



Mainstreaming of Biosafety and Institutional Capacity Building to strengthen effective implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10773

Countries

India

Project Name

Mainstreaming of Biosafety and Institutional Capacity Building to strengthen effective implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

10/30/2023

Review completed by PM

11/7/2023

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

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

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

Agency Response

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

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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 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

HF 11/27/23:

Cleared.

HF 11/2/23:

Yes, although section 1.1 includes a reference to \$10 million in co-finance. This is inconsistent with the tables and the co-finance letter. Please correct to make consistent.

Agency Response

11/15/2023

The typo in cofinancing is acknowledged and corrected to \$6.7 million.

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

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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

HF 11/27/23:

Cleared.

HF 11/2/23:

No, the table is not visible in the section of the Portal submission. Please fix and resubmit.

Agency Response

11/15/2023

The table is fixed within the margins of the portal for resubmission.

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

HF 11/27/23:

Cleared.

HF 11/2/23:

1.) Please provide an explanation of how the Core Indicator target 11 was derived, and the significant change from PIF to CER stage in this target.

2.) Please explicitly mention the core indicator 11 and its target in the results framework (annex a).

Agency Response

11/16/2023

1. Explanatory text on how the core indicator target 11 was derived has been added under Section E of the CEO endorsement template and changes from PIF have been explained.

2. 2. Details on core Indicator II have been incorporated in Annex A ? Project Results Framework

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
HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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
HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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
HF 11/27/23:

Cleared.

HF 11/2/23:

Yes, but please include a description and depiction of the barriers to mainstreaming that exist and show how the project will overcome these via the TOC to achieve the project's alternative scenario.

Agency Response

11/20/2023

The needful has been appropriately described under the threat, root causes and barrier analysis with reference to the activities proposed to achieve the project's alternative scenario.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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

HF 11/27/23:

Cleared.

HF 11/2/23:

Please further describe the approach to sustainability, particularly given the GEF investments in CPB implementation and capacity to date.

Agency Response

11/20/2023

The description of the approach to sustainability of the project activities beyond the project duration has been further detailed in Section 5 of the prodoc.

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

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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

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

HF 11/27/23:

Cleared.

HF 11/2/23:

- 1.) To what extent/how will local level stakeholders, including farm-level be involved/play a role in project implementation?
- 2.) Stakeholder engagement plan and gender action plan tables are off margins ? please adjust (ITS can help as needed).

Agency Response

11/20/2023

1. Proposed association/involvement of the local level stakeholders at the farm level has been included.

2. Stakeholder engagement plan and gender action plan tables has been initially adjusted. UNEP will follow up with ITS as needed

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

HF 11/27/23:

Cleared.

HF 11/2/23:

Gender dimensions were outlined in detail in the Gender Action Plan but are not reflected in the description of the project components and outputs. As part of gender mainstreaming, please capture the gender dimensions in the project components and outputs. Please also ensure that the Gender Action Plan activities are budgeted and reported on.

Agency Response

11/20/2023

The gender dimensions are appropriately referred in the section on project components and outputs that are in line with the details described in the Gender Action Plan of the project document. These have already been budgeted for and thus no changes are made in the budget. The activities will be reported as part of project implementation reports. The Gender

Action Plan has been incorporated in the section on Gender Equality and Women's empowerment.

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

HF 11/27/23:

Cleared

HF 11/2/23

Please describe **specifically**, for this GEF project the private sector's engagement in the project, if any. Given the scope of the project it seems as though private sector engagement would be critical to practical and effective implementation of the CPB at several levels.

Agency Response

11/20/2023

Private sector engagement and associated scope in the project is detailed and has been further refined.

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

HF 11/27/23

Cleared

HF 11/2/23

Please include climate change in the risk section, as well as other social (could imagine protest/backlash to LMOs at local level or other social unrest etc) and environment risks to the project objectives being achieved.

Agency Response

11/20/2023

Risks related to climate change, social and environmental risks have been incorporated in the project risk section and highlighted in yellow

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

HF 11/27/23

Cleared

HF 11/2/23:

- 1.) Please elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.
- 2.) How is this project building on/coordinating with "Promoting the safe application of biotechnology through Multi-country Cooperation in the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Asia" multi-country project?

Agency Response

1/20/2023

1. Planned coordination of proposed project outcomes with the relevant GEF financed projects has been acknowledged in the document and will be considered at the implementation phase.
2. The present project will make use of the outputs and experiences from the multi country project to strengthen the national activities to ensure synergy and avoid duplication of efforts.

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

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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

HF 11/27/23

Cleared

HF 11/2/23:

No, please describe the KM approach for the project including a timeline and set of deliverables.

Agency Response

11/20/2023

The Knowledge Management Approach has been depicted appropriately with the required timelines and deliverables in a summary table.

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

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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
HF 11/27/23

Cleared

HF 11/2/23:

- 1.) Beyond the required MTE and TE, please describe the M&E plan for the project.
- 2.) Monitoring and Evaluation budget table is missed in Section 9 in Portal ? please include/amend

Agency Response

11/20/2023

1.) The M & E plan is described in the prodoc guided by the ?standard text used by UNEP under the Section on M & E?

2.) The Monitoring and Evaluation budget table is inserted in Section 9 in the Portal

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
HF 11/2/23:

Yes

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/27/23

Cleared.

11/2/23:

No, please:

- 1.) Complete Annex C (PPG status) so it is legible in the Portal.
- 2.) Budget: ensure that the proportion of PM covered by the GEF and co-finance are proportional to that of the GEF finance to co-finance ratio.
- 3.) Budget: Please redact the \$5,000 from "hospitality and entertainment" and "sundry" from the GEF budget, and cover with co-finance and redistribute.
- 4.) Budget: Generic Administrative support staff is not an eligible activity ? please include a specific position such a Administrative Assistant or Financial Assistant as appropriate.
- 4.) The co-finance is not legible in the Portal entry. Only in the annex. Please fix.

Agency Response

11/20/2023

1. Errors with Annex C in the Portal has been addressed
2. Issue of proportionality has been addressed within the needs for PMC support in the country
3. The budget has ben reviewed and funds redistributed as guided.
4. Specific positions for project support have been budgeted for to cover Finance and Administration position

Issues on cofinance in the Portal entry has been addressed

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF 11/2/23

Clear

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF 11/27/23

CLeared.

HF 11/2/23:

No, the table is not visible in the section of the Portal submission. Please fix and resubmit.

Agency Response

11/20/2023

PPG table Annex C has been reviewed and updated in the Portal for submission

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

HF 11/2/23:

Yes

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

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 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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
HF 11/27/23

Yes, CEO endorsement recommended by PM.

HF 11/2/23:

No, not yet. Please address comments in review sheet and resubmit. Ensure that you are accessing the correct CER review sheet and feedback-rather than a review sheet duplicate with only a couple of random comments

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	11/2/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/27/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations