

Strengthening Yemen's National Biosafety Framework for Safe Management of Biotechnology

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12260
Countries
Yemen
Project Name
Strengthening Yemen's National Biosafety Framework for Safe Management of
Biotechnology
Agencies
UNDP
Date received by PM
12/22/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Celine Augereau ep Coisy
Focal Area
Biodiversity
Project Type
MSP

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

03/16/2026

Cleared.

03/10/2026

The project is still tagged as MFA in the Project General Information and in the financing tables. Please correct.

Executing Partner:	TBD
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds ⓘ
UNDP	GET	Yemen	Multi Focal Area	BD STAR Allocation: BD-1

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds ⓘ
UNDP	GET	Yemen	Multi Focal Area	BD STAR Allocation: BD-1

1/22/2026

a) Not cleared. This is a BD focal area project and must be tagged entirely to BD focal area elements. It is currently tagged to LD-1 for sources of funds, and multifocal area in information table and financing tables, which is wrong. Please align the project with BD focal area only and update the financing and information tables consistently with LoE.

Agency's Comments

UNDP 12 Marh 2026

Thank you for your comment. The project is fully aligned with the BD focal area. All references to Land Degradation (LD-1) and multifocal area tagging have been removed in the GEF portal to ensure consistency. The financing and information tables have been updated in line with the LoE to accurately reflect this alignment.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Cleared.

Agency's Comments

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

03/10/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Cleared.

1/22/2026

a) Not cleared. Co-financing resources allocated to PMC are not proportional to GEF resources allocated to PMC - for a co-financing of \$3,503,500 million, the 10% should be \$350,350 million, instead of \$346,500 million, which represents 9.8%. Please amend.

b) Not cleared. M&E contribution is 5.4% of the GEF financing. For projects up to \$5 million - the recommended threshold is 5% - please revise. Also, Outputs and Outcomes are missed in the M&E component.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)						
M&E	Technical Assistance	4. M&E, as indicated by: - satisfactory rating of the project Quality Assurance supported by TE;	4.1. Participatory, inclusive, and gender-responsive M&E system is implemented to measure the project effectiveness, and support Adaptive Management	GET	50,000.00	253,500.00
Sub Total (\$)					916,243.00	3,503,500.00

c) Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP 1 March 2026

a) The co-financing across all project components, including PMC has been corrected to be strictly proportional to GEF Funding (page 4).

b) The comment has been addressed. The M&E budget of 5% became USD 45,800, that represents 5% of the GEF financing. In addition, the M&E Outputs and Outcomes have been included in the GEF portal.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

03/10/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Cleared.

1/22/2026

a) Not clear. Please complete the current situation describing the global significance of the biodiversity targeted in the country, the drivers of BD loss, the barriers to address them, and the conflict risk situation to deal with to implement the project.

b) Not cleared.

Barriers for effective implementation of the National Biosafety Framework: please correct Indonesia/Yemen in the text. "Barriers for effective implementation of the National Biosafety Framework Despite some national progress to implement Living Modified Organism Biosafety Management (LBM) concept in **Indonesia** there are a few barriers that impede the effective integration of LBM in the country's area-based conservation measures".

Please also address the conflict situation as a barrier for implementation of the NBF explaining current reality of governance, legislative issues, difficulties of enforcement of public entities, and power fragmentation.

Agency's Comments UNDP 1 March 2026

a) A paragraph on the global significance of Yemen's biodiversity has been added to **Section A: Project Rationale** (page 4). In addition, a paragraph describing the direct threats (drivers of loss) to biodiversity associated with the lack of biosafety framework has been added to **Section A: Project Rationale** (page 5).

Barriers for development of functional Biosafety Frameworks are already described in the subsection **Barriers for effective implementation of the National Biosafety Framework** (pages 8-9).

Risk of conflict in Yemen and its potential influence on the project implementation is already reflected in the subsection **Future scenarios for Yemen that can influence National Biosafety Efforts**, pages 5-6, and subsection **Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation**, pages 27-30. The Political and Governance Risk category (page 28) was strengthened with the following:

?Conflict and insecurity remain a cross-cutting risk, potentially restricting access to priority ports/airports/land borders, disrupting counterpart participation and decision-making, delaying procurement and logistics, and increasing duty-of-care and asset-security requirements for laboratory establishment, field sampling, and trainings?.

b) The sentence has been corrected (page 8).

Thank you for your comment on 'conflict situation as a barrier for implementation of the NBF'. However, we use **'barriers'** to refer only to conditions and capacity gaps that the project can realistically influence and remove through its planned interventions (i.e., elements within the project's sphere of control such as policy instruments, institutional coordination, technical capacity, systems, and awareness). In contrast, Yemen's conflict context is a material external factor that the project cannot resolve; it is therefore treated as an **implementation risk** rather than a barrier in the project logic. Accordingly, conflict and security-related constraints are addressed under **'Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation'** (pages 27-30), including their potential implications for access, procurement/logistics, continuity of government functions, and delivery of trainings and laboratory services, together with mitigation measures (adaptive sequencing, remote/alternative delivery modalities, corridor-based logistics planning, and duty-of-care procedures).

The governance and legislative issues relative to Biosafety Framework are already explained in the subsection **Baseline Programs in Yemen to establish functional National Biosafety Framework** (page 6) and **Barriers for effective implementation of the National Biosafety Framework** (page 8). All other challenges that the project cannot directly influence and only can adapt to are described in the **Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation** (page 27).

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) **Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

b) **Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

c) **Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

d) **are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/10/2026

d) Cleared.

1/22/2026

a) Cleared

b) Cleared. Despite a conflict situation the project intends to build resilience through actions in consideration of political fragmentation and conflict context, to help implementation of a real NBF and enhance capacities of the main stakeholders involved in the processes.

c) Cleared.

d) Not cleared. Please clarify and list civil society organizations and local community-based groups or farmer associations consulted in project design and describe plans to engage and consult these in project development.

Agency's Comments UNDP 1 March 2026

b) Thank you. Your comment has been noted.

The stakeholders consulted during the development of the PIF are listed in the table "Key Consultations for PIF Development" on pages 32-33.

d) The stakeholders consulted during the development of the PIF are included in the table **Key consultations for the PIF development** (page 32-33). It includes the following stakeholders related to NGOs and private sector: Istidama for Nature Conservation NGO, Federation of Yemen Chambers of Commerce and Industry and Hayel Saeed Anam Group, and Women National Committee and Yemeni Women's Union.

Plans to engage stakeholders (including NGOs and farmer groups) in the project development and implementation already described in the subsection **Key Stakeholders** (pages 21-22).

During the PPG Stage the project will produce a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the entire project lifetime to coordinate and manage stakeholders' involvement in the project activities as well as empower them. Project stakeholders and their roles in the project development and implementation will be explicitly described in the Plan. Stakeholder empowerment in the Yemen Biosafety Project will be anchored in shared decision-making, practical capacity, economic incentives, and transparent engagement. **Communities, farmer groups, importers/retailers, universities, and NGOs** will co-create the Biosafety regulations, guidelines, and SOPs through NBC-led consultations and SRAC hearings, with inclusion of women and youth, accessible venues, and disability-aware materials; a feedback loop tied to the BCH will ensure voice and accountability.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) **Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

b) **Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

03/27/2026

Cleared.

03/10/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Not cleared. Please address the comment and remove the Agency's name as executing partner. At this early stage, it is too premature for proposing the dual role. During the PPG, you will present the case by following the procedure included in the GEF guidelines 2025. You could further elaborate for the Secretariat to take a decision.

1/22/2026

a) Not cleared. Please precise through diagram and diagram of funds the implementation framework, and describe the project organization and governance to be implemented.

b) Not cleared. At this early stage, it is too premature for proposing the dual role - please remove the Agency's name as executing partner - during the preparation phase, the Agency can further elaborate for the Secretariat to take a decision.

c) Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP 19 March 2026

Thank you for your comment. In line with the guidance provided, the agency's name has been removed as the executing partner at this stage, both in the portal and in the PIF document (page 2 and 25, General Project Information and Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects). It is acknowledged that, during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase, a comprehensive case will be developed and presented in accordance with the procedures outlined in the GEF Guidelines, 2025. This will include further elaboration and justification to support the Secretariat's review and decision-making process.

