting environmental issue, requires coordination across multiple sectors of government. The SINBF's capacity building at the national level will equip office-bearers for evidenced-based coordination of multisectoral policy implementation, contributing to better harmonised and transparent decision-making on environmental governance issues.

Pillar 4 of the NDP 5 covers governance issues with the overall goal to "Promote Good Governance through Effective Institutions". Good governance is a pillar that can lead to various cross-cutting benefits. The SINBF project Output 2.2: National biosafety administrative systems strengthened with training and technical assistance to review and update processes and systems for implementation of national biosafety considerations, combines the benefits of capacity building and good governance adequately capacitated biosafety administrative and institutional systems will contribute to upholding the "rule of law; transparency and accountability". Of particular relevance is the contribution of good environmental governance to environmental sustainability. **Pillar 3** of the NDP 5 focuses on environmental and natural resources management, which is a key contributor to sustainable development (Pillar 1: Economic Progression - Achieve inclusive, sustainable, and equitable growth).

Component 1 of the SINBF project, on **Biosafety policy and Regulatory regime**, is supporting National Core teams (a set of selected multidisciplinary teams of experts from each project country) with training and backstopping to cooperate in the review of national biosafety laws, policies, and plans, and prepare national decisions to meet the CPB and Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol.

Expected outputs, including Biosafety, mainstreamed into relevant national sustainable development policies and strategies, including NBSAPs and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, are aligned with the strengthening environmental governance through tools to support evidence-based decision-making and monitoring and enforcement contributing to compliance with environmental laws, guidelines, and policies.

The UNSDCF Namibia (2024-2028) is currently in draft form for review.

MADAGASCAR

The SINBF project's components and outputs closely align with Madagascar's four priority areas, as outlined in the draft UNDAF/UNSDCF country programme document (2024-2028);

- **Enhance Good Governance, Rule of Law, and Security:** Strengthening institutions to ensure effective governance, uphold the rule of law, and maintain security.
- **Human Capital Development:** Improving health, education, and social protection systems to enhance the well-being and potential of the population.
- **Work Productivity and Job Creation:** Promoting economic growth by increasing labour productivity and creating decent jobs for a competitive economy.
- **Sustainable, Resilient, and Inclusive Environmental Management:** Ensuring sustainable use of natural resources and building resilience against environmental challenges

By enhancing institutional capacities, training national experts, and strengthening biosafety policies, the SINBF project supports good governance, human capital development, job creation, and sustainable environmental management, thereby contributing to the overarching goals of Madagascar's national development plan.

The SINBF Project Component 2: Strengthening Biosafety Institutional Systems and the associated Outputs 2.1: Multidisciplinary teams of national experts from project countries trained and backstopped to train government officials and their stakeholders in implementing biosafety and thematic areas, and 2.2: National biosafety administrative systems strengthened with training and technical assistance to review and update processes and systems for implementing national biosafety considerations, and the other outputs under this component aimed at imparting knowledge and skills for effective biosafety regulation, contribute to Madagascar's **Priority Area** on enhancing good governance, rule of law, and security. Training government officials and strengthening institutional and administrative systems for biosafety regulation will ensure effective environmental governance and uphold the rule of law. The capacity building under the various thematic areas relevant to evidence-based decision-making will contribute to the strengthening of monitoring and enforcement measures, ensuring greater compliance with environmental policies, laws, and guidelines.

The SINBF's training of trainers (ToT) strategy, employed to build the capacities of various strata of office-bearers involved in the biosafety regulatory chain and supports national task teams lead project implementation and train in-country stakeholders, will contribute to the **Priority Area** on Human Capital Development. The envisaged in-country training of relevant stakeholders will contribute to sustainable capacity building, thus developing a critical mass of biosafety chain players with the relevant skills and knowledge for efficient and transparent implementation of NBFs. By enhancing the skills and knowledge of those involved in the biosafety regulatory chain, the SINBF project helps improve environmental management and regulatory compliance, leading to better health, education, and social protection systems, thereby enhancing the well-being of the population.

The SINBF project, by strengthening biosafety policies and regulatory regimes (Component A), will contribute to the creation of a more stable and conducive environment for economic growth. Through the Project, National Core Teams are supported with training and

backstopping to cooperate with relevant stakeholders in the review of national biosafety laws, policies, and plans, aligning them with the CPB and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress. The training provided to biosafety chain actors and stakeholders and the policy review processes will ensure that environmental governance is integrated into national development frameworks, promoting the sustainable management of natural resources and resilience against environmental challenges. The SINBF project's emphasis on capacity development for the review of regulatory regimes and for strengthening institutional and administrative systems will promote good environmental governance, aligning with the **Priority Area** on Sustainable, Resilient, and Inclusive Environmental Management. Sustainable use of natural resources will contribute to increased productivity, creating decent jobs which are essential for a competitive economy.

THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO (DRC)

In DRC's Framework Cooperation Plan of the UNSDCF (2020-2024), Axis 2 deals with Inclusive economic growth, agricultural development, capture of the demographic dividend, protection and sustainable management of natural resources. The pillar encompasses various priority areas in the area of environment and sustainable development. The five-year development plan (2019-2023) has retained five strategic pillars, with Pillar 5 focusing on Environment and Sustainable Development. The pillar aims to create the best conditions for industrial development through a healthy environment and a healthy population.

The SINBF Project's **Component 1: Biosafety Policy and Regulatory Regime** supports National Core teams with training and backstopping to review national biosafety laws, policies, and plans, enabling Parties to meet the obligations under CPB and Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress. By enhancing biosafety policies and regulatory frameworks, the SINBF project supports DRC's goal of "protecting the environment and combating climate change." Strengthening biosafety laws and policies will also improve environmental governance, contributing to the development of robust and effective national biosafety frameworks.

Component 2 on Strengthening Biosafety Institutional Systems, with several outputs on capacity development, contributes to strengthening biosafety regulatory systems with technical support to provide evidence for informed decision-making. By building the capacity of biosafety regulatory chain officials and relevant stakeholders, the SINBF project will support the integration of biosafety into environmental management policies, laws, and guidelines, promoting sustainable use of natural resources and enhancing resilience against environmental challenges. Furthermore, Component 2's focus on capacity development at the national level, through the training of trainers strategy, will contribute to enhancing transparency and coordination in environmental governance. By requiring the trained national core teams to train in-country stakeholders, the project will achieve a multiplier effect on capacity building, supporting various strata of duty-bearers involved in environmental regulation and promote equitable development across provinces. In addition, engagement with the relevant stakeholders will improve communication and coordination across multiple sectors of government for effective implementation of NBFs. The skills will improve transparency in decision-making processes related to environmental management. By building the capacity of those involved in biosafety regulation, the SINBF project ensures that environmental management practices are sustainable and inclusive.

	The SINBF project's components and outputs closely align with DRC's focus on Environment and Sustainable Development. By enhancing biosafety policies, strengthening institutional systems, promoting capacity development, and fostering good environmental governance, the SINBF project supports DRC's goals of protecting the environment, ensuring sustainable development.
Link to relevant SDG Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
Link to relevant SDG Targets:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5 By 2020, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and international levels, and promote access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed

2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators

GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results

Indicators	Targets - Expected Value			Materialized to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
11- People benefitting from GEF-financed investments	3000	3000	3000	244
11.1- Male	2000	2000	2000	136
11.2- Female	1000	1000	1000	108

2.3. Implementation Status and Risks

	PIR#	Rating towards outcomes (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2024	1st PIR	S	S	L
FY 2023				
FY 2022				
FY 2021				
FY 2020				
FY 2019				
FY 2018				
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

Summary of status

This is the first year of the SINBF project began in July 2023 after a long initiation phase. The initial setback was compounded by unexpected delays in the signing of the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) between RAEIN-Africa and the Madagascar National Executing Agency (NEA) due to internal political changes.

Systems and structures for coordinating and managing intercountry projects, including establishing the Project Management Unit (PMU) under the LEA, were promptly implemented. Forming the SINBF Technical Advisory Committee (SINBF TAC) was a crucial step for the project. The selection process for the SINBF TAC was thorough, focusing on qualifications, technical expertise, experience in the southern Africa regional contexts, and involvement in previous biosafety initiatives. Specifically, there was a strategic emphasis on including representatives experienced in establishing national biosafety frameworks (NBFs) to benefit from their firsthand experiences in biosafety regulation for capacity building. The selected six-member SINBF TAC comprises individuals whose expertise has significantly shaped the biosafety regulatory frameworks in their respective countries. The LEA ensured that the TAC's collective expertise covered various thematic areas crucial to the SINBF project's goals. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will offer crucial technical guidance and support to the project teams, drawing from their diverse backgrounds and experiences. This support will involve capacity building on key technical issues aligned with the project's objectives. Additionally, the TAC will provide technical backstopping and offer recommendations tailored to the specific contexts of the participating countries. Despite efforts to achieve gender balance, this goal was not met in the TAC composition, as the selection prioritised expertise and experience in relevant areas. Only one curriculum vitae from a female candidate was received.

At the recommendation of the UNEP Task Manager, national inception meetings were to be held before the intercountry inception workshops. Namibia was the first to sign the PCA with RAEIN-Africa during an online signing workshop. Namibia conducted its national inception meeting to introduce the project to relevant stakeholders and gather inputs that would contribute to achieving the expected outputs and outcomes in line with national plans and priorities.

The SINBF project was officially launched during the intercountry inception meeting in August 2023. A total of 22 participants (6 female and 16 male) attended the intercountry inception meeting, representing the Technical Advisory Committee, the three implementing countries and the LEA. DRC's inception phase was further delayed due to prolonged banking formalities within the country, which led to a delay in fund disbursement. The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) was able to hold its national inception meeting in November 2023.

Madagascar's delay in formalising the PCA posed challenges, considering that the project involves inter-country activities that require the simultaneous participation of all three partner countries. Despite these complications, the Madagascar NEA approved the participation in the inception and planning meeting of the project team, which had been involved in developing the SINBF proposal. The SINBF Intercountry Project Inception, Planning, and Experience-sharing meeting was held back-to-back with a train-the-trainer workshop on establishing administrative and institutional setups to implement national biosafety frameworks effectively. Using provisions of the CPB, UNEP Technical Guidelines, and other national and international regulations and documents on biotechnology and biosafety, a training manual was developed to assist the three participating countries in establishing functional, workable and transparent NBFs. However, the LEA could not convene the Intercountry Project Steering Committee since Madagascar had not yet signed the PCA or officially nominated its SINBF project team. Therefore, it remained a priority for Madagascar to formalise the agreement and commence the in-country project inception processes. For more details on the project inception activities, please refer to the SINBF Inception Phase Report. RAEIN-Africa engaged with Madagascar through the UNEP Task Manager and various key national stakeholders.

The inaugural mission, jointly undertaken by the RAEIN-Africa and the UNEP Task Manager, aimed to reemphasise the shared understanding of the project's purpose, approach, expectations, and anticipated outcomes as set at the project development phase. Additionally, the Mission sought to assist national teams in connecting with higher authorities regarding the urgency of facilitating project processes. Given the varied levels of development and implementation progress among the partner countries, the mission also aimed to engage stakeholders and assess project progress in DRC and Namibia, and to advocate for the establishment of project implementation structures in Madagascar. The mission was an important step in promoting alignment and synergy among the stakeholders involved in the SINBF project. Additionally, the mission helped country partners in planning to review biosafety legal frameworks or draft bills. It supported the project teams in gaining higher-level endorsement and support for the national-level project implementation. The mission team was able to meet with high-level ministerial representatives, including the Secretary General of the Ministry of Environment in the DRC, Mr Toirambe Bamoninga Benjamin and the newly appointed Minister of Environment and Sustainable Development in Madagascar, Mr Max Andonirina Fontaine. In Namibia, the mission team met representatives from the Ministry of Environmental Affairs, Forestry and Tourism and members of the Biosafety Council. For effective project implementation, the active participation of relevant biosafety chain stakeholders was emphasised. For further information on the SINBF inaugural mission, please consult the Mission Report.

Project steering committees are essential governance structures established at both intercountry and national levels. Following the signing of Madagascar's PCA in May 2024, the Intercountry Project Steering Committee could be constituted. At the national level, steering committees or task force teams are made up of departments responsible for biosafety decision-making, facilitating the initiation of the necessary communication channels. Namibia appointed their Biosafety Council, which includes representatives from various sectors and disciplines within the biosafety domain, as the National Steering Committee for the SINBF project. During its national project inception workshop, the DRC sensitised relevant stakeholders on biosafety issues and called for nominations to its national steering committee. After signing the PCA, Madagascar nominated an elaborate project implementation team with representations from various key portfolios. Thus, Madagascar, in its second-year activities, has taken note of the need to catch up with the national project activities, including inception meetings and the appointment of a multi-stakeholder, multi-institutional national-level steering committee.

The project strongly emphasises sustainable capacity development within the biosafety frameworks in the SINBF partner countries. To achieve this, the project utilizes a 'train the trainer' approach, with the aim of creating a multiplier effect by disseminating knowledge within institutions. This approach not only expands the reach of the training but also supports national core teams, ensuring that the expertise remains within the implementing institutions for the long term. Specific attention was given to the mechanisms for selecting qualified trainees who would, in turn, efficiently propagate the training within their respective domains. Partners took a keen interest in operationalising the train-the-trainer model and ensuring the nomination of the relevant personnel into the national task teams. To date, the SINBF has implemented two training trainers workshops.

The first ToT was on administrative and institutional setups for biosafety regulation held back to back with the inception meeting. The TAC trained nine individuals (3 females and 6 males) on biosafety institutional and administrative systems. The objective was to equip national core teams with the necessary knowledge and skills to develop and execute administrative and institutional frameworks for NBFs. The trainees received a training manual and other supportive documents on biosafety institutional and administrative systems. In addition, the TAC shared experiences from both developed and developing countries on implementing biosafety institutional and administrative systems. The second ToT training was for legal task teams and focused on aligning the biosafety regulatory regimes with the CPB and relevant supplementary protocols. Ten national representatives (4 female and 6 male) were trained. As part of the pretraining assignment, countries were tasked to identify the gaps in their national biosafety regulatory regimes and bills. These documents were to guide the facilitators of the workshop on issues of concern to each of the participating countries. The training equipped legal and biosafety experts on aligning biosafety regulatory regimes with the Cartagena Protocol and other international obligations. The main objective was to equip the national core teams with the relevant skills required to review and update national regulatory regimes and bills on biosafety. The TAC facilitated the sharing of experiences with six countries (Cameroon, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, and Tunisia). In addition, the TAC compiled guiding documents on aligning biosafety regulatory regimes with international protocols.

Post ToTs, the trained trainers have planned for in-country training in year 2 of the project. In the meantime, the core teams are in the process of leading the review of the national regulatory regimes (the Biosafety Act for Namibia and the draft biosafety bills for DRC and Madagascar). In Namibia and the DRC, sensitization workshops were held to create awareness of the SINBF project and to highlight gaps in the regulatory regimes or draft bills, thus lobbying for stakeholder participation in these processes. By the end of the reporting period, reviewed Draft bills for DRC and Madagascar had been submitted and are to undergo the process of further stakeholder

consultations, updating and review by the Technical Advisory Committee. Namibia was in the process of reviewing its Biosafety Act. In addition to the review process, all three countries are participating in the country NBSAP reviews and working on ensuring alignment with the biosafety regimes.

In the first year, the implementation of the SINBF project was delayed due to administrative hiccups. However, these issues have been resolved. The delays caused several activities to be moved to year two. It is anticipated that by the end of year two, the project will be on track to deliver the major outputs.

2.4 Co Finance

Planned Co-finance:	\$ 9,000,000
Actual to date:	2,250,000
Progress	<p>Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges:</p> <p>The actual co-finance as of 30 June 2024 is USD 2,250,000, which constitutes 25% of the planned co-finance.</p> <p>As reported, the SINBF project's co-financing is on track. Even though Madagascar started late, the supporting system is in place, and therefore, co-financed activities have been carried out.</p>

2.5. Stakeholder

Date of project steering committee meeting	2024-07-03
Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)	<p>At the inter-country level, only one steering committee meeting was held. As explained earlier, the delays in Madagascar signing the PCA led to a steering committee that was not fully constituted. Therefore, it was only at the annual review and planning meeting at the end of the reporting period that the first steering committee meeting took place. The LEA provided a brief explanation of the steering committee's role and also outlined the reasons for the delays in constituting the steering committee. The meeting discussed the objectives of the steering committee and the constitution of the Steering Chairperson. The DRC was nominated to chair the steering committee in year two of the project. The members of the steering committee constituted the planning and review of year one. A second steering Committee meeting is scheduled.</p> <p>National steering committees were established in Namibia and DRC, and Madagascar is in the process of nominating members to its steering committee. As is the norm, the national steering committees in the three participating countries were to review year one and</p>

	approve planned activities for year two. At the national level - Stakeholders were engaged at the inception meetings in Namibia and DRC. Stakeholder matrixes of all the 3 countries will continue to be updated.
--	---

2.6. Gender

Does the project have a gender action plan?	Yes
Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal):	<p>The SINBF project, with its primary goal of monitoring gender access, participation, and benefits among women and men, underscores the crucial role of gender mainstreaming. As we enter this review period, it's imperative that we recognise the significance of our roles in ensuring that gender is not just a component but a specific criterion in all project activities. This is a key step towards achieving gender equity and balanced representation. On gender access, women are involved in setting up the structures of implementing the project. Although such access at a higher level is dependent on the structures in the implementing institutions, the project endeavours to ensure that in each step of the project, all involved are aware of the need to avail access to all gender alike, where possible.</p> <p>The project is unwavering in its commitment to balance gender representation and participation across all levels of project implementation. Throughout the implementation of the project, gender disintegrated data is being compiled on the project personnel and on project participants/ beneficiaries. Gender access, participation, and benefits among women and men are being monitored, and remedial action will be incorporated to address (as far as possible) any gender inequalities in project implementation. Where possible, on resource use and capacity development, efforts are being made to ensure a balanced representation of women and men in the selection of workshop participants.</p> <p>In the Democratic Republic of Congo, Madagascar and Namibia, women depend heavily on natural resource utilisation. Thus, ensuring gender equity will benefit everyone in the balanced allocation of resources, involvement and decision-making, leading to greater incomes and the overall well-being of all persons. On participation at all levels, the project creates awareness of the implementing partners to endeavour gender equity and disintegrate participation reports by gender. Of the implementing teams in year one, there are five females and eight males participating. The following is the gender representation by country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRC - the team comprises a coordinator (1 male) and finance officer (1 Female); • Madagascar, National Project Director (1 male), Coordinator (1 male) Assistant Coordinator(1 male), Finance Officer (1 female), Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (1 male); Communication Officer (1 male), Administrative Officer (1 female), Technical Secretary (1 female)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Namibia Coordinator (1 Male), Assistant Coordinator (1 Female) and Finance Officer(1 male). <p>Each country has established two national core teams to lead in two main thematic areas: institutional and administrative systems and regulatory regime review (referred to as Legal task teams in reports); these teams are responsible for both intercountry-level training and the implementation of national activities within each thematic area. in total, the gender representation in these national core teams is 12 male and 7 females. The gender representation across the countries is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional and administrative core team: 3 males - Regulatory Regime Legal core team: 3 males and 1 female • Madagascar: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional and administrative national core team: 2 males and 1 female - Regulatory Regime Legal core team: 2 males and 2 females • Namibia: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional and administrative national core team: 1 male and 2 females - Regulatory Regime Legal core team: 1 male and 2 females <p>Achieving gender equity requires an integrated approach aimed at fostering behavioural and procedural changes at several levels in the biosafety regulatory process, including at the regulatory, administrative, technical and outreach levels. As much as possible, and guided by expertise/ knowledge base, gender and existing opportunities in each of the partner countries, the SINBF seeks a balanced inclusion of women and young people in capacity-building initiatives and in stakeholder engagement activities. Thus, representation at national levels in the implementation of the project during the period under report are as follows:</p> <p>The project will ensure that stakeholder engagement activities promote gender sensitivity throughout the project design and implementation process, respecting and considering the needs and priorities of both women and men. Consideration of time constraints, knowledge, and socio-cultural impediments to the full participation by women will guide the planning of consultative meetings to promote gender balance in all stakeholder activities.</p>
--	---

