



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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10584

Countries

Regional (Congo DR, Madagascar, Namibia)

Project Name

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

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/30/2022

Review completed by PM

10/16/2022

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Please revise the amounts that GEF and cofinancing are paying for in project management costs so that its is proportional to the overall amount GEF and cofinancers are paying for the entire project.

9/29/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

05/29/2022

Guidance is noted. The PMC on the GEF side is guided by limiting PMC to about 5% of project cost, whilst cofinance for PMC is based on direct support to project management, the remaining allocation of cofinance is allocated to the specific project components.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

For cofinancing grants should be labeled investment mobilized and in-kind should be labelled recurrent expenditures. Please revise.

10/5/2022

On co-financing: on the co-financing from UNEP, please change the \$200,000 from ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?Investment mobilized?.

10/16/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

08/31/2022

Noted. The cofinancing grants have been revised as guided per the attached updated cofinancing letter. The cofinancing data is revised in the Portal.

10/13/2022

Cofinancing allocation from UNEP has been changed from 'Recurrent expenditures' to 'investment mobilized' as guided.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

No. The table in the portal is not visible and it cut off thus there is no information to review. Please revise.

9/29/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

5/16/2022

The table has been updated in the Portal, the error was caused during translation

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Cleared. There are no core indicators mapped to biosafety. CI 11 is completed.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems,
including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects
were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is
there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a
description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

NA.

Agency Response
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/5/2022

Stakeholder engagement: The project included updated information on efforts to map project stakeholders and their respective roles in the project implementation. This information, however, does not fully incorporate important components of the required Stakeholder Engagement Plan at CEO endorsement. As per the GEF guidelines, this plan should include steps and

actions to achieve meaningful consultation and inclusive participation, including information dissemination, roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan as well as timing/budget of the engagement throughout the project cycle. The submission includes some of this information, but information provided seems tentative and as such, the PM should ask agency to provide further details on its confirmed details and plans to engage stakeholders.

10/16/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/13/2022

Additional details on stakeholder engagement plan have been provided under Section 2 of the CEO Endorsement template highlighting roles, responsibilities, actions to be undertaken and timing. Related budget costing is integrated in the components as per the plan. The detailed plan is also attached to the resubmission.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Please clarify how the project proposes to close the gender gap in access and control over natural resources. You have clicked that box in the portal but it is not at all clear how the project will do that given its design. Was this a mistake? Please clarify.

9/29/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

5/16/2022

This was a mistake in transfer of information from the project proposal to data on the GEF Portal. The project proposed focus is on ?improving women's participation and

decision making? and is reflected in the updated narrative. The change has been effected on the portal.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

This section has no information, the budget is cut off and there is only two rows of numbers. Please revise.

10/5/2022

Please remove audits from the M&E budget and charge these expenses to the PMC.

10/16/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

5/16/2022

This is an error in translation of data into the GEF Portal. This has been addressed and the table is updated in the Portal

10/13/2022

The audits have been removed from the M& E budgeted and charged to the PMC per the updated budget. The M & E budget has been revised accordingly

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

10/5/2022

The overall project budget presented in Annex E lacks information on the activities funded through the components / M&E / PMC ? therefore, it is not possible to assess the reasonability of charging the activities/expenditures to these sources . Per the resubmission we will assess the budget and provide comments if appropriate.

10/18/2022

The overall project budget presented in Annex E lacks information on the activities funded through the project components / M&E / PMC ? therefore, so it is not possible to assess the reasonability of charging the activities/expenditures to these sources. Besides, there is also no information on the responsible entity (should be the last column of the budget table). Also, in Portal the Budget Table shows 5 components, but in Table B there are only 3 components ? the lack of detail in some budget items needs to be addressed in the budget table. Please resubmit the budget and we will provide comments if appropriate.

Agency Response

10/19/2022

The budget under Annex E has been updated. A detailed budget has also been inserted in the portal. The fifth component has been deleted from the standard budget template. To ensure the budget summary fits four components namely Two Technical components, M & E and PMC budgets respectively. In addition, a key has been provided to indicate what the components mean. We have also added a detailed budget showing costed activities as sheet 2 in the uploaded budget. The detailed budget is in the Portal under Annex E as the second sheet.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Germany provided extensive comments on this project when it was approved in the work program. Please provide a response in the portal.

9/29/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
09/01/2022

The comments of Germany are noted with appreciation. The issues raised are addressed in the updated documents in the updated texts, the theory of change and project results framework and also noted as a key issue to focus on during project inception and throughout implementation in the national level execution activities (See Table I in the CEO endorsement template in the section on stakeholder participation and para 90 of the UNEP Prodoc)

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2022

Please fix the table entry with STAP response so it fits within the portal margins.

9/29/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

5/16/2022

The table entry with STAP response is fitted within the portal margins

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

NA.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

NA.

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

NA.

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 5/11/2022

See above. The table is cut off in the portal and can not be viewed. Please revise.

9/29/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

09/06/2022

Data on Status of PPG utilization in the Portal has been revised and updated.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

NA.

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

NA.

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

NA.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2022

No. Please revise and resubmit.

10/5/2022

No. Please address all issues below and that are highlighted above as well:

1. On project information: please correct the year of the expected completion date to match the duration of the project (48 months).

2. On the budget: the overall project budget presented in Annex E lacks information on the activities funded through the components / M&E / PMC ? therefore, it is not possible to assess the reasonability of charging the activities/expenditures to these sources . Per the resubmission we will assess the budget and provide comments if appropriate.

3. On the M&E budget: please remove audits from the M&E budget and charge these expenses to the PMC.

4. On co-financing: on the co-financing from UNEP, please change the \$200,000 from ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?Investment mobilized?.

5. Stakeholder engagement: The project included updated information on efforts to map project stakeholders and their respective roles in the project implementation. This information, however, does not fully incorporate important components of the required Stakeholder Engagement Plan at CEO endorsement. As per the GEF guidelines, this plan should include steps and actions to achieve meaningful consultation and inclusive participation, including information dissemination, roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan as well as timing/budget of the engagement throughout the project cycle. The submission includes some of this information, but information provided seems tentative and as such, the PM should ask agency to provide further details on its confirmed details and plans to engage stakeholders.

10/18/2022

No, the CEO endorsement is not recommended. Please see comments above on Annex E and the project budget and please revise and resubmit accordingly.

10/20/2022

Yes. CEO endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/11/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/29/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/5/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/16/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/20/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

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

The overall goal of the project, "Strengthening the Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Southern Africa (SINBF)" is to assist the Democratic

Republic of the Congo (DRC), Madagascar and Namibia to enhance and strengthen their national capacities through cooperative facilitative mechanisms for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and have functional, workable and transparent national biosafety frameworks by 2026.

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

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

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

Component A - Biosafety Regulatory Regimes and Policy

Component B - Biosafety institutional systems

Component C - Project Administration, Monitoring and Evaluation

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