

## Strengthening the Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Southern Africa (SINBF)

### Part I: Project Information

**GEF ID**

10584

**Project Type**

FSP

**Type of Trust Fund**

GET

**CBIT/NGI**

☐ CBIT

☐ NGI

**Project Title**

Strengthening the Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Southern Africa (SINBF)

**Countries**

Regional, Congo DR, Madagascar, Namibia

**Agency(ies)**

UNEP

**Other Executing Partner(s)**

**Executing Partner Type**

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 Government National Commission on Research, Science and Technology of Namibia (NCRST), NAMIBIA)

#### **GEF Focal Area**

Biodiversity

#### **Taxonomy**

Focal Areas, Influencing models, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Demonstrate innovative approach, Stakeholders, Private Sector, Communications, Indigenous Peoples, Beneficiaries, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Non-Governmental Organization, Trade Unions and Workers Unions, Academia, Local Communities, Type of Engagement, Partnership, Information Dissemination, Consultation, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Participation and leadership, Access to benefits and services, Awareness Raising, Capacity Development, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Gender Mainstreaming, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Gender-sensitive indicators, Women groups, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Innovation, Knowledge Generation, Knowledge Exchange, Targeted Research, Learning, Theory of change

#### **Rio Markers**

##### **Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

##### **Climate Change Adaptation**

Climate Change Adaptation 0

#### **Duration**

48 In Months

#### **Agency Fee(\$)**

271,547.00

#### **Submission Date**

3/23/2020

A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-3-8	GET	2,858,390.00	9,000,000.00
	Total Project Cost (\$)	2,858,390.00	9,000,000.00

## B. Indicative Project description summary

### Project Objective

To strengthen institutional, human and regulatory capacities and promote cooperative measures in the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in the Participating Southern African countries.

Project Component	Financing Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
I. Institutional Capacities and Human Resource base for Biosafety Implementation	Technical Assistance	1. Joint-country and National Biosafety Institutional and decision-making capacities strengthened	1.1 Institutions, Biosafety expertise, technical tools and resources on Risk Assessment/Risk Management, Monitoring and Enforcement including harmonized inspection and transit measures, and port handling systems strengthened for national biosafety decision-making.	GET	1,100,000.00	3,000,000.00

II. Biosafety Regulatory Regimes and Policy	2a. National Biosafety Policy and regulatory Environments updated and aligned with the CPB and mainstreamed into National Biodiversity Strategies & Action Plans (NBSAPs)		2.1 Ten Year Strategic plans and policies addressing identified national needs, gaps, and opportunities for biosafety developed and integrated into NBSAPs and related national policies including resource mobilization.	GET	1,210,000.00	4,500,000.00
	2b. Cooperative measures and intercountry experience sharing, uptake, and use of monitoring and enforcement measures in the transboundary movement and handling of Living Modified Organisms in the participating countries strengthened.		2.2 Reviewed/ updated and operational national biosafety regulatory and harmonized administrative systems reflecting national policies and defining all other NBF components in compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.			
III. Project Monitoring and Evaluation	Technical Assistance	3. Effective Project Coordination and delivery meeting agreed on measurable outputs and indicators	3.1 A comprehensive project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework developed and implemented drawing on best practices and lessons learned.  3.2 Mid-Term/Terminal Evaluation.	GET	412,390.00	500,000.00
Sub Total (\$)					2,722,390.00	8,000,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
GET					136,000.00	1,000,000.00
Sub Total(\$)					136,000.00	1,000,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)					2,858,390.00	9,000,000.00

**C. Indicative sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type**

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	National Commission on Research, Science and Technology, Namibia	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	National Commission on Research, Science and Technology, Namibia	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Democratic Republic of Congo	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Democratic Republic of Congo	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Madagascar	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	300,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Madagascar	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,200,000.00
Others	RAEIN-Africa	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	300,000.00
Others	RAEIN-Africa	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
GEF Agency	UNEP	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	200,000.00
			<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>	<b>9,000,000.00</b>

**Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified**

Not Applicable

D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	Namibia	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	1,100,000	104,500	1,204,500.00
UNEP	GET	Madagascar	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	798,390	75,847	874,237.00
UNEP	GET	Congo DR	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	960,000	91,200	1,051,200.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					2,858,390.00	271,547.00	3,129,937.00

E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)  
PPG Required



PPG Amount (\$)				PPG Agency Fee (\$)			
93,490				8,882			
Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	Namibia	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	30,000	2,850	32,850.00
UNEP	GET	Madagascar	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	23,490	2,232	25,722.00
UNEP	GET	Congo DR	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	40,000	3,800	43,800.00
Total Project Costs(\$)					93,490.00	8,882.00	102,372.00



## Core Indicators

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	1,000			
Male	2,000			
Total	3000	0	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

The proposed project interventions will contribute to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as outlined under Focal Area Programming Direction BD 3-8. This will ensure tools, interventions, and capacity is installed to support science-based decision-making in the sustainable utilization of biodiversity through modern biotechnology. The results and deliverables shall contribute to Aichi Targets 13 and 14 through safeguarding biodiversity, managing genetic resources and related benefits through sound science risk assessment, pre and post-approval monitoring measures, and engagement with the end-users of genetic resources.

## Part II. Project Justification

### 1a. Project Description

#### 1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes, and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)

The earth's biological resources are vital for maintaining and sustaining food security, economic development, and health. The recognition of the importance of biological diversity as a global asset of tremendous importance for the present and the future is indisputable. The Southern African region has one of the highest levels of biodiversity in the world. Southern Africa has eight centers of plant diversity (hotspots; UNEP, 2008 ). This high level of diversity is because of the broad range of climates, geological, soil, and landscape forms found in the region. However, many species and ecosystems are under threat of extinction.

The sustainable development goals hold the promise of a fresh start for the planet and set out that global food production must increase by 70% by 2050. At a global level, there is the recognition that modern technologies can contribute to achieving this objective. Considering increased food insecurity, growing population, climate change, and socio-economic shocks and stresses, products of modern biotechnology including Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) are considered an attractive source of effective innovations (Roberts, 2018). Over 185 million hectares, across 30 countries scattered over the whole world, was under GM crops in 2016. About 70% of Southern Africa's population survives on agriculture for food, income, and employment. Countries in the region can benefit from technology for the improvement of crop performance and tolerance to both abiotic and biotic stresses. The need for food and germplasm for planting leads to transboundary movement of genetic materials, which in normal agricultural practices and trade requires the development of procedures to ensure safe transfer, handling, and use of the new germplasm.

Transboundary movement of seed, through trade and informal exchanges, is extensive across the region. To facilitate harmony in the management and trade of planting materials in Southern Africa, the region developed and implemented the 'SADC Harmonized Seed Regulatory System'. The SADC harmonized seed system is silent on the transboundary movement of LMOs. Thus, in pursuit of improvement of agricultural production, the region is the first on the African continent to have one of its member states (South Africa) introduce LMOs for food security and livelihood enhancement. Eswatini is currently undertaking field trials of Bt Corn. Despite the positive promises, balancing technological development while ensuring biodiversity conservation is a recognized global challenge.

Concerns regarding the possible adverse effects of the LMOs on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity led to the adoption of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The proposed project is focused on managing possible modern biotechnology threats to the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity in participating countries. Participating countries are Madagascar, Namibia, and DRC. The potential modern biotechnology threats are centered on regional, political, and economic agendas, the transboundary nature of vulnerable ecosystems in the region. The high fragility of the region's ecosystem is compounded by threats to biodiversity from the intensification of production systems, increased climatic variability, and increasing population densities. Contributing to this vulnerability are commercial agricultural practices and frequent encroachment into forest areas. Whilst some of the participating countries have developed NBFs to address the threat of biodiversity loss, these need to be

fully operationalized with additional institutional capacity for the different streams of Biosafety interventions. The root causes for this are mainly: (i) Inadequate human and institutional capacity and resources of national systems to assist in developing and/or implementing of the biosafety regulatory regimes, (ii) Lack of fully functional technical, administrative and institutional frameworks supported by law; (iii) Lack of awareness across the relevant biosafety institutions and all the levels of decision-makers and users of the technology; (iv) Limited sharing of best practices, leading to disjointed efforts which in many cases lack sufficient technical guidance; (v) Limited collaboration in the development of tools and guidance for the decision making processes; and (vi) limited engagement across countries in the region to catalyze the development and implementation of biosafety regulatory frameworks.

Barriers to the implementation of NBFs and/or development of NBFs are what guide the proposed project. These include:

A. Inadequate human and institutional capacity and resources of national systems to assist in developing and/or implementing of the biosafety regulatory regimes

A functional biosafety framework relies on an institutional and administrative framework that is able to accept and review applications, have an established framework for scientifically assessing potential risks, recommend risk management practices with clearly defined permit conditions that allow for pre- and post-approval monitoring for compliance and enforcement in the decision-making process which is supported by a clearly defined regulatory framework. The absence of a coordinating mechanism that allows relevant stakeholder inputs also tend to affect the “buy-in” and vigor with which decisions are accepted by end-users. Aside from Namibia which has a National Biosafety Council in place with a single-window for issuance of decisions, DRC and Madagascar have only “interim” measures without a functional law to guide decision making. All three countries are yet to undertake confined field trials which tend to give hands-on experience in managing limited releases to the environment as this tends to help test tools developed. Namibia has however handled applications for food, feed, and processing and will act as a good peer in the thematic harmonization process. Namibia envisages potential applications for confined field trials and will need to update its capacity.