2.7. ESSM

Moderate/High risk projects (in terms of Environmental and social safeguards)	Was the project classified as moderate/high risk CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage? No If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?
New social and/or environmental risks	Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period? No If yes, describe the new risks or changes?
Complaints and grievances related to social and/or environmental impacts	Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period? No If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail, including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken? N/A
Environmental and social safeguards management	<p>This is a low-risk project. The project supports DRC, Madagascar and Namibia in implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, operating in line with the Precautionary Principle in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development. It will develop specific risk assessment, risk management, and social and environmental safeguards frameworks in line with Articles 15, 16 and 26 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Standard Operational Procedures will be implemented in relation to the handling, introduction and movement of Living Modified Organisms. The project is based on the current NBF status and gaps as identified by the National Biosafety Authorities of the participating countries. The stakeholder groups have been identified both at the national and local levels and incorporated during the PPG phase. They continue to be updated as the project is being implemented. Participating stakeholders are clear on their roles in the project's implementation. The project endeavours to achieve equal access to the project and representation by both men and women during its implementation. A good practice approach to management activities is being used to avoid or minimise identified potential risks in the project. The project continues to analyze relevant gender issues and is developing a gender-responsive project approach. At all levels, awareness is being created of the need to ensure access, participation, and benefits by all genders and disadvantaged communities in the project.</p>

2.8. KM/Learning

Knowledge activities and products	Knowledge activities <p>The project aims to enhance the capacity of institutions involved in biosafety implementation in a sustainable manner. This will be attained through the Training of Trainers approach (ToT). A structured approach to knowledge management is essential to ensuring the long-term retention and dissemination of critical knowledge within participating institutions. Thus, the trained national core teams are to train relevant biosafety-implementing stakeholders at the national level. At the national level, training targets various hierarchies and gender groups (both men and women, and from senior, middle cadre, and new recruits) to ensure long-term retention of knowledge and skills within the relevant institutions.</p> <p>The project partners are committed to promoting diversity and inclusion. By nature, biosafety implementation is multi-stakeholder and multidisciplinary and involves various levels of personnel in decision-making and implementation. Thus, the importance of disseminating knowledge across these structures guides the SINBF's capacity building initiatives. Promoting diversity and inclusion will significantly amplify the impact of the training of trainers strategy.</p> <p>The SINBF Technical Advisory Committee (SINBF TAC) members were selected according to competence and knowledge of African biosafety systems. They were nominated from various areas of expertise, including knowledge and experience in the implementation of the CPB, drafting of biosafety laws, biosafety risk assessment and risk management, monitoring and enforcement systems, GMO detection methods, the establishment of the requisite administrative and institutional systems, liability and redress issues, biosafety socio-economic considerations, and communication and public engagement. The SINBF TAC facilitated the capacity-building initiatives implemented at the intercountry level in year 1 of the project. specifically the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Training of Trainers workshop on biosafety institutional and administrative systems <p>Although biosafety chain actors may have the relevant information and knowledge on both biotechnology and biosafety, most of the available national human resources lack hands-on experience in the technical and administrative skills relevant to biosafety decision-making processes. Thus, all three countries require technical support for further hands-on training and experience in handling simulated and real cases to increase their capacities and skills.</p> <p>Component 2 of the SINBF seeks to enhance the capacity of national experts in the establishment of administrative and institutional</p>
--	--

frameworks for the effective implementation of the NBFs. National managed institutions and stakeholders are expected to take measures to strengthen implementation compliance and enforcement of NBFs through multidisciplinary capacity building activities relevant to various biosafety thematic areas. The TOT workshop on the establishment of an administrative and institutional framework for the implementation of NBFs was held at the Birchwood Hotel and OR Tambo Conference Centre, Johannesburg, South Africa, from 16 to 19 August 2023. The ToT workshop was held back to back with the SINBF Intercountry Project Inception, Planning and Experience Sharing Meeting. The objective of the ToT workshop was to equip national Experts with the necessary knowledge, skills and tools to develop and implement administrative and institutional frameworks for NBFs. The participants are expected to raise awareness at all levels about the minimum requirements for an administrative and institutional system to manage biosafety. They are also responsible for seeking support and guiding the implementation of biosafety administrative and institutional systems. Furthermore, the trained national core team members are tasked with training local stakeholders on national-level administrative and institutional biosafety systems. The national Core Teams' input will contribute to the establishment of functional, workable and transparent NBFs.

Participants of this workshop were equipped with skills in establishing administrative and institutional systems for the effective implementation of biosafety according to the minimum requirements under the CPB. Furthermore, the training provided guidance on the prerequisites for implementing institutions that play specific roles in the handling of LMOs as per the minimum requirements.

2a. The Trainers' Training workshop on aligning biosafety regulatory regimes with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and related supplementary protocols.

To kick start Component A of the Project, The SINBF Project Team conducted a 4-Day Training of Trainers (ToT) Workshop for Legal Experts focused on aligning national biosafety regulatory frameworks. The workshop was held at the Protea Hotel by Marriott Fire & Ice in Menlyn, Pretoria, from April 22 to 25, 2024. The workshop aimed to review participating countries' biosafety regulations and harmonise them with international agreements such as the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) and its Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol (NKLSP) on Liability and Redress, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) and the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and Capacity-Building Action Plan (2021-2030), and other international agreements, taking into account, the recent advancements in science. as part of the workshop an experience sharing webinar was implemented.

2b. The Experience Sharing Webinar: Learning from African Countries with Operational Regulatory Regimes was held on the 22nd of April. Six countries, Cameroon, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, and Tunisia, shared their experiences on their National biosafety frameworks. The experiences shared were specifically on the choices made regarding biosafety laws, regulations, and guidelines, the processes followed, inter-institutional coordination and stakeholder processes, and the country's positions on regulations of emerging

technologies. A total of 31 participated (20 males and 11 females).

Throughout these trainings, the RAEIN-Africa and the SINBF TAC supported the multidisciplinary expert teams in reviewing national biosafety laws and policies, ensuring compliance with environmental laws and national priorities. The review enabled the examination of biosafety regulatory systems with a view to mainstreaming national biosafety regulatory regimes into broader national systems. By the end of the workshop, all three countries had an understanding of the gaps in their current regulatory regime or bills and how the gaps could be addressed, ensuring that the laws are aligned with the international agreement on biosafety. Drafts of the gaps identified were updated after the workshop and submitted (see attached). The national experts were expected to capacitate more stakeholders in the country on the alignment process and on options available for addressing gaps. In addition, drafts of the proposed changes and an updated version of the Act and bills were to be produced and used for further stakeholder consultation and updating.

Experience sharing and Lessons Learnt

Experience sharing at the intercountry level was embedded in the ToT workshops and the webinar implemented in Year 1. In The project will utilise a structured process for capturing lessons learned, tools, and best practices from other projects. This may include detailed case studies, procedural documents, and outcomes analyses. By leveraging lessons learnt, tools, and best practices from the LMO Testing project (MCP-ICLT - GFL/5283) and other biosafety implementation projects executed in the region, the SINBF will strengthen the partner countries' NBFs on pre- and post-approval monitoring of LMOs. In addition, the project will also build capacity on Liability and Redress. In Namibia and Madagascar, the project will create awareness of the importance of acceding to the Nagoya Kuala-Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

In year 1, "The SINBF Intercountry Project Inception, Planning, and Experience-Sharing Meeting" was held from August 14th to 15th, 2023, at Birchwood Hotel, OR Tambo Conference Centre in Johannesburg, back to back with "The ToT on Institutional and Administrative Systems". a total of 22 participants comprising 6 females and 16 males. Participants were from the Lead Executing Agency (RAEIN-Africa), the National Executing Agencies and other implementing stakeholder institutions of DRC, Madagascar and Namibia, the SINBF Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and UNEP. Speakers affirmed the SINBF project as an important milestone towards biodiversity conservation and promoting responsible biotechnology practices. The meeting emphasised the SINBF project's collaborative nature, where project partners have pooled resources to address common needs and gaps. The project was poised to bolster the foundations of environmental governance in the region, recognising the significance of joint efforts in fulfilling national obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB). The meeting also highlighted the strategic importance of biosafety issues within each country's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs), as well as other national policies and development plans. the meeting facilitated

	<p>discussions that established a common understanding of the SINBF project purpose, design and approach. the countries shared experiences on their national biosafety systems, and the Lead Executing Agent imparted some soft skills, specifically teamwork and communication. The Year 1 plan of action was then reviewed, updated and endorsed.</p> <p>Products—In preparation for each of these workshops, the SINBF TAC compiled materials for use in the training and for further reference as the project team implements the review of national biosafety regulatory regimes and bills, strengthens administrative and institutional arrangements of the NBFs, and carries out national capacity-building initiatives. The project tapped into resources available on the BCH and other sites as produced by the CBD secretariat and other Experts. In addition, the project produced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing and Implementing National Biosafety Frameworks, Training Manual (August 2023), a guiding document on establishing biosafety administrative and institutional systems to be adapted to national contexts in each participating country. The training products produced are : • Proceedings of the "Training of Trainers Workshop on the Establishment of Administrative and Institutional Structures for Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks" • Proceedings of the " Training of Trainers Workshop for Legal and Biosafety Experts on Drafting and Reviewing of Laws Aligning of the Provisions of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Kuala-Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress" • Report on "The Experience Sharing Webinar: Learning from African Countries with Operational Regulatory Regimes" <p>Due to delays in the commencement of year one activities caused by administrative challenges at the start of the SINBF, with the disbursement of funds, signing PCA (Madagascar), and constitution of the implementing teams, the Year 1 focus ended up being concentrated on equipping the national core teams on the specific thematic areas. Further capacity building activities at the national level were moved to year 2. In implementing capacity building activities at the national level, the TAC will also provide ongoing technical support to the national core teams as necessary.</p>
Main learning during the period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutionalization in each participating country is crucial for successfully executing an inter-country project. However, the process of institutionalisation is influenced by factors beyond the project's control, such as political context. Therefore, project planners and implementers must account for these external factors and develop adaptive strategies to navigate them effectively. • In the inception phases and early years of implementing national projects that require sustainable support from local governments, providing additional support by both external facilitators (UNEP and LEA) and national Champions (National Executing Agency and a self-driven National Coordinator) is often necessary. Engaging with high-level decision-makers and consistently reiterating the project's purpose, benefits, and needs are crucial. This persistence and focus on securing sustainable

	<p>support will ensure the project's success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building sustainable human capacity in an inter-country project requires an approach that includes several key strategies. The strategy of putting together a Technical Advisory Team that not only trains the national experts but continues to nurture them and handhold them as they review, establish and implement their national Biosafety systems is crucial. Cross-country exchanges and collaborative workshops engender knowledge sharing and the development of best practices, leveraging the diverse experiences and expertise within the project. Moreover, the clear communication channels that foster a culture of continuous lesson learning and adaptation are essential to address emerging challenges and incorporate new insights. • Soft skills development is vital within the SINBF approach, fostering efficient teamwork, communication, experience sharing, conflict resolution, and mutual learning.
--	--

2.9. Stories

Stories to be shared	Two stories are attached, one from the national coordinator of SNBF in Namibia and the other from the SINBF Project manager. More stories will be shared as more benefits from the -project are delivered (see attached stories)
-----------------------------	--

3 Performance

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
An effective project that is well-coordinated and delivers and meets agreed measurable outputs and outcomes.	Overall Project Performance Index (PPI) and stakeholder engagement satisfaction score To assess the project's effectiveness and stakeholder engagement, the measurable indicators to be used are: - the overall project performance index, including the milestone achievement rate, budget variance, and activity completion rate, provides an overall measure of the project's adherence to timelines, budget, and planned activities. The index is calculated by averaging the percentage of project milestones achieved on schedule, the degree to which the	no systems developed for the project	a 60% PPI and Stakeholder satisfaction score - functional project management and coordination system	Successful delivery of the project on schedule, within budget, and to the satisfaction of all stakeholders. (90% Project performance index and 80% stakeholder engagement satisfaction score)	35% stakeholder satisfaction score and 40% PPI	PCA agreements signed with all 3 countries. A project Management Unit established and functional, Project Steering Committee established and functional at the intercountry level, at the national level, project steering committee in place in Namibia, Project implementing Units established in all three countries, and Financial management systems in place and being used. Inception meetings were held, and stakeholders engaged in Namibia, DRFC and at the Intercountry level. The delayed start of the project led to some activities scheduled for year one being moved to year 2. A clean financial audit was achieved for year 1. Monitoring of project activities currently underway.	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
	<p>project stayed within budget (with zero variance being ideal), and the percentage of planned activities completed as scheduled.- the Stakeholder Engagement and Satisfaction score. This indicator measures the effectiveness of project communication, involvement, and the quality of deliverables as perceived by stakeholders. It combines the Stakeholder Satisfaction Score and Deliverable Quality Score obtained from surveys and evaluations to provide a comprehensive view of how well the project meets stakeholder expectations and delivers high-quality outcomes.</p>						
National biosafety policies and regulatory regimes in DRC, Madagascar and Namibia consistent with the CPB and	Number of biosafety laws reviewed & updated	1	1	1	10%	Namibian Biosafety Law has yet to be reviewed; however, gaps in the Act, for alignment with the CPB and supplementary protocol taking into consideration	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, cooperatively strengthened, mainstreamed into national systems to permit effective evaluation, management and monitoring of LMO(s) risks						emerging technologies, were identified. Draft Zero, stating the gaps identified was completed in year 1.	
	The number of biosafety bills updated	2	2	2	15%	Draft biosafety bills for DRC (2006 version) and Madagascar (2016 version) have been reviewed by the National Core Teams after the ToT training. Draft Versions 1 are ready for further updating for stakeholder inputs.	S
	Number of updated or new national plans	3	2	3	N/A	Activity schedule to commence in years 2	S
Biosafety institutional systems enhanced and strengthened for decision making	Guideline and technical documents, and capacities developed and in use	Namibia has some established systems established, DRC and Madagascar are yet to establish systems	Capacities in administrative and institutional systems established for national Core Teams and stakeholders.	Biosafety Institutional systems established and strengthened	15%	1 ToT training workshop on Institutional and administrative systems was held at intercountry level. Countries are yet to train in-country.	S
	Number of trained trainers in biosafety institutional and thematic areas Number of national core teams actively involved in capacity building on	Limited number of national experts training on biosafety institutional and thematic issues	National Core Teams actively capacitating mandated Institutions on Biosafety Institutional and	All three countries have a pool of trained personnel (National Core Teams) per thematic area) in each biosafety thematic area.	50%	Three National Core Teams (1 in each of the participating countries) trained in biosafety administrative and institutional systems.	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
	biosafety institutional and thematic issues		administrative management in each of the 3 participating countries	Each country has personnel trained on the thematic areas by the National Core Teams			
	<p>Number of institutions with mandates on biosafety implementation The number of functional inter-institutional committees on biosafety constituted</p> <p>Number of administrative procedures documented and published</p> <p>Number of simulations undertaken</p> <p>Number of decisions made on applications</p>	<p>Namibia has mandated institutions that are not fully implementing the NBF</p> <p>Madagascar biosafety institutions have no legal mandates</p> <p>DRC has no institutional framework for biosafety.</p>	<p>Biosafety mandated institutions in each of the participating countries should have representatives capacitated to train national stakeholders biosafety administrative and institutional systems and to lead of guide in the review of the administrative systems and in strengthening the biosafety</p>	<p>All countries have fully functional NBFs in place All participating countries have administrative structures in place.</p>	15%	Each of the Biosafety focal institutions in the three countries had representatives trained on administrative and institutional systems	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
	2 Number of technical tools and resources on RA & RM produced 2 Number of workshops on RA & RM Number of simulations on “real case” studies	2 Madagascar and Namibia have procedures for RA & RM Madagascar’s documents require approval & Namibia procedures require updating. In addition, COMESA has published Guidelines on Free Movement of People and Goods. DRC & Madagascar are members to COMESA	systems. 50% of the tools developed and disseminated	Training workshops on RA&RM implemented at intercountry and national level and each of the countries would have carried out Simulations of real handling of LMO applications including carrying out RA &RM.		activities scheduled for year 2 onwards	S
	2 Cooperatively developed guideline document on socio-economic considerations	2 Existing voluntary international guideline on socio-economic indicators RAEIN-Africa guideline on Socio-Economic considerations	Guideline document on socio-economic considerations national review processes	Each of the participating countries would have established a provision for socio-economic considerations in their national regulatory framework		Output to be achieved in Year 2	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
				aligning with the provisions of the CPB.			
	<p>Number of biosafety inspectors trained & certified</p> <p>Number of frontline personnel trained on the use of BCH for finding information to support decision-making</p> <p>Number of LMO testing facilities functional and meeting agreed standards</p> <p>Results from proficiency testing and lab audits</p> <p>Results from simulation of monitoring and enforcement systems</p>	<p>Limited number of uncertified inspectors, 4 functional laboratories (2 in Madagascar & 2 in DRC) from MCP-ICLT project and 1 in Namibia lab partially functional</p>	<p>All The three countries have capacitated and operational LMO testing laboratories,</p>	<p>a capacitate inspectorate monitoring LMOs and a functional enforcement system. in each of the participating countries.</p>		<p>output to be achieved in year 2 onwards</p>	S
	<p>Guidelines and Technical Tools Developed as per identified needs including a Monitoring Enforcement Guideline.</p> <p>Communication Strategy on PAEP developed</p> <p>Adoption and Application of Guidelines</p>	<p>Baseline targets: - Namibia and Madagascar: Align existing baseline documents with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, specifically regarding adaptation to</p>	<p>50% of the documents and technical guidelines tools developed, shared and in use at country level in reviewing and</p>	<p>Guidelines and technical documents adapted to national contexts</p> <p>Draft technical documents developed and shared</p>		<p>Outputs to be achieved in year 2 onwards</p>	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
	<p>and Tools at country level Technical Backstopping offered as per project need Experiences Lessons learnt, and Best Practices documented and shared</p>	<p>stacked or multiple events in genetically modified organisms (GMOs). - Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC): Develop specific guidelines for spatial arrangements in living modified organism (LMO) testing laboratories. - All countries: Consider the need for dedicated laws on liability and redress for biosafety issues and promote the use and integration of a voluntary guidance document on socioeconomic considerations into national frameworks.</p>	<p>strengthening of National biosafety systems.</p>				
	<p>Biosafety awareness levels, measured by surveys to</p>	<p>Madagascar</p>	<p>at least 50% of end of project</p>	<p>At least 4 peer-reviewed</p>	<p>15%</p>	<p>Both Namibia and DRC have carried out a number of awareness creation activities</p>	<p>S</p>

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
	gauge increased awareness of biosafety issues, and participation rate, measured through assessment of stakeholder participation in decision-making processes. Number of peer-reviewed publications on biosafety themes, publications on experiences and lessons learned on the development and implementation of NBFs, Systems for public education, awareness in place, participation and access to biosafety information reviewed and updated	ar and Namibia have some materials on PAEP & have implemented some public awareness creation activities ☐ DRC engaged with the public in the development of the bill	targets achieved	publications on biosafety themes ☐ Compilation of experiences and lessons learned on development of NBFs ☐ Systems for public education, awareness, participation and access to biosafety information reviewed and updated			
Effective project coordination and delivery, meeting agreed measurable outputs and indicators	Effective project coordination and delivery, meeting agreed measurable outputs and indicators Effectiveness and efficiency of project management	No systems developed yet	Systems for project management and operational coordination units in place	National systems for project implementation functional and strengthened	30%	Project Management Unit and National Task Teams set up. Technical Advisory Committee Formed, PCAs for national partners signed. Inception Workshop executed, all project reports for the reporting year prepared within the agreed timeline including Audits prepared	S

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
1 Biosafety Policy and Regulatory Regime	Output 1.1: Cooperation achieved to create capacity for review, update and alignment of biosafety law and policies, guided by the local context and in compliance with the CPB	2025-06-30	0%	80%	SINBF TAC established and serving the project partners, TOT workshop implemented and virtual experience sharing workshop implemented	S
	Output 1.2: Biosafety Governance regimes are improved and aligned with the CPB and Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, legally mandated	2026-06-30	0%	25%	Due to administrative hurdles, Madagascar signed the PCA late, which led to a delay in the first disbursement of funds. As a result, the project began fully only at the end of the first quarter, causing some activities to be delayed. The project successfully capacitated national Core teams, who played a crucial role in implementing the project. The three countries have started reviewing their regulatory regimes, with DRC and Madagascar having produced Draft 1 of the reviewed bills, and Namibia identifying the gaps and submitting a Draft Zero. Namibia and DRC carried out some awareness creation lobbying for stakeholder participation in the review process. Major consultation processes will take place in year 2. The delays led to none of the countries implementing in-country training after the intercountry TOT. All National implementing Teams are participating in the in-country planning	S

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
					process on reviewing and mainstreaming biodiversity issues across all the NBSAPS with national strategies and plans. Thus, ensuring alignment of the yet-to-be-reviewed laws and bills with the NBSAPs.	
	Output 1.3 Biosafety mainstreamed into relevant national sustainable development policies and strategies, including NBSAPs and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF)	2026-06-30	0%	15%	The project raised awareness at various levels about the need to ensure that as countries develop/ review their biosafety regulatory regimes, they take into cognizance the need to mainstream them with the NBSAPs	S
2 Project Administration, Monitoring and Evaluation	Output 3.1: Systems and structure for project coordination and management established	2027-06-30	0%	60%	Established Project implementing units at Inter-country and national levels, developed a comprehensive financial management system implemented two planning meetings and 1 review meeting and three inception meetings (at inter-country, in Namibia and in DRC)	S
	Output 3.2: Lessons learnt, and M&E framework institutionalized and operationalized for purposes of continuity beyond the Project	2027-06-30	0%	20%	the M&E is being implemented for purposes of accountability and assessment of project, the project continue to implement adaptive management, identifying project risks and strategising on mitigatory actions to ensure project remain on track. Mid term review is to be implemented end of year 2	S
	Output 2.1: Capacity of selected national experts on implementation	2026-06-30	0%	25%	In the first year, the focus was	S

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
	of biosafety institutional setups and on biosafety thematic areas cooperatively enhanced				onsetting up project systems and ensuring the functioning of structures and review processes. Capacity building activities for implementing national biosafety regulatory frameworks will become more intense from the second year onwards. In the first year, an administrative and institutional Training of Trainers' workshop was held, equipping three national core teams with the necessary skills and knowledge to establish, capacitate and or support institutional and administrative systems for implementing national biosafety legislation.	
	Output 2.2: National biosafety administrative systems strengthened with training and technical assistance to review and update processes and systems for implementation of national biosafety considerations	2026-06-30	0%	25%	Across the three countries awareness creation on the need for a national implementing structure for handling requests and decision-making process on biosafety & capacity building of such structures will be implemented in year 2 national training workshops on the theme have not yet been implemented and were postponed to the second year	5
	Output 2.3: Biosafety risk assessment and risk management systems strengthened with technical support to provide data for informed decision making	2026-06-30	0%	0%	activities scheduled for year 2, year 3 and year 4	
	Output 2.4: National Biosafety systems supported with capacity to develop and strengthen national guidelines on biosafety socioeconomic considerations	2026-06-30	0%	0%	Activities scheduled for year 2, year 3	

