

## **Support to Preparation of the Fourth National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - ASIA-PACIFIC, GRULAC, CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE REGIONS**

GEF Secretariat Review for Enabling Activity – GEF - 7

### **Basic Information**

**GEF ID**

10639

**Countries**

Global (Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kiribati, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, St. Lucia, Suriname, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkey, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen)

**Project Title**

Support to Preparation of the Fourth National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - ASIA-PACIFIC, GRULAC, CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE REGIONS

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNEP

**Agency ID**

UNEP: 01819

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Biodiversity

Program Manager  
Mark Zimsky

## Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

### Part 1: Project Information

#### Focal area elements

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-16-20

Yes. This EA is to assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the CPB to prepare and submit their 4th National Reports on the implementation of the protocol.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

### Project description summary

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**

8-16-20

Please remove the name of the countries that are entered twice in the front page of the submission. According to the GEF, there are 41 countries NOT 54 as stated in the Expected Outcome.

9-8-20

List of countries now matches

Cleared

## **Agency Response**

9-3-20

Per the updated EAs, the countries are 52 not 41 as per the attached and as matched with the commitment letters

See below

### **ASIA-PACIFIC**

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Yemen, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, India, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Pakistan, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Tonga, Viet Nam  
[25 Eligible Parties]

### **GRULAC**

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Venezuela  
[20 GEF Eligible Parties]

### **Central and Eastern Europe**

Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova  
[7 GEF Eligible Parties]

10-9-2020

Countries now listed under global designation

## Co-financing

**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

8-16-20

Yes. Parties will provide co-financing in the amount of \$1,123,890 A ratio of 1:0.7

9/22/2020

Co-financing: while co-financing is not compulsory for EAs, it is difficult to verify the total co-financing amount as there is not a single table that summarizes each Country's indicated co-financing contribution [as provided in the OFP letters]. Although most of the co-financing is in-kind, at least 1 [Barbados] provided both cash and in-kind – please amend the portal entries accordingly.

10/6/2020

Cleared.

### Agency Response

9-3-20

Cofinance updated per the resubmitted EA request

10-6-2020

An excel sheet has been added listing the cofinancing and labeled as cofinancing data. Cash and in-kind cofinance has been separated

Cofinancing data tabulated in cash and in-kind per the attached sheet labeled "cofinancing data"

10-9-2020

Countries without cofinance contributions removed from list of cofinance contributors.

## **GEF Resource Availability**

**Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

8-16-20

Yes. Financial resources to be provided by the BD Set Aside.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

**Are they within the resources available from:**

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-16-20

Yes. Financial resources to be provided by the BD Set Aside.

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

**Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

#### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

8-16-20

When the request for \$1,370,000 (without Project Management) is divided by 41 countries (NOT 54), the net allocation per country is \$33,415. This value is higher than the request for the countries in the Africa Region (\$25,434/country). Please adjust the total budget and the budget/country for this project ASIA-PACIFIC, GRULAC, CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE REGIONS.

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

9-3-20

The budget is adjusted per the review to reflect the cost of \$25,480 per country (52 countries) which compares to \$25,434/per country) with the request for the Africa region in terms of national allocation.

10-06-2020

An image of the project budget is inserted and the full budgeted uploaded as an excel file – Annex B1 and B2 updated

## **Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification**

### **Background and Context.**

**Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-16-20

No all parties to the CPB requesting financial assistance for the 4th National Report completed and submitted the 3rd report according to the CBD (List below <https://www.cbd.int/reports/biosafety/>). Please remove from the project the countries that have not rendered the 3rd report.

Azerbaijan	Bahrain,	Bolivia,	Bosnia-Herzegovina,	Ecuador,	Guyana,	Jamaica,	Marshall Islands,	Moldova,	Montenegro,	Nauru,	Nicaragua,	Palau,	Panama,	Paraguay,	Suriname,	Venezuela	Yemen,
------------	----------	----------	---------------------	----------	---------	----------	-------------------	----------	-------------	--------	------------	--------	---------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--------

9/10/2020

Thank you for the annex and the links to the reports.

Please note that the Azerbaijan link is to its second report and there is no record of the 3rd report being completed. Please remove the country or send link to the third report. Make the other necessary adjustments in the document.

9/22/2020

Cleared.

## Agency Response

9-3-20

The EA is updated to reflect countries who submitted their 3<sup>rd</sup> National Report.

Nauru and Papua New Guinea is removed. Paraguay has declined the funding

9-15-20

Azerbaijan has been removed from the proposal. Adjustments have been made in the proposal to reflect request for 51 countries instead of the 52 listed parties submitted. Budgets have been updated accordingly



## Goals, Objectives, and Activities. Is the project framework sufficiently described?

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-16-20

#### Project Goal:

The overarching goal is to assist Parties to review and provide an update on the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in line with obligation of Article 33.

#### Project Objective:

The main objective of this project is to assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare their Fourth National Reports on measures that each Party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33. Project Objective.

**Project Activities:** At the party level, the projects will collect data taking into consideration the questions in the reporting format. The collected data will be utilized to prepare a draft national report which will be subjected to a first national consultative workshop. In parallel, the draft report will also be shared with key national expert groups and relevant stakeholders for inputs. The feedback from the workshop and stakeholders will then be incorporated in the first draft report. The report will be updated and subjected to a second national consultative workshop for review and validation. The updated report will be submitted to UNEP for technical review. The final updated report will be uploaded online using the online format on the Biosafety Clearing House by the Biosafety Clearing House National Focal Point.

Cleared

### 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

8-16-20

Potential stakeholders, depending on in country dynamics may include the following:

Potential Stakeholders	Expected Roles
------------------------	----------------

Government Ministries/Departments and Agencies [e.g. Environment, Science and Technology, Health, Agriculture, Finance, Trade]	
--	--

Development and implementation of policy and regulatory frameworks, implementation of regulatory functions including monitoring and compliance with Protocol related matters	
--	--

Academia [Universities and Research Institutions]	Biosafety research and training including laboratory analytical functions to support regulatory agencies
---	--

Civil Society Groups (CSOs)	Consumer related issues, public engagement and socio-economic others
-----------------------------	--

Private Sector	Provision of Industry information on product development and related biosafety interventions
----------------	--

Cleared

## Agency Response

**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

8-16-20

*As stated in the EA: Even though the proposed project is a normative task required to be executed by all Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a party obligation, efforts will be put in place to ensure representation of women, youth and men in the consultative process and also gender specific data will be collected and disaggregated even though the reporting formats does not require this information especially in the execution of Article 23 of the Protocol on Public Awareness, Education and Participation.*

Cleared

## Agency Response

### Monitoring and Evaluation.

#### Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-16-20

*As stated in the EA: The project will follow United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) minimum requirements for project monitoring, reporting, evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument, the Small Scale Funding Agreement (SSFA), that will be signed by the National Executing Agencies and UNEP. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process will include an end of project review undertaken by independent review teams. The project will be evaluated on the basis of: execution performance, output delivery, and project impact. Evaluation of the project's success in achieving its outcomes will be monitored continuously throughout the project through the progress reports, and the final evaluation. Since the project is an Enabling Activity, a desktop review will be undertaken focusing on lessons learnt and best practices which will be feed to the global assessment and review obligation under Article 35 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.*

Cleared

## Agency Response

### Cost Effectiveness.

## Is the project cost effective?

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-16-20

Yes.

Cleared.

### Agency Response

## Cost Ranges

### If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-16-20

No. Cost per country is within the range of the cost of the 3rd National Report. Nevertheless, the budget/country in this project is higher than for the AFRICA region project. See above and address.

9-8-20

Cleared

### Agency Response

9-3-20

The cost per country is on the average \$5,481 and is in line with Africa Region project

### Part III. Endorsement/ Approval by OFP

#### Country endorsement

**Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-16-10

The GEFSEC checked the names of the OFPs of the LoE uploaded in the Portal vs. those in the GEF Web site and found that the names of the OFPs of the following countries do not correspond.

**Albania, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cuba, Guatemala, Kiribati, Kyrgyz R., Lao PDR, Lebanon, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Tajikistan and Yemen.**

Several LoE uploaded in the Portal couldn't be open. The GEFSEC requested them again from UNEP. The GEFSEC checked the names of the OFP in these letters sent by UNEP vs. those in the GEF web site, and found that in the following countries, the names do not correspond.

**Armenia, Bolivia, Grenada, Mexico, Montenegro, Paraguay, St Lucia and Venezuela.**

Please compile the revised LoE that are GEFSEC is assisting in collecting and resubmit a COMPLETE PACKAGE of LoE.

NOTE: As of today (8-16-20) the following letters have been obtained by the GEFSEC and copies to UNEP: Cuba, Guatemala, Kyrgyzstan, Lao PDR, Montenegro, Venezuela, Yemen,

9/22/2020

Please complete entries for Part III:

### 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):

Focal Point Name	Focal Point Title	Ministry	Signed Date
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]

### 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):

Focal Point Name	Focal Point Title	Ministry	Signed Date
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]

10/6/2020

Cleared.

### Agency Response

9-3-20

LoEs revised as requested, see the attached folder and a table reflecting the updated list.

EA is updated with a package of revised LoEs and a table showing submissions of the Third national reports

10-6-2020

Entries for Focal Points updated as requested.

1. Duplicated countries removed
2. Project is now tagged as Global.

### Response to Comments

## Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)

GEF Secretariat Comment NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP Comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?



is CEO Endorsement/ approval recommended:

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-16-20

No. This EA is not recommended for approval. Please resubmit with a COMPLETE SET OF REVISED LoE. In addition, please remove the countries that have not render the 3rd Report. Thanks.

9-8-20

All LOEs submitted

Please note that the Azerbaijan link sent with the submission is a link to its second report and there is no record of the 3rd report being completed. Please remove the country or send link to the third report. Make the other necessary adjustments in the document.

9/15/2020

Not yet. Please note the issues above and correct and revise the package accordingly. All issues are also summarized here:

- 1) Part I – Project Information - there are 4 countries duplicated in the list, namely Nicaragua, Belarus, Afghanistan, and Bangladesh - this should be corrected.
- 2) Also please tag this Project as Global instead of Regional considering that the participant countries belong to two different regions.
- 3) Co-financing: while co-financing is not compulsory for EAs, it is difficult to verify the total co-financing amount as there is not a single table that summarizes each Country's indicated co-financing contribution [as provided in the OFP letters]. Although most of the co-financing is in-kind, at least 1 [Barbados] provided both cash and in-kind – please amend the portal entries accordingly.
- 4) The Budget table is not attached in Annex A of the CEO Approval request in Portal – please attach an image. Also there are some inconsistencies in referring to the number of countries participating in the project:

2199	Total	-	-	-	-	-
2200	Sub-contracts (MoU's/LA's for non-profit supporting organizations)					
####	SSFAs for 54 Participating Countries	1,295,000		1,035,890	1,295,000	1,035,890
####	Total	1,295,000	-	1,035,890	1,295,000	1,035,890
####	Component Total	1,295,000	-	1,035,890	1,295,000	1,035,890
2199	Total	-	-	-	-	-
2200	Sub-contracts (MoU's/LA's for non-profit supporting organizations)					
####	SSFAs for 54 Participating Countries	1,295,000		1,035,890	1,295,000	1,035,890
####	Total	1,295,000	-	1,035,890	1,295,000	1,035,890
####	Component Total	1,295,000	-	1,035,890	1,295,000	1,035,890

10/6/2020

No. Two minor clerical issues remain.

First, before the word Global in the portal, list all the countries that are participating in this project. Please keep the word Global at the end. Please be do not duplicate country names.

Second, under item C. Source of Co-financing in the Portal. There were 3 countries that did not indicate their co-financing contributions. These are Afghanistan, Samoa and Yemen. Please delete these three countries from the list.

10/10/2020

Yes, CEO endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/16/2020	9/3/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/10/2020	9/15/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/15/2020	10/6/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/6/2020	10/9/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/10/2020	

## CEO Recommendation

### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The GEF has an obligation to support all country reporting obligations for the Cartagena Protocol. The MSP provides financial support to countries to produce their fourth national report to the Cartagena Protocol, and is consistent with COP guidance provided to the GEF to provide said financial support.