B. Lack of functional technical, administrative, and institutional frameworks supported by law

The Democratic Republic of Congo is among the countries which did not have the opportunity to implement the national biosafety framework. The draft Framework will need to be updated and operationalized through an implementation project especially as the technology has developed. Madagascar on the other hand has a draft framework that needs to be reviewed, approved, according to prevailing national legislation framework and supported by law with implementation regulations and technical guidelines to operationalize the framework in line with the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Namibia on the other hand has a Biosafety Act of 2006 which needs to be reviewed and updated due to new trends in Biosafety, the Act also needs technical guidelines and new regulations to allow for review and decision making on multi-event/trait applications, field trials, and potential releases into the environment. The Draft Biosafety Laws of DRC and Madagascar needs to be finalized and translated into a Biosafety Law. The laws also need further regulations to operationalize the handling of applications for field trials and commercialization. Operationalization, mentoring, and sharing of experience will create good entry points for harmonization and development of model regulations and technical tools which can be replicated and taken on board as cases of interest by Regional Economic Communities including COMESA (Congo D.R. and Madagascar are member States) and SADC (Namibia, Congo D. R., and Madagascar are member States). All three countries do not have operational regulations on Liability and Redress. The regulatory instruments developed will support pre- and post-approval measures to support biosafety decision making on field trials and deliberate release in the environment.

C. Lack of awareness across the relevant biosafety institutions and all the levels of decision-makers and users of the technology

Even though the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is a transboundary instrument, interventions are mainly Party based because Africa as a region is not a Regional Party. This has led to very little awareness of what is happening among countries in the same region or Economic blocks. The relevant biosafety institutions have no medium to cooperate, share experience, and best practices to support decision-makers or to give regulatory guidance to end-users of the

technology. This barrier has also led to limited dialogue at the regional level for cooperation and/or harmonization of technical tools and guided lines for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This limited inertia has led to unscientific barriers to movements of LMOs and trade barriers mainly due to lack of knowledge through limited technical and scientific cooperation among countries.

D. Limited collaborative tools and guidance to support engagement at the joint-country level to catalyze the implementation of biosafety regulatory frameworks

Whilst there are policy instruments on harmonization of biosafety practices at the Africa regional level through the African Union (AU) Biosafety Policy, Biosafety Strategy, and the Model Biosafety law, there are limited efforts at the sub-regional level through the Regional Economic Communities as envisaged by the AU Biosafety Strategy. The AU and the Regional Economic Communities referenced are only able to provide soft guidance to support the harmonization and implementation of Biosafety regulatory frameworks. The absence of model regulations, procedures, guidelines, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and Toolkits has impacted negatively on the quest of State Parties to develop, harmonize and implement the transboundary measures to support the biosafety regulatory process. The absence of monitoring and compliance tools to guide decision making impacts negatively at the borders where the transboundary movement of Living Modified Organisms are likely to occur.

The envisaged project interventions will provide outputs and eventual outcomes that will ultimately contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of Biological Diversity by strengthening coordination of the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in the safe use, transport, and handling of Living Modified Organisms.

The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects

Policy & Legal scenarios

The political and legal will to ensure conservation and sustainable use of Biodiversity is entrenched in the Constitution and the Environment Protection Law (No. 009/2011) and the draft Biosafety Bill in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The Environmental Protection Law has chapter Six dedicated to the Biosafety and highlights obligations in Articles 62 – 65 under section 5 on biosafety measures. The law does not deal directly with biosafety, but chapter 6 gives some basic legal guidelines for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms in the Democratic Republic of Congo until the draft Biosafety Bill developed by the Government is passed by Parliament as a Biosafety Act and promulgated by the President of the Republic. There is therefore the need to get the Biosafety bill and its supporting implementing regulations passed to facilitate the implementation of the National Biosafety Framework.

All three countries have provisions made in the NBSAP which needs to be reviewed and updated. In the case of Namibia, there is a Biotechnology Policy which has specific provisions and actions to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

Madagascar has also developed a draft biosafety Bill and draft instruments on risk assessment and risk management. The country is yet to develop implementing regulations and technical guidelines to support decision making. Public awareness has been initiated but further work to engage relevant stakeholders including women, youth is needed to assist in operationalizing the Malagasy framework including Decree no. 2018-397.

Namibia through both national, bilateral, and GEF support developed a Biosafety Act in 2006. The law currently needs to be reviewed and updated. There is a need for additional implementing regulations including Liability and Redress, operating guidelines, and toolkits to make the framework fully functional.

The three countries do not have liability and redress provisions or specific biosafety measures to support transit, border, and port handling of shipments or consignments containing Living Modified Organisms. It is a key area where the countries can share expertise and experience in institutional capacity building. The GEF support can be harnessed in the delivery of these interventions which will ensure that each introduction of an LMO has regulatory, technical,

and cooperative measures to assist in Biosafety Decision making.

#### Institutional Scenario

Namibia has a National Biosafety Council under the National Commission on Research, Science and Technology with a supportive Biosafety Act 2006, Madagascar and the Democratic Republic of Congo have interim measures under the umbrella national laws on Environment Management and temporary national biosafety committees without the institutional framework to be fully operational. All countries are yet to fully train and capacitate experts and designated Biosafety regulatory officials to support national Biosafety decision-makers especially on risk assessment/risk management, monitoring, inspection, and enforcement at the Borders, the marketplace, and deliberate releases to the environment.

Without GEF support and looking at the number of years from ratification in 2003 to date, the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol will be greatly slowed down whilst activities on modern biotechnology in the region is going at a fast pace. The countries will in such a scenario raise unscientific reasons as barriers to making decisions on transboundary movement of Living Modified Organisms irrespective of SADC or COMESA policies on the movement of goods and services.

Entry into Force of the Protocol on the 11th of September 2003 meant that it is legally binding internationally and in the legal systems of all Parties to the Protocol. Parties are obliged to comply with and implement all provisions of the Protocol since the Protocol is a “no reservation” Protocol. Furthermore, the CPB Article 14 paragraph 1 states that “Parties may enter into bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs, consistent with the objectives of the Protocol and provided that such agreements and arrangements do not result in the lower level of protection than provided for by the Protocol”. To implement the provisions of the CPB efficiently, and abide by its general provision as provided for in the Protocol objective, countries have to develop a biotechnology/ biosafety policy/ or strategy, have a regulatory regime, a system of handling applications including decision making, mechanisms for public awareness, education and participation and follow-up systems, including compliance monitoring and enforcement. All countries in the Southern African region are party to both the CBD and the CPB. All countries in the region are therefore obligated to develop and implement NBFs in line with the provisions of the Protocol. The proposed project is related to ongoing and/or just concluded UNEP/GEF projects on implementation of national biosafety frameworks in the Southern Africa Region.; the Biosafety Clearing-House project Phase III in which DRC and Namibia are participants, and the Multi-Country Project on Institutional Capacity on LMO testing to strengthen biosafety decision-makers (MCP- ICLT) in which six countries (Angola, DRC, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, and Mozambique) are participating. The MCP-ICLT focuses on building capacity on LMO testing and strengthening science-based decision-making systems. Due to the overlap between the two projects, the proposed project does not allocate resources to laboratory infrastructure capacity building in the MCP-ICLT countries (Madagascar and DRC). Apart from the harmonization of LMO testing protocols across the participating countries, additional LMO testing capacity building activities in the proposed project will be allocated to Namibia.

The Participating countries are at different levels of development and/or implementation of the NBFs and can be clustered as follows:

- Countries with biosafety/ biotechnology policy/ strategic focus, accompanying regulatory regime and varied levels of systems for decision making, public awareness, education and participation, and compliance monitoring and enforcement. Countries in this cluster include Eswatini, Malawi, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.
- Countries that have drafted their National Biosafety Frameworks that may need to be updated and translated into fully operational frameworks to provide a functional base for the management of safe use and transboundary movement of LMOs. Some of these countries are yet to develop supporting implementing regulations. In this group is the Botswana, Democratic Republic of Congo, Lesotho, Madagascar, and Mozambique.

For countries that do not have legal instruments to guide the implementation of the NBFs, interim measures are used to facilitate the safe transboundary movement of LMOs. The laws currently used include Environmental Protection Laws, NBSAPs in the case of Madagascar and DRC. Both countries have developed draft Biosafety Laws which need to be finalized and promulgated into National Biosafety Laws to support Biosafety Decision making.

The Regional Agricultural and Environmental Innovations Network - Africa (RAEIN-Africa) was instrumental in assisting countries in the SADC region to develop the capacity for implementing NBFs. RAEIN-Africa is the Lead Executing Agency (LEA) of the MCP-ICLT. There have been several interventions by both the UN and other development agencies and Governments to support biosafety capacity building at national levels.

These include

- i. The UNEP-GEF Global Umbrella Project on “Development of National Biosafety Frameworks” – Madagascar and the Democratic Republic of Congo developed their Draft National Biosafety Frameworks in 2004 and 2007 respectively.
- ii. Implementation of National Biosafety Framework for Madagascar – 2017. Further efforts are needed on supplementary regulatory instruments and institutional capacity on thematic issues including Risk Assessment, Monitoring and Enforcement, Border controls, and Transit measures
- iii. Implementation of Biosafety Act 2006 – 2017. The National Biosafety Council, through its program of work, is attempting to develop additional regulatory and technical instruments to support decision-making at a limited pace as a national intervention. Further interventions are needed on review, update the policy and regulatory framework with supplementary regulations and issue-specific interventions for field trials and environmental releases including Risk Assessment, Monitoring, and Enforcement
- iv. The UNEP-GEF Biosafety Clearing House Phase III Project – Democratic Republic of Congo and Namibia - - the Project is ongoing
- v. The Multi-Country Project on Institutional Capacity on LMO testing to strengthen biosafety decision-makers (MCP- ICLT) in which six of countries (Angola, DRC, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, and Mozambique)

In addition to these efforts, the need to develop and implement a long-term strategic framework for capacity building beyond 2020 was decided on at the last COP14/MOP9 meeting in Egypt. Cooperative measures in the development and implementation of NBFs is increasingly becoming a strategic priority. It allows for countries to go beyond their national boundaries in their implementation of NBFs and is in line with the GEF 7 Focal Area strategy on Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

The proposed project will also contribute to ongoing work on the COMESA biotechnology/ biosafety regional policy and the Draft SADC Policy on transboundary movements for Living Modified Organisms. It will create a platform for assessment and testing of the process and lessons learned in both the development and implementation to date of the COMESA and SADC biotechnology/Biosafety policy.

3) The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project;

As stated above, the countries are at different levels of development and implementation of the NBFs. There are generally some common threats to all the three project countries namely transboundary handling and movement of Living Modified Organisms. In addition, Madagascar and Namibia must deal with transit-related issues in the handling of LMOs at the ports. Thus, a good case can be made for a thematic and joint-country project to promote the cooperative and technical implementation of NBFs, shared expertise and resources in the transboundary management of Living Modified Organism and to avoid duplication of efforts, build synergies, enhance efficiency and cost-effectiveness through shared expertise and resources whilst providing lessons and best practices for potential uptake by other countries in the region and the Regional Economic Communities. This approach can act as a catalyst for the countries

that are yet to finalize the development and implementation of their NBFs. To cater to the different national needs, participating countries will retain the national specific responsibilities while cooperating with other countries through a cooperative agreement or providing tools for uptake by the Regional Economic Communities as pilots for upscaling.

#### Project Components

Impact- Sustainable conservation and Safe use of biological diversity, through improved management of modern biotechnology.

Intermediate State: Strengthened institutional, human and regulatory biosafety capacities of the participating countries promoting mainstreamed measures in the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks

#### Project Objectives:

The project seeks to strengthen institutional, human and regulatory capacities and promote cooperative measures in the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in the Participating Southern African countries

The proposed project comprises of national and joint-country activities. Both national and specific joint activities will be guided by the results of the stocktaking process during the PPG and aligned with the project components as stated in this proposal. This proposal is based on the current NBF status and gaps as identified by the National Biosafety Authorities who have been consulted in three different meetings; in Mexico at a side meeting to the COP-MOP8, a Regional Agricultural Environmental Innovations - Africa (RAEIN-Africa) training workshop on proposal writing held in October 2018 in Pretoria, and a meeting of the Biosafety Authorities held at COP-MOP9 in Egypt. Additionally, RAEIN-Africa in its implementation of the MCP-ICLT project consulted its partners. Parties were also invited to submit their priority areas for intervention. The compilation of the proposal is guided by the set of identified common and the specific national needs to support pre- and post-approval handling of LMOs. The inputs into the project in terms of the resources pooled together to implement the project is proportionate to the ratio of national versus just country needs to be guided by the common areas for thematic interventions. In that regard, all the three countries exhibited a strong need and desire to strengthen the thematic and regulatory processes to support pre- and post-approval management of LMOs through interventions including strengthened risk assessment and risk management systems, handling and transport of LMOs, inspection procedures, and transboundary procedures including transit measures and port management of Living Modified Organisms with technically sound Standard Operating Procedures and guidelines.

Generally, at the national level, the project will aim to operationalize NBFs in line with the five components as per the CPB provisions and the UNEP Tool kits for Developing and Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks and strengthen biosafety/biotechnology capacity. Project activities to be implemented will include the development/ review/update of the NBFs and associated supporting systems for handling applications and requests, including national decision making. The joint-country component will have the responsibility to facilitate the strengthening institutional capacities and human resource base for biosafety implementation, including developing and implementing modalities for cooperation, identification and strengthening of national centers of excellence, establishing an inter-country biosafety advisory panel, facilitating a common and/or harmonized application system/formats, building capacity for scientific risk assessment reviews including developing common approaches technical documents, training manuals and technical tools for risk assessment and risk management, monitoring and enforcement including Pre- and Post- approval measures on LMOs, developing methodologies for biosafety data gathering and sharing (data portability), develop model subsidiary legislations, guidelines and/or toolkits.

The proposed project is conceptualized as per the Theory of Change elaborated in Annex 1.

The proposed project has three components:

## PROJECT COMPONENT I –INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND HUMAN RESOURCE BASE FOR BIOSAFETY IMPLEMENTATION.

### Outcome 1: Joint-country and national biosafety institutional and biosafety decision-making capacities strengthened

Institutions with a multi-disciplinary cadre of trained personnel and technical support mechanisms that combine both national and regional biosafety implementation capacities and a widely accessed information resource base.

Human and institutional capacity building is a crucial component of the project. National regulatory systems should consider the cross-cutting nature of modern biotechnology, navigating the complex and interconnected issues of scientific, economic, social, and environmental significance. Thus, biosafety chain actors, including regulatory and scientific institutions, need the adequate human and institutional capacity that is relevant for making informed decisions on pertinent biotechnological and biosafety issues. The participating countries have some common capacity needs and gaps. Capacity building will be focused mainly on common and thematic biosafety across the three countries. The training areas will be on institutional capacity development and utilization of technical tools and resources on risk assessment/risk management, Monitoring and enforcement, transit measures, port handling and LMO Testing to allow for review and decision making on different events, identification and strengthening of centers of excellence, strengthening of the BCH mechanisms, Developing capacity on issues that can enhance the review and/or updating and mainstreaming of biosafety frameworks into national development plans, practical measures and approaches for integrated implementation of the CPB and the CBD at national level, technical issues on strengthening risk assessment and risk management and decision making and on practical implementation of NBFs (administrative structures, decision making structures, LMO identification and standards, sampling testing and identification of LMOs, public awareness and education), awareness creation and sharing of experiences on the Nagoya - Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

Capacity-building activities will be need driven and decisions on those that will be national and/or joint-country will be made by the stocktaking. At the Project Preparation stage, a matrix will be developed segregating national and joint-country activities guided by the main theme of focusing on common needs and gaps. For all common gaps and needs, capacity building will be implemented at the joint-country and national level for incremental reasons. The project will adopt a Train the Trainer (TOT) approach to allow for a multiplier effect at national levels. At the joint-country level, the project will train national teams that will in turn train in-country. Where there is a clearly defined and legally established Biosafety Administrative system, the capacity building will be channeled and mainstreamed into the operational activities of the institutions. Country interventions will be guided by the stocktaking results on the specific and common issues that they would require capacity development on. For purposes of sharing best practices, capacity building on compliance monitoring and enforcement will be held and train the trainer approach used in training the inspectors. To ease the monitoring and compliance, the project will endeavor to develop common (or a shared understanding of) LMO testing protocols and application formats.

The expected outputs of this component are:

1.1 Institutions, Biosafety expertise, technical tools and resources on Risk Assessment/Risk Management, Monitoring and Enforcement including harmonized inspection and transit measures, and port handling systems strengthened for national biosafety decision-making.

## PROJECT COMPONENT II - BIOSAFETY REGULATORY REGIMES AND POLICY

### Outcome 2



## Outcome 2a. National Biosafety Policy and regulatory Environments updated and aligned with the CPB and mainstreamed into National Biodiversity Strategies & Action Plans (NBSAPs)

Biosafety Governance regimes are put in place/ improved and aligned with the CPB.

An extensive situational analysis will be carried out to capture the main national needs on biosafety, including data on sectoral policies (existing instruments/ practices), with relation to biosafety and the integration of biosafety across the sectors including the NBSAPs, data on the stakeholder base which will be disaggregated guided both by existing expertise/knowledge base and gender, on possible entry points for capacity building that promote shared ownership, possible entry points for participation, required expertise, review of the biosafety/ biotechnology policies in light of the advancement in the CPB and emerging technologies, identifying common biosafety related issues at the multi country level based on measures defined by wider regional imperatives; developing need-driven and context specific Ten-Year action plans and strategies to ensure biosafety is fully mainstreamed, including resource mobilization and budgetary plans on biosafety, coordination of biosafety frameworks, interchange of expertise and common thematic areas for capacity building and ensuring public input into decision making processes.

The project will review and finalise the Biosafety Bills of Madagascar and DRC and prepare implementation regulations and complementary technical guidelines with supportive and harmonized administrative guidelines including Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) to support single window handling of applications and permits. The Biosafety Policies of the three countries will be reviewed and updated as applicable to absorb current trends and identify entry points for update of NBSAPs with resource mobilization plans

Outcome 2b. Cooperative measures and intercountry experience sharing, uptake and use of monitoring and enforcement measures in transboundary movement and handling of Living Modified Organisms in the participating countries strengthened.

Cooperation in the implementation of the biosafety achieved and improving compliance with the CPB. Participating countries will have operational compliance monitoring and enforcement systems that are streamlined.

In tandem with the BS strategy 2011-2020, this component aims to strengthen cooperative measures in the implementation of the CPB. Based on the outcomes of a post 2020 BS strategy under Means of Implementation and Enabling conditions, planned interventions may be aligned at mid-term to capture any new issues guided by the project objective. Interventions will focus on scientific risk assessment reviews, Risk Management practices, Socio-economic Considerations, monitoring and enforcement and customs training. An advisory panel will be promoted and established through dialogue with the participating countries. The project will facilitate development of common application formats, develop model guidelines on specific thematic areas (socio-economic considerations, public awareness, education and public participation, labelling), facilitate biosafety data portability and sharing, develop practical risk assessment training modules with “real case studies; the project will also develop model subsidiary legislations and toolkits including on Liability and Redress to support the national regulatory systems in decision making.

Guided by the regulatory regimes, each of the participating countries will develop a clearly defined and operational monitoring and enforcement system that allows for follow-up to ensure compliance on pre- and post-approval permits for LMOs and transit/port handling measures. Monitoring and Inspection guidelines will define the designation of biosafety inspections and the workflows on monitoring, enforcement and inspections. Baseline information will be collected, compiled and is vital for benchmarking. Each country will ensure that the enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance are clearly elaborated on.

The expected outputs of this component are:

2.1 Ten Year Strategic plans and policies addressing identified national needs, gaps and opportunities for biosafety implementation developed and integrated into NBSAPs and related national policies including resource mobilisation

2.2 Reviewed/updated and operational national biosafety regulatory and harmonised administrative systems reflecting national policies and defining all other NBF components in compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

### COMPONENT III – PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Outcome 3 - Effective project coordination and delivery meeting agreed measurable outputs and indicators

This component is aimed at ensuring that the project is implemented in line with the intended objectives and outcomes. Variances will be captured and explained. A Project Monitoring and Evaluation Framework will be developed and used for internal monitoring and evaluation activities. To ensure efficient implementation in the early phases the project will ensure that implementing teams are capacitated on soft skills and Monitoring and Evaluation principles. M&E will be carried out during the review and planning meetings at national and joint country levels, through reviewing of progress reports against the work plans, steering committee meetings and the national missions. Gender specific data will also be collected as part of the M & E process. Additionally, there are two scheduled evaluation and review activities - midterm review and end of project evaluation.

The expected Outputs of the component are:

- A comprehensive project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework developed and implemented, and drawing on best practices and lessons learnt
- Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluations

5) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies;

The project belongs to the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective 3 Program 8 – Further development of biodiversity policy and institutional frameworks through the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and is in consistent with GEF's strategy for financing Biosafety. The project contributes to the implementation of the BS strategy 2011-2020 with a focused thematic and cooperative measures to support implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

The proposed project fits into the GEF 7 Biodiversity Focal Area as defined in the Biodiversity Strategy. The project will also contribute to Aichi Targets 13 and 14 through elaboration of biosafety measures that ensure the diversity of cultivated plants and farmed, and domesticated animals and wild relatives'/ landraces and the integrity of land races is maintained through management practices to contain and ensure material and genetic confinement. In addition, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is an environmental safeguards instrument and is set up to ensure Parties elaborate interventions with scientifically sound risk analysis and detection processes that restore and safeguard ecosystem services. The project, through its components, also fits directly into the capacity building interventions outlined in the "Framework and Action Plan for Capacity Building for Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011 - 2020)" and is envisaged to also fit into the Implementation Plan under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for 2021 – 2030 which is in preparation.

The proposed project will assist the participating countries to implement the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, including capacity-building related to risk assessment and risk management and pre- and post-approval monitoring and enforcement measures on the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms. The initial stock taking assessment and practices on management of genetic resources clearly points to coordination of biosafety frameworks, interchange of regional expertise, and capacity building in common priority and technical frameworks in the handling of products of modern biotechnology. In line with the GEF 7 strategy on Biosafety, the project will have both a thematic and a coordinated approach to build on a common set of targets and opportunities to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

6) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline,

The proposed project, without GEF Support, will have limited support to access technical expertise and resources to build institutional and regulatory capacity to effectively manage transboundary movement of LMOs guided by scientific risk analysis. Most of the participating countries will not be able to manage or scientifically assess impacts of potential risks and socio-economic impacts of LMOs or movements of LMOs across the region. The GEF support will allow for translation and update of the National Biosafety Frameworks into functional and operational biosafety frameworks with clearly defined entry points for handling, risk and socio-economic assessments, public engagement and follow-up measures for approved permits. It will also empower frontline staff in handling transboundary movements of LMOs. The proposed project will also harness the results of the ongoing "Multi country LMO Testing project" into the project component on Monitoring and Enforcement, to support pre- and post-approval follow-up measures on permits and compliance. The proposed incremental reasoning is as captured in Table B under Components I and II. The proposed communication strategies will facilitate harnessing of best practices in engaging the diverse stakeholders on the potential benefits and risks of LMOs through clearly defined risk communication platforms and interactive networks using both modern and traditional channels of communication.

With GEF support through this project, incremental financial resources necessary for effective review/ updating and/or translation of the draft biosafety laws and associated implementation frameworks to a functional and operational national biosafety regime with supportive handling, decision making and follow up measures will be achieved. The project will also provide the technical and financial resources for institutional capacity building for relevant and designated stakeholders with clearly defined roles and responsibilities under the national biosafety systems.

The project is designed to build on and complement existing or ongoing interventions including the BCH, the existing NBFs, the draft Biosafety Bills, interventions by the African Biosafety Network of Expertise (ABNE) on handling of deliberate releases of LMOs and the ongoing Multi Country LMO Capacity Building Project on LMO testing, ensuring a cost-effective approach and a coherent intervention strategy to maximize the possibilities of achieving the identified outcomes. By building on the baseline with GEF support for the countries, the project will translate the current baseline into updated functional and operational biosafety frameworks to support handling and decision making on LMOs in line with obligations of the Cartagena Protocol. The results of the proposed intervention could benefit many countries in other sub regions of Africa.

#### 7) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

The proposed project is the second of its kind under the GEF Biosafety Portfolio in Africa after the World Bank-UEMOA Project for Francophone West Africa about ten years ago. It takes a strategic approach of combining implementation of national biosafety frameworks with issue specific or thematic interventions to support national biosafety decision making. It builds interventions around handling of Living Modified Organisms, Transit measures, Border control and Monitoring and enforcement. The project also brings together parties at different stages of implementation to allow for mentoring, a “buddy system” and a cooperative approach to build tools, instruments and share expertise which provide lessons, case studies and best practices which can be leveraged, replicated and scaled up by the Regional Economic communities to drive the regional biosafety agenda. It also allows countries like Namibia to some extent to mentor and “pull along” Madagascar and DRC trading partners to rapidly implement their National Biosafety Frameworks whilst learning from each other and sharing experiences. No specific attempts have been made by Parties in the region to develop and test transit measures at the ports or borders in the handling of transshipment of Living Modified Organisms. Namibia being a border country will utilize this intervention to develop and test transit measures of transboundary movement of LMOs from South Africa, Brazil and Argentina among others. Madagascar is an important transit port in the Indian Ocean, the proposed project will provide instruments on port handling of transit goods and transshipment which may contain LMOs. The two countries being Anglophone and Francophone will provide cases, examples, lessons and best practices which can be utilized both within the region and the wider Anglophone and Francophone Africa. The Buddy system will help DRC to assess expertise and pick lessons on implementation from Madagascar and Namibia. The proposed intervention guided by both the African Union, SADC and COMESA strategies have the potential for replication within the Regional Economic Communities.

## 1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

The project will be implemented in the Southern Africa region. The participating countries came together to build on common set of targets and opportunities to implement the CPB beyond the development and implementation of NBFs through cooperation and maximizing on available biosafety resources (institutional, financial and human resources). The following countries will be participating at different levels in this project: DRC, Madagascar and Namibia. Other countries in the region will be invited to participate, using their own resources, in discussions and planning of key regional cooperation activities. The eligible countries for this project are at varied levels of establishment and implementation of the Protocol. The policy and regulatory frameworks of these countries are guided by their obligations to the CPB, which emphasizes safe handling, transfer, and use of LMOs and the importance of science-based tools in decision making (see Annex A – Map of Project Parties)

Annex A





### PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

- MADAGASCAR
- DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO
- NAMIBIA

## 2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Yes

Civil Society Organizations Yes

Private Sector Entities Yes

If none of the above, please explain why:

Consultation of CSOs

During the SADC Workshop on the Development of a Common Position for the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD) COP 14; Cartagena Protocol; and Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) held in Gaborone, Botswana (25-26 June 2018) the breakaway sessions on biosafety discussed the challenges faced by Parties in the SADC on the implementation of the CPB. The Parties acknowledged the capacity building activities under "Multi Country Project to Strengthen Institutional Capacities on LMO Testing in Support of National Decision Making" (MCP-ICLT), led by RAEIN-Africa. However, Parties recognized that National Biosafety Frameworks in many of the SADC countries were largely not operational and capacity issues remained a challenge. Non-Party organizations (Civil Society and research organizations involved in biosafety) represented at the meeting put forward their proposals on how a regional initiative could be vital in assisting parties to operationalize their NBFs. Given the importance of the discussion, side meeting on biosafety requested the contenders, RAEIN-Africa and ICGEB to make presentations in plenary to all the SADC member state representatives present, highlighting the organizations' work on biosafety implementation and the organizations' initiatives in the region. As membership to ICGEB is subscription based, the Parties considered that the membership criteria would exclude most countries in the region, thus supporting RAEIN-Africa's pitch. Engagement with Private companies is limited to those that work with the Multicounty project on LMO detection capacity building project.

In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.

Stakeholders	Type of involvement
Decision makers/policy makers:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members of National Steering Committee</li> <li>• Consultations and meetings on key issues at national, sub-regional and regional level.</li> <li>• Resource persons in programmes on awareness raising.</li> </ul>
Scientists/ technical experts, researchers and technicians from public and private sectors including academic institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultations and workshops for training of trainers and awareness.</li> <li>• Developing training modules and working knowledge documents.</li> <li>• Developing outreach materials for different target groups</li> <li>• Members of Technical Advisory Panels</li> </ul>
Legal experts and economists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultations on documents related to socio-economic assessment.</li> </ul>
Regulatory Agency officials including Customs, Plant Quarantine, Environment Inspectors, Animal and Food Safety experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participate in training workshops for post-release monitoring and enforcement at border controls.</li> </ul>
Interest groups (women & youth), teachers, students, mass media and extension workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participate in awareness raising meetings</li> <li>• Participation, review and development of outreach materials designed for the different target groups.</li> </ul>



### 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).**

The project in design will take into consideration the involvement, use and knowledge of Biotechnology resources and safety concerns by undertaking socio economic assessment, stakeholder and gender analysis during the project preparation phase. To ensure participation and involvement of women and youth, an approach will be taken that takes into consideration time constraints, knowledge and socio-cultural impediments to their full participation. This approach will guide the selection and representation during the finalization of the Biosafety Bill to ensure women, youth, civil society and private sector are represented on envisaged statutory bodies as per the law through affirmative action.

This same approach will guide the setting up, selection and participation in meetings and training workshops. As envisaged, the project will set up and organize separate sector/thematic based meetings for different end users to ensure that that women, youth and local communities are fully informed of the activities to date, to obtain their input, and to collaboratively work together to develop a strategy for their long-term inclusion and participation of the biosafety regulatory processes in the country.

The proposed project recognizes the importance of involving women in setting up the Biosafety Regulatory processes because women play a critical role in assessing genetic resources both at the farm level, the marketplace and trade across borders with neighbouring countries. Women in the case of the Democratic Republic of Congo depend heavily on the use of natural resources therefore ensuring gender equity will benefit all including women and men in the balanced allocation of resources, involvement and decision-making will result in greater incomes and overall well-being for all persons – women, men, youth and local communities will support efforts on conservation and sustainable use of biological resources.

Achieving gender equity requires an integrated approach geared towards behavioral and procedural changes at several levels in the biosafety regulatory process namely at the regulatory, administrative, technical and the outreach levels. In response to this, the project will incorporate the following elements:

i) Analysis of livelihoods, gender and vulnerable groups will inform the project design, through assessments of women engagements in handling biotechnology related activities, needs and aspirations, to enable collection of gender specific data. Because gender relations, aspirations, and opportunities can vary greatly, the analysis will begin with a closer look at the social set up that define the roles, burdens, access to and control of resources for men, women, youth and local communities. This will ensure a gender sensitive project design from the start, and thus set up an implementation process that considers the needs and priorities of both women and men. The analysis itself will need to be organized in a way that allows varying approaches and availability to meet the needs and participation of women and men.

ii) Gender-balanced management: Behaviour change and gender-balanced management within community-based organizations (CBOs) is key to opening spaces that empower women. In the case of regulatory officials and end users of technology, women and men will be trained and tools provided on the national biosafety systems guided by needs captured during the gender analysis.

Women will be adequately represented in regulatory mandates as per the law and the guidelines developed not only at the policy level but also at the technical and training levels. Trainers will be taught how to be aware of, responsive to and advocate for gender issues in their training context and community and equipped to counter negative behaviour.

iii) Technical and financial capacity building: Targeted, gender-balanced capacity building, budgeting and technical assistance packages will be refined based on the results of the stocktaking analysis. The timing and structure of workshops will take care not to overburden participants, particularly women, who tend to shoulder more of the household and caregiving responsibilities. In addition to the core training activities, specialized technical assistance may be provided in support of handling of modern biotechnology products and the required obligation of biosafety measures in the country, especially where in relation to in country use, transit and transboundary movement of LMOs and its impact on biodiversity as the safe use of genetic material is of supreme value to the livelihoods of women and their families. This can include direct support to women's organizations. Women have shown significant interest in tools that help build consumer confidence and acceptability of their products.

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes1 /no 0 / tbd 0

Gender-disaggregated performance indicators: Monitoring and evaluation will include gender-specific indicators (e.g. management/regulatory agency positions held by women and men) and indicators of the presumed result of greater gender equity (e.g. increased family income, improved household wellbeing, more efficient businesses, and improved Biosafety measures). Results will be disaggregated to demonstrate distribution of results across the different genders, biosafety expertise, opportunities in decision making (through the Technical Committees/Advisory Panels and the Expert Technical Groups), socio-economic and local communities.

**Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes**

**closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;**

**improving women's participation and decision-making; and/or Yes**

**generating socio-economic benefits or services for women. No**

**Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?**

Yes

#### 4. Private sector engagement

Will there be private sector engagement in the project?

No

**Please briefly explain the rationale behind your answer.**

During the Project Preparation stage, country specific data will be captured on Private sector roles and engagement and updated as applicable.

## 5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the Project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the Project design (table format acceptable)

### *Assumptions:*

The following assumptions are made:

- That participating countries will be implementing capacity building activities in response to identified needs,
- Countries will timely submit their work plans and project progress reports to enable synchronized implementation of the project at regional level,
- Countries will submit, in a timely manner, national reports and the required information, such as existing laws and regulations, and decisions on living modified organisms, to the Biosafety Clearing-House,
- Adequate resources will be allocated (technical and institutional), and countries will timely honor their co-finance obligations,
- Baseline of the status of implementation of the NBFs and the CPB at national level will be established by the stocktaking and documented in a way that would facilitate measurement of progress against this baseline.

Issue	Rating	Identified Risk	Mitigation measure
COMMUNICATION	Medium	Language barrier - 2 different language groupings within participating countries	Budget and allocate enough resources for translation of documents and facilitation of meetings
		Inadequate collaboration and engagement between the labs in participating countries	RAEIN-Africa to support networking initiatives and create ongoing dialogue between the participating labs
		Absence of formal coordination mechanism at national levels	Establish an electronic platform for information sharing
		Insufficient moderation of platforms/project for a	Simplify workshop content
STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS	Medium	Government approval/endorsement for participation in the project	Engage political principals on the project for approval
		Limited participation by a Regional entity that can facilitate and enforce governments/regional cooperation for the implementation	Engage the SADC to take on board implementation of biosafety regulatory regimes, develop and implement

		ntation of the biosafety regulatory regimes	nt a regionally acceptable agenda
		Limited participation by regulators in the regional project's capacity development initiatives	Sensitization of regulatory decision makers at national and regional levels on the importance of participating on the project
		Long national process to put in place regulatory frameworks and/or adopt revised/reviewed Frameworks	Project partner to lobby key stakeholder ministries (ministry of science and technology, agriculture, environment or health)
		Political instability/will	Ongoing lobby actions
		Standards are coordinated by different ministry	Carefully identify key/ relevant stakeholders
HUMAN RESOURCES	Medium	Inadequate skills for implementation of the biosafety frameworks, and where available skills developed/ transferred not adequately used	Need driven capacity and skills developed, attached to existing biosafety activities across all relevant sectors. Resource sharing platform updated and Skills sharing facilitated across the region.
		High staff turnover	Incentivize participation in the project through the mentorship programme
		Number of qualified personnel including men and women to participate in the project	Recruit more personnel with the requisite skills for further development with a target to achieving gender equity
		Constant changing of staff participating in the project and Project based staff not permanently employed	Engage governments to absorb trained personnel into permanent positions. Inform top management about the importance of committing constant staff to the project
SYSTEMS	Medium	Absence of national biosafety frameworks	Use the regional project to catalyze action at national levels, including sharing of best practices,

	Lack of harmony at national and regional level for the safe use, handling and trans boundary movement of LMOs	Regional cooperation and harmonization of systems for risk assessment, risk management, LMO testing, information sharing, lesson learning and continuous engagement through relevant regional instruments to be developed and practiced
	Poor Governance systems	Biosafety regulatory regimes will designate the Competent Authorities. The updated regulatory Framework will identify the relevant ministries that work with the Authority in the implementation of the NBF. Component II will result in biosafety mainstreaming thus, diversify and enhance resources for implementation of biosafety.
	Non-uptake of training content	Diversify capacity building methods and include practical, experience sharing through exchange visits etc.
	Poor recording of biosafety information and data in the BCH, leading to low compliance by countries	Assign and train staff to ensure information and data is collected and timely posted on BCH
	Technology shortcomings e.g. data transfer	Include project equipment such as laptops and computers
	No national standards on technical issues	Lobby for setting of guideline Standards at regional level and for national buy in where standards are lacking
	Inadequate/ unclear institutional arrangements	Decide on appropriate national coordination mechanism and draw clear Terms of Reference

## Consolidated cross cutting risk issues

Risk	Rating	Mitigation measure
a) Slow administrative and political response to biosafety issues	High	Cooperation between government structures, institutions and special awareness programs for targeted and relevant authorities will be organized at the inception of the project, with follow ups to strengthen the political support for the NBF implementation process. Efforts will be made to ensure biosafety is placed on a higher level in the agenda of governments and national assemblies. Designated Stakeholder institutions will be strengthened to do continuous outreach, lobby and network as a means of getting political leverage.
b) Inadequate mechanisms for institutional coordination in the management of biosafety	Medium	Regular coordination meetings for relevant ministries and agencies will be held, defining clear procedures and responsibilities for all the key stakeholders identified. Institutional capacity building will be placed on a high priority level throughout the planned project activities. The steering committees and the information sharing activities will be used to consciously support coordination and management of biosafety. Similar processes will also be initiated through the regional component of the project. Where feasible, concerted efforts will be put in place to develop guidance and easy to read materials to support the coordination mechanism. Entry points will also be created for key non-governmental stakeholders including private sector, NGOs, farmers and women groups to be represented in the steering committees as part of the coordination mechanism
c) Low institutional capacity to manage handling of LMOs in SADC	Medium	Capacity building activities, coupled with strengthening of existing facilities, will equip designated regulatory agencies to effectively execute their mandate. A high priority will be placed on building a critical mass of resource persons through the Trainer of Trainers approach, mentoring and training in "soft skills" as focal points who will contribute to the enhancement of public awareness through intensification of the contribution of national experts in this process. Through the planned initiatives at the regional level, efforts will also be made to get "buy-in" by the SADC secretariat through coordination of similar interventions, lobbying and periodic briefs.
	Low	Potential use and import of LMOs may increase under increased temperature and other climate change related results due to tolerance to abiotic



d) Due to climate change impacts, public perception towards LMOs change, especially if LMOs perform better under climate change conditions

ture and other climate change related results due to tolerance to abiotic stresses.

For **DRC**, the main projections under climate change suggest that seasons of heat, drought and rainfall will become more intense. These changes are likely to result in an increased frequency of extreme events, primarily floods (resulting in erosion, landslides, and crop failure) but in some cases also droughts. Food security will be affected by land and infrastructure degradation due to erosion/landslides, an increase in livestock and crop diseases due to temperature increase, direct crop failure due to floods and heavy rains. Water availability will be affected by possible periods of drought[1]. Climate projections (for year 2100) for **Madagascar** include projected increase in temperature of 2.5°C -3°C, increased unpredictability of seasonal rains, and increased incidence or intensity of extreme weather events including droughts, cyclones and floods. Key climate impacts are crop loss/failure, loss of pasture lands and water resources for livestock, loss of marine habitat, increased ranges of vector-borne diseases and increased risk from waterborne diseases and degradation of water quality and reduced access to water supplies [2]. Climate change projections for Namibia for period 2045 – 2065 suggest: (i) minimum expected temperature increase of 1-2 °C and a maximum of 2-3.5°C in the summer, and 2.5 - 4°C in winter; and (ii) rainfall projections are uncertain with differences among regions. Implications are: (i) projected temperature rises could result in evaporation and evapotranspiration increases from 5-15%; (ii) hotter days, in tandem with shorter growing seasons, would make it harder even for resilient crops; (iii) Productivity among crops could drop by 20 – 50%; (iv) increased difficulty in the provision of sufficient grazing for livestock; (v) heat stress on livestock which can affect feeding and reproduction[3]. Due to the effects on food security and food production in the countries, potential use and import of LMOs that are better adapted (or perceived to be) or tolerant may increase. During PPG, the potential of climate change scenarios on the countries' response will be integrated into capacity building interventions and into the design of the ten-year strategic plans and policies to ensure that such changes to public attitude to LMOs are anticipated and proactively managed. Furthermore, the project purpose is to strengthen participating countries capacity to effectively manage safe handling and use of LMOs in such cases.

<p>e) An outbreak of diseases (Covid-19)</p>	<p>Low/Medium</p>	<p><b>Namibia</b> has had as of 15<sup>th</sup> October 2020, 12,069 total cases of COVID-19 since the start of the epidemic. 130 COVID-19 related deaths occurred and there is currently 1,794 active cases. <b>Madagascar</b> had 16,754 cases, 237 deaths and currently 393 active cases. <b>DRC</b> had 10,935 recorded total cases, 281 deaths and currently 348 active cases<sup>[4]</sup>. Although the three countries seemingly escaped the full impact of the pandemic as compared to total and active cases of other countries, the global economic slowdown will have an economical impact on the three countries. For example, tourism is a major contributor (14.5%) to Namibia's GDP, and created 18.2% of all employment pre-COVID. This will have a major impact on the economy of the country. Under such conditions, governments are expected to focus public resources on rebuilding the economies of countries. This might affect the co-financing of the project and the ability of the project to deliver on the GEBs. However, biosafety and the set-up of stringent biosecurity conditions will also be priorities post-COVID to mitigate the recurrence of such pandemic and diseases. During PPG and project implementation the importance of having a strong biosafety regime will be communicated as part of the green recovery programme of country and building back better. Potential impacts on the commitment of co-financiers and partners will be assessed in detail during the PPG phase to develop adequate risk mitigation actions. The outbreak of Covid-19 has already affected work nationally and regionally. Travel restrictions have been in place. Should the situation continue, or should similar situations take place, the risk will be mitigated by trying to carry out relevant activities via alternative working methods (e.g. video-conferences, telecommuting, recourse to national human resources in the countries, etc.). Any mitigation measure will have to be discussed between the implementing and the executing partners/agencies.</p> <p>The risk is only partly under project control. Nationally and regionally, the recent outbreak of Covid-19 is already affecting work and the way people implement projects. Travel restrictions have been in place.. Biosecurity considerations which is at the base of Biosafety capacity building and implementation will be fully triggered in a phased approach both to ensure human and environmental safety to project implementation measures and execution of activities guided by the technical principles</p>
--	-------------------	---

		of ensuring genetic and material confinement and management measures in project delivery. Standard Project Operational Procedures will be developed as applicable
--	--	---

## Sustainability

The project will be implemented with the participation of the regional economic block(s), whose mandate is to ensure sustainable economic development of the region. The project team will build soft skills capacities within all the national teams and institutions to ensure that the networks developed thrive beyond the project life span, driven by a shared common goal of sustainable use and conservation of biological diversity and safe handling and transboundary movement of LMOs across the region. By building personal attributes within the various project partners and their institutions, both technical and management personnel of these entities will be equipped to interact effectively and harmoniously whilst building a shared understanding of the importance on sustainable implementation of NBFs. Mainstreaming biosafety across the various sectors and NBSAPs will also act as stimuli for resource allocation to biosafety across the sectors and will ensure linkages and support from mandated sectors in the regulatory process, coupled with dedicated administrative and technical systems that allow decision making on biosafety. Each participating country will also lobby for endorsement of the resource mobilization plans on biosafety with budgetary allocations and the Communication Strategies on Biosafety in support of efforts to sustain the national biosafety regime and resource mobilization plans.

The approach adopted in capacity building will contribute to ensuring that capacity built within the regional biosafety technical advisory panel and the local (national) experts continue to be accessible to the NBFs. A roster of experts will be developed and updated periodically. The BCH Focal Points will be trained to periodically maintain the roster beyond the project. The information Hub will be built into the regional economic communities' information systems.

The proposed project will be among the first NBF implementation projects that develops and capture knowledge and institutional capacity from a purely national and thematic approach (Risk Assessment framework, monitoring and enforcement Liability and Redress, LMO Testing) to operationalize its national biosafety system. By leveraging tools, lessons learnt and best practices from the LMO Testing project and other NBF projects executed in the region, the NBFs will strengthen their pre- and post-approval monitoring systems on LMOs. In addition, the project will also be building capacity on Liability and Redress and use this current project to support and ratification of the Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress for Madagascar and Namibia. In addition, the implementation project is closely following and will be harnessing additional resources from the ongoing regional economic block led and regional institutions' activities.

The design and approach including resource mobilization, linkages to ongoing regional interventions and harnessing best practices from other jurisdictions and creation of a platform on best practices/lessons learnt has a potential to be scaled up in the African region.

---

[1] <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/DRC%2B%28east%29.pdf>

[2] [https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/2016%20CRM%20Factsheet%20Madagascar\\_use%20this.pdf](https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/2016%20CRM%20Factsheet%20Madagascar_use%20this.pdf)

[3] [https://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/events/seminars/ht09\\_water-climate-newsham.pdf](https://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/events/seminars/ht09_water-climate-newsham.pdf)

[4] <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>

## 6. Coordination

**Outline the institutional structure of the project including monitoring and evaluation coordination at the project level. Describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.**

The proposed project will be executed by the Competent National Authorities in the three countries. Project oversight will be provided by UNEP in its role as the GEF Implementing Agency whilst RAEIN-Africa will be the Lead Executing Agency. RAEIN-Africa will also coordinate reporting and execution of joint-country project activities. The Project Steering Committee will provide supervisory oversight with technical advice and support from a joint-country Biosafety Technical Advisory Panel. At the country level, national steering committee or Task forces will provide supervisory oversight under the oversight of the Competent National Authorities responsible for Biosafety.

The project will complement and build on the earlier UNEP-GEF Global Project on the "Development of National Biosafety Frameworks" through which National Biosafety Frameworks for the following countries were developed: Democratic Republic of Congo, Eswatini, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe. The National Biosafety Framework for Namibia was developed through the UNEP GEF Biosafety Demonstration Project. Most of draft National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs) had clear plans of action on implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks. The project will also provide the required data, participating countries' perspectives and contributions to the earlier USAID-funded COMESA Biotechnology and Biosafety Project, which focused on a harmonized sub-regional biosafety regulatory framework based on the existing National Biosafety Frameworks. Some of the participating countries on this project are members of COMESA[1]. In addition, the project coordinates with the ongoing UNEP-GEF "Multi Country Project to Strengthen Institutional Capacities on LMO Testing in Support of National Decision Making" (MCP-ICLT). Components I and II on "*Institutional and human capacity building, Policy and Regulatory Regimes* and on *monitoring and enforcement*" fit with MCP-ICLT in the area of capacity building on LMO detection, harmonizing LMO testing tools and monitoring for LMOs during pre- and post-approval permits to ensure compliance. The MCP-ICLT is assisting the Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi and Mozambique through its three key components to build capacity on LMO Testing to support the implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks. The proposed project will support Namibia in LMO Testing and related measures and support harmonization of LMO testing systems. This is done to avoid "double dipping" and duplication. The MCP-ICLT envisages an electronic platform which will be used to share best practices on standard operating procedures, experiences and protocols on LMO testing onto which the other countries will have to join. These best practices and tools will assist the countries in the implementation of the National Biosafety Framework as a resource to assist in monitoring of LMOs on contained use, transit and transboundary movements. The following countries: Namibia and, DRC are participating on the ongoing "UNEP-GEF Project for Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the BCH (BCH III)", the proposed project will be implemented in synergy and will benefit from the planned sub regional training on the BCH. The project will enhance the countries' capacity to compile and post the required information on BCH, through the establishment and implementation of a repository of biosafety information which is considered as a catalyst to generating and updating information on the national and global BCH. The two project components on *Global and sub-regional networking on information sharing for effective management of the BCH and the BCH educational packages* are of direct relevance and will be harnessed to support the implementation of public awareness, education and public participation component of the project. The designated national staff on the BCH will also take part in regional training workshops and the Global training for Focal Points at the COP/MOPs through the BCH III project. The project shall also ensure, as required by the component 5 of the BCHIII, that implementation activities utilize the deliverables to build synergy between the two projects. It will also build on the information sharing component and public engagement as initiated through the BCH Project.

The proposed Biosafety project will share and coordinate its experience in the elaboration with legislative, technical and administrative frameworks and the use of clearing houses with the Access and Benefit Sharing projects implemented in some of the participating countries through new integrated Clearing House Mechanism portal under the CBD.

---

[1] See <https://www.comesa.int/comesa-actesa-to-revive-regional-policy-on-biotechnology-and-biosafety/> The proposed project will provide a test case and implementation activities to support the revived work on the Regional Policy on Biotechnology and Biosafety. The results can be scaled up

## 7. Consistency with National Priorities

**Is the Project consistent with the National Strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions**

Yes

**If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc**

- National Bio Strategy Action Plan (NBSAP) x
- CBD National Report x
- Cartagena Protocol National Reportx
- Nagoya Protocol National Report
- UNFCCC National Communications (NC)
- UNFCCC Biennial Update Report (BUR)
- UNFCCC National Determined Contribution
- UNFCCC Technology Needs Assessment
- UNCCD Reporting
- ASGM National Action Plan (ASGM NAP)
- Minamata Initial Assessment (MIA)
- Stockholm National Implementation Plan (NIP)
- Stockholm National Implementation Plan Update
- National Adaptation Programme of Action Update
- Others X – National biosafety frameworks

**National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans and National Biosafety Reports**

*Democratic Republic of Congo*

The project is consistent and falls within the priorities set in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action plan (NBSAP 2016-2020). The project directly addresses Strategic Priorities 8 on Biosafety and 9 on Promotion on Scientific Research and acquisition of knowledge. The aim is to set up an operational and implementable Biosafety Framework supported by a Biosafety Act. The Strategic Priorities 8 and 9 requires specific actions to drive the set-up of an operational biosafety framework, these include (i) Passage the Biosafety Bill to provide the required legal support for the implementation of the National Biosafety Framework; (ii) Update the national biosafety framework; (iii) Strengthening the institutional capacity building to support implementation of the administrative and technical frameworks to support decision making on safe use of modern biotechnology; and (iv) promotion of research in the uptake and safe use of modern technologies including modern biotechnology.

The third National Biosafety report highlights the need for an update and implementation of National Biosafety Framework with a strong emphasis on institutional capacity building on handling of LMOs, risk assessment to support decision making and the setting up of a Biosafety law to guide biosafety practices in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

The fifth National Biodiversity Report highlights the sustainable use of Biotechnology to support national development efforts and places a call for expedited action on enhanced national capacity on science based national biosafety framework supported by a Biosafety Act. It also emphasizes the national biosafety framework should be effectively implemented.

Also, the project's activities are in line with the new constitution adopted in 2006, which clearly introduces environmental rights and obligations (Articles 48 and 53-55) and provides for the creation of other domestic laws concerning, *inter alia*, the protection of the environment and tourism (Article 123).

## ***Namibia***

Biosafety is highlighted in the revised [NBSAP](#) (version 2) of Namibia as critical to the conservation and sustainable utilization of Biodiversity in line with Aichi Target 12 as follows - "Namibia has developed a legislative framework to promote the safe use of biotechnology and the management of living modified organisms through the Biosafety Act in 2006. The legal and administrative basis to implement this Act has been identified as a challenge as well as human resources and infrastructural capacity, and insufficient awareness of the issue among the wider population. These challenges will be targeted directly through NBSAP2. The proposed project will give opportunity for institutional capacity building and harmonization of legal, technical and institutional frameworks to equip Namibia to handle confined field trials, potential environmental releases and handling of Living Modified Organisms to Food, Feed and for Processing. The envisaged deliverables are hinged on the Key Development Indicator – "Operational Institutional Framework in place to implement and enforce the Biosafety Act of 2006. The Strategic Initiative is to "strengthen capacity and institutional frameworks to implement and enforce the Act 2006. The need for strong institutional capacity on monitoring and enforcement is also highlighted in the National Biosafety Report as a capacity need. Support for the proposed GEF 7 project is highlighted in the National Biosafety Report as an area to support capacity building under Articles 14 and 22. The areas for capacity building are highlighted in the report and mirrors the intervention areas in the proposed project



## ***Madagascar***

Under the revised [NBSAP](#), Biosafety issues are captured under Strategic Objective 12 on management and conservation of threatened species – and it specifically relates to guidelines 12:2 – Develop and implement management practices on new biological introductions with a lot of emphasis on monitoring, enforcement and compliance. The proposed project will assist Madagascar to finalise its Biosafety bill and develop operational, technical and regulatory guidelines to make the national biosafety Act operational. It will also create a platform to strengthen the core of national experts who will be able to provide expert advice and guidance to decision makers on handling of Living Modified Organisms and the related pre- and post- approval biosafety measures. The National Biosafety Report under Article 22 identifies areas where further capacity building is needed and these include among others institutional and human capacity building, monitoring and enforcement, Liability and Redress, Risk Assessment and Risk Management, Public Awareness, Participation and Education in Biosafety.

### **The National Biosafety Frameworks**

The NBF constitute a biotechnology/biosafety policy, legal, administrative and technical instruments developed to ensure an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health. The implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks is in line with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action plans (NBSAPs)

The implementation of the NBF in the Democratic Republic of Congo is in line with the targeted sustainable development and poverty reduction objectives of the Congolese Poverty Reduction Strategy (CPRS), the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development has been tasked to promote the development and deployment of Science & Technology at all levels to increase industrial production, employment and natural resource utilisation, enhance food security, sustainability, self-sufficiency and environmental health. Appropriate and New Innovative Technologies including modern Biotechnology have been targeted as potential tools to support agriculture, health and enterprise development in the [National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan \(NBSAP\)](#) version 3 under Strategic Priority Area 8. The proposed implementation project is focused on capacity building to operationalise and implement the draft NBF and meet expected challenges and priorities in balancing sustainable use of biodiversity and sound environmental management. Such a project will meet urgent national needs, foster regional collaboration in managing transboundary issues related to LMOs and help address current national strategies to alleviate poverty in an environmentally sustainable manner.

The NBFs of Madagascar and Namibia have had a phase to implement the basic national framework and is now focused on operationalization through issue specific interventions.

The proposed implementation project focuses on capacity building to operationalize and implement the NBFs /draft NBFs and meet expected challenges and priorities in balancing sustainable use of biodiversity and sound environmental management. Such a project will meet urgent national needs, foster regional collaboration in managing transboundary issues related to LMOs and help address current national strategies to alleviate poverty in an environmentally sustainable manner.

### **Regional Biotechnology and Biosafety Activities**

At the regional level, the project is also in line with the COMESA Biotechnology and Biosafety Implementation Plan which seeks to develop regional harmonized approaches and scientific tools to support the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks and decision making. The COMESA Regional Biotechnology and Biosafety Policy Implementation Plan is designed to translate the COMESA Policy on Biotechnology and Biosafety into an effective, region-wide implementation program. The overall goal of the plan is to support the Member States to realize their aspirations of becoming active participants in the global biotechnology enterprise through commercial planting of GM crops, trade in products of GM technology and involvement in dealings with emergency food aid with GM content. The plan will involve the enhancing of awareness and outreach activities in a continuous and progressive manner. A regional biosafety risk assessment mechanism is also envisaged in the plan. This will rely on the establishment and efficient functioning of a COMESA Biotechnology and Biosafety Panel of Experts and a COMESA Biosafety Risk Assessment and Management Desk. The plan will also see to the capacity building for biosafety regulation and biotechnology research and product development/ testing at Member States level. This is an ongoing process. DRC and Madagascar are members of COMESA. All three countries are members of SADC which also has initiated activities on harmonization of National Biosafety Frameworks particularly as it relates to transboundary movement and handling of Living Modified Organisms.

The project is well aligned with the African Union Biosafety Strategy and the Model law on Biosafety.

the project project is consistent with national strategies and plans, or reports and assessments under relevant conventions

COUNTRY	NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN (NBSAP)	CBD NATIONAL REPORT	CARTAGENA PROTOCOL NATIONAL REPORT	NAGOYA PROTOCOL NATIONAL REPORT
DRC	X	X	X	X
MADAGASCAR	X	X	X	X
NAMIBIA	X	X	X	X

See – [www.cbd.int](http://www.cbd.int)

## 8. Knowledge Management

**Outline the Knowledge management approach for the Project, including, if any, plans for the Project to learn from other relevant Projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.**

**Learning and Knowledge Management:** The project will identify, analyze, document, and share biosafety information and lessons learnt, and disseminate results from the project beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks, including online based forums, newsletters, national and a regional BCH, learn and share forums and SADC platforms. The project will establish a knowledge management hub and work on its sustainability beyond the project lifespan. Identification and analyzing lessons learnt will be an ongoing process. Deliverables will be shared quarterly as applicable or at least twice a year. Publications and thematic reports will be developed and disseminated in the participating countries and at regional level. The project shall use the UNEP reporting format for categorizing, documenting and sharing of lessons learnt. In every annual review and planning meeting; information sharing will be promoted. To enable effective management of information, an Information Hub will be established during the project implementation period. The project will lobby for building of information management tasks into existing regional institutions/ structures e.g. the SADC or any other such institution. This will promote continuity beyond the project lifespan. In addition, relevant information will be posted on all BCH portals at national and regional levels, and the CBD BCH portal. UNEP has an existing platform through the library of its project management database ANUBIS (A New UNEP Biosafety Information System) for Biodiversity and Land Degradation projects and related initiatives to learn from each other, share experiences and expertise, and tools and methodologies to support biosafety decision making. ANUBIS also allows the projects to assess project outputs and reports in a user-friendly form. In addition, UNEP has created an annual forum, funded by the Biosafety Technical Fund, for the projects to physically meet at regional/sub regional levels to learn and share experiences on project management, including best practices and challenges, in addition to training on emerging issues in biosafety. The project will also have access to both the SCBD and UNEP Biosafety's YouTube channels to access media files and share materials for the benefit of the projects in the Biosafety Portfolio. Existing mechanisms and training will be offered for the project to assess and share information on the Biosafety Clearing House in line with obligations of Article 20 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the ongoing BCH III Project.

The project will have access and contribute stories and news to the UNEP Biosafety website <https://www.unenvironment.org/explore-topics/biosafety> which is a forum set up to enable projects access information, publication, events and knowledge materials on Biosafety among the project partners.

At the national level, the knowledge management will help to build and maintain supportive and useful knowledge, attitudes, skills and practices via a number of workshops and trainings with participation of various stakeholders, including governmental sector, media, parliament, researchers, academia, farmers, women, the youth and local and Indigenous Communities. Manuals and guidelines will be developed and published and made available for all the relevant stakeholders. The national BCH websites will be updated periodically with new /relevant information and made accessible via the internet, mobile telephony, social media - Facebook, Twitter and YouTube. Communication sites will be used to disseminate information. Special publications, brochures, leaflets, posters, calendars on best practices on biosafety, etc. will be provided and disseminated through the relevant actors and stakeholders. On-line forums and webinars to discuss and share information will be used to facilitate inter-country and sub-regional communication and networking.

Furthermore, outreach materials used by the participating countries will be shared and or developed, targeted at different stakeholders, including Extension workers, Parliamentarians, Media, Women, Youth and Local communities, among others, as will be identified in the stocktaking process under Component Substantial time and efforts will be devoted to ensure involvement of the public in meeting the national obligations on Biosafety. The National Biosafety Frameworks will be extensively reviewed, and key entry points identified and used for training on public participation in the decision-making processes.

Procedural manuals and tools including gender considerations will be translated into easy and user-friendly modules to assist the public on biosafety measures. The national BCH will be updated, and a website created to serve as both an information repository and platform for the public to follow and input into the national decision-making processes on biosafety. In addition, experiences in the mainstreaming of biosafety into educational curricula at various levels will be shared, lesson learnt will be incorporated by those countries that are yet to mainstream biosafety into national development processes.

In addition:

- the project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNEP/GEF sponsored networks, organized for Senior Personnel working on projects that share common characteristics; and
- the project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned.

## 9. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification\*

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
Low			

### Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Provide preliminary information on the types and levels of risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and describe measures to address these risks during the project design.

The project per the attached Environmental and Social safeguards document is classified as Low Risk. The project is a Biosafety project which per the objective of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety sets up legal, administrative and risk analysis measures to ensure safe use of Biodiversity. The project is guided by the precautionary approach principle.

Only Namibia anticipates potential field trials (under confinement) with a possibility for Commercial releases later possibly post project guided by the regulatory framework. At this stage, the only likely LMO based activities for Madagascar and DRC will be trading of Living Modified Foods and Feeds and for processing. Appropriate risk management procedures will be guided to ensure limit genetic and material transfer through the permit conditions, waste disposal procedures and related permit conditions by Law

#### **Supporting Documents**

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Submitted
10584_SRIF SAfrica-Biosafety	
Multi country Biosafety Project_ ESERN	

### Part III: Approval/Endorsement By GEF Operational Focal Point(S) And Gef Agency(ies)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter with this template).

Name	Position	Ministry	Date
Mr. Godefroid Ndaukila Muhinya	GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministere del'Environnement et Developpement Durable 15, avenue Papa Ileo (es-des Cliniques), commune de la Gombe, Kinshasa- BP.12348 Kin-1 Kinshasa, - Congo DR Tel: +2438164046055 Email: godendaukila@gmail.com ; godendaukila@yahoo.fr ; jean_ilunga@yahoo.fr ; berchmans57@gmail.com	1/21/2020
Dr. Hery Andriamirado Rakotondravony	GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, BP 3948 Antsahavola, Rue Toto Radola, Antananarivo 101, Madagascar. Email: hery.rado@aol.com; hery.ravony@gmail.com	3/31/2020
Mr. Teofilus Nghitila	Executive Director & GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Environment and Tourism Private Bag 13306 Windhoek, Namibia Tel: + 264 61 284 2751 Email: teofilus.nghitila@met.gov.na	4/9/2020

## ANNEX A: Project Map and Geographic Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project intervention takes place







## PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

- MADAGASCAR
  - DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC  
OF CONGO
  - NAMIBIA
-