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
	Output 2.5: National biosafety systems provided with technical support to develop and/or strengthen monitoring and enforcement systems for follow-up	2026-06-30	0%	0%	Activities scheduled for year 2, year 3, year 4	
	Output 2.6: Tools and guidelines on RA&RM; handling and review of applications; socio economic considerations and public participation cooperatively developed for adaptation to national contexts	2026-06-30	0%	0%	Activities scheduled for year 2	
	Output 2.7: Capacities and systems on biosafety communication for public information, public awareness and public participation strengthened through provision of communication products and services and support mobilised through participation in key forums to influence sound management of LMOs in SADC and COMESA	2027-06-30	0%	20%	The project raised awareness at various levels about the need to align biosafety regulations with international agreements. This was achieved through activities at regional meetings, workshops, and webinars. Namibia and the DRC organized multiple stakeholder meetings to emphasize the importance of reviewing regulatory frameworks and biosafety bills. Further activities to enhance implementing partners' capacity to communicate science effectively and create awareness are planned for year 2.	S

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

4 Risks

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the Risk Help Sheet for more details on rating

Risk Factor	EA Rating	TM Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low	Low
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Low	Low
3 Implementation schedule	Low	Low
4 Budget	Low	Low
5 Financial Management	Low	Low
6 Reporting	Low	Low
7 Capacity to deliver	Low	Low

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in Table B below

4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
Communication	All outcomes/outputs	M	L						↓	Adequate Budgetary allocation and translation/interpretation resources made available translation of documents and facilitation of

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
										meetings
Low institutional capacity to manage handling of LMOs in sub-region	Outcome 2: National mandated institutions and stakeholders take measures to strengthen implementation compliance and enforcement of updated national biosafety frameworks	M	M							
Due to climate change impacts. public perception towards LMOs may change. especially if LMOs perform better under climate change conditions	Outcome 2: National mandated institutions and stakeholders take measures to strengthen implementation compliance and enforcement of updated national biosafety frameworks Output 1.3: Biosafety mainstreamed into relevant national sustainable development policies and strategies. including NBSAPs and the KM GBF	L	L						=	
An outbreak of diseases (e.g. Covid-19)	All Outcomes	M	L						↓	Due to the time lapse since the COVID19 lockdowns. there are no eminent threats
Slow administrative and political response to biosafety issues	Outcomes 1&2: National	H	S							High-level awareness creation was carried in both Madagascar & DRC. and a strategy put in place for champions to continue creating awareness and advocating for prioritisation of biosafety
Inadequate mechanisms for institutional coordination in the management of	Outcome 2: National	M	M							

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
biosafety										
		L	L						=	

4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

Additional mitigation measures for the next periods

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
Low institutional capacity to manage handling of LMOs in sub-region	N/A	A training of trainers workshop for strengthening national core teams on the establishment of administrative & institutional frameworks for implementation of NBFs was implemented	The national core teams will train in-country stakeholders to achieve a multiplier effect on capacity building & to raise awareness on the importance of effective inter-institutional coordination for biosafety implementation	Throughout the project cycle	National Core Teams supported by PMU (LEA) and the Technical Advisory Committee
Communication	N/A	Adequate Budgetary allocation and translation/interpretation resources made available translation of documents and facilitation of meetings	Continuous provision of translation and interpretation services and technical support in French and English	Throughout the project cycle	PMU (LEA) and the Technical Advisory Committee (Cameroonian & Malagasy TAC Members)
Inadequate mechanisms for	N/A	Project Management Units	Continuous skills training in	Throughout the project	PMU (LEA), Technical

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
institutional coordination in the management of biosafety		have been set up in all three countries, National Core Teams/Task Forces have been set up to be supported by ty the Technical Advisory Committee	coordination, negotiations and Project management will be provided	cycle	Advisory Committee and the UNEP Task Manager
Slow administrative and political response to biosafety issues	N/A	The project raised awareness at various levels on the need to align biosafety regulations with international agreements. This included 1) The UNEP Task manager and the Project Manager from the LEA engaging with high-level decision-makers. in all three countries to emphasize the need for administrative Political support and 2) activities at regional meetings. workshops. and webinars to consistently reiterate the project's purpose and benefits. and the importance of political buy-in. and 3) activities by the National Core Teams to	Raising awareness at various levels about the need to align biosafety regulations with the CPB and other relevant international agreements	Throughout the project cycle	National Core Teams supported by relevant in-country stakeholders

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
		raise awareness among relevant stakeholders and identify champions who will advocate for policy and legal reviews			

High Risk (H): There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks. Significant Risk (S): There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks. Moderate Risk (M): There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks. Low Risk (L): There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

5 Amendment - GeoSpatial

Project Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines. Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate

5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

Minor Amendments	Changes
Results Framework:	No
Components and Cost:	No
Institutional and implementation arrangements:	No
Financial Management:	No
Implementation Schedule:	
Executing Entity:	No
Executing Entity Category:	No
Minor project objective change:	No
Safeguards:	No
Risk analysis:	No
Increase of GEF financing up to 5%:	No
Location of project activity:	No
Other:	No

Minor amendments

5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision

GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as OpenStreetMap or GeoNames use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking here

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GEO Name ID	Location Description	Activity Description
DRC-Ministry of Environment and sustainable Development	-4.3234	15.3072	2314302	National Executing Agent Office	National Executing Agent of the SINBF
Madagascar- Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	-18.8792	47.5079	1070940	National Executing Agent Office	National Executing Agent of the SINBF
Namibia - National Commission on Research. Science and Technology	-22.565726	17.074506	3352136	National Executing Agent Office	National Executing Agent of the SINBF
Regional Agricultural and Environmental Innovations Africa (RAEIN-Africa)	-25.78443	28.27561	7870446	Lead Execution Agency	

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. *

[Annex any linked geospatial file]

Additional Supporting Documents:

Filename	File Uploaded By	File Uploaded At	
SINBF - Story telling Namibia.docx	BDLD TM	2024-09-12 11:23:24	<u>Download</u>
SINBF ToT Workshop on Legal Regimes_Proceedings_April2024.pdf	Executing Agency	2024-08-06 09:24:42	<u>Download</u>
SINBF_Report on the ToT Workshop on Admin Institution structures_Final.pdf	Executing Agency	2024-07-31 12:19:19	<u>Download</u>
SINBF Intercountry Project Inception & planning meeting report_August2023.pdf	Executing Agency	2024-07-31 12:19:19	<u>Download</u>
SINBF Inception Phase Report. final submitted to UNEP.pdf	Executing Agency	2024-07-31 12:19:19	<u>Download</u>
LEA story on Strengthening Biosafety Across Borders.docx	Executing Agency	2024-07-31 12:19:19	<u>Download</u>