UNDP 1 March 2026

a) Thank you for the comment. At the PIF stage, we typically present the proposed implementation arrangements (implementing Agency, executing/implementing partners, and core coordination bodies) rather than a fully developed project organization and governance structure or a detailed fund-flow diagram, as these are normally finalized during the PPG phase once institutional roles and capacities, fiduciary modalities, and operating procedures are confirmed with the Government and key partners (page 25).

During PPG, we will develop and validate: the detailed implementation framework (including organogram/governance diagram, decision-making and reporting lines, TORs for the Project Board/Steering Committee, PMU roles, and technical committees such as NBC/SRAC); the detailed project budget consistent with UNDP/GEF requirements (including disbursement channels, accountability, and controls); and procedures for coordination and financial management. In the interim, the PIF narrative has been strengthened to clarify the proposed institutional set-up at a summary level (lead competent authority, inter-agency coordination mechanism, and linkages to NBC/SRAC and BCH).

b) Thank you for the comment. We understand the concern regarding project implementation roles at this stage. However, given Yemen's current operating environment including institutional fragmentation, constrained government execution capacity, and heightened fiduciary, access, and security constraints the project can only be implemented through UNDP Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) as agreed between the UN and the relevant authorities in Yemen. Under DIM, UNDP serves as the implementing Agency and executes project activities directly (with strong and active involvement of government institutions and responsible parties/service providers as needed) to ensure continuity, risk management, and compliance with UNDP and GEF fiduciary and safeguard requirements.

Accordingly, the project will retain UNDP DIM as the "proposed execution arrangement" in the PIF to reflect the only feasible implementation pathway at present and as agreed with government for UN/DP operations in Yemen under the current FCAS situation. The detailed execution architecture (including any specific responsible parties, technical partners, and their contractual roles) will be elaborated and validated during PPG and reflected in the governance and implementation framework and submitted for Secretariat review and decision.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**
- b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

See comments on Annex D.

1/22/2026

- a) Cleared
- b) Cleared.
- c) Cleared

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) **Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) **Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) **Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

- a) The project tends to be durable and transformative through operationalization of a new National biosafety framework, through legal adoption and capacity building enforcement.
- b) The project is already a national project, but could be improved in case of conflict resolution. Nevertheless, it offers capacities for cooperation in the region, by development of a network and information sharing.
- c) Yes, cleared. It offers opportunity to align and fill gaps in policies in different sectors and to implement existing laws.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

- 6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

Yes, cleared. It is aligned with BD FA Objective 2. To effectively implement the Cartagena and Nagoya protocols (Goals A, B and C of the GBF)

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

Cleared.

The project is aligned with country international commitments, NBSAP and diverse national strategies (environmental, food, agriculture and fisheries...)

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

Yes, Cleared.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

Yes, Cleared.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

1/22/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

03/16/2026

Cleared.

03/10/2026

Not cleared. See comment on Box 1. The project is still tagged as MFA in the financing tables. Please correct.

02/09/2026

Not cleared. Please correct the table mentioning BD FA project (vs Multifocal area) and Programming of funds: BD FA. Idem for PPG FA and programming of funds, remove LD Star and add BD Star.

For source of fundings, correct by removing LD and adding BD FA, consistently with the LoE.

Agency's Comments UNDP 1 March 2026

The project is fully aligned with the BD focal area. All references to Land Degradation (LD-1) and multifocal area tagging have been removed to ensure consistency. The financing and information tables have been updated in line with the LoE to accurately reflect this alignment.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

02/09/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

02/09/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

02/09/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

02/09/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

03/10/2026

Cleared.

02/09/2026

The letter is not consistent with the amounts in the portal. Please correct the portal (see comments above).

Agency's Comments

UNDP 1 March 2026

The discrepancy between the letter (LoE) and the amounts in the portal have been reviewed and addressed. The portal has now been updated to reflect the correct figures.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

02/09/2026

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

03/10/2026

Cleared.

02/09/2026

Not cleared. The agency has included the ESS supporting document (SESP). Based on the review of the documentation, the following actions and clarifications are requested:

In the PIF, within the Key Risk Table, the ESS risk is rated as Moderate and the overall risk as Substantial. In the same PIF under "Overall Project/Program Risk Classification," the risk is indicated as Medium/Moderate. The SESP supporting document also suggests a Moderate risk rating. In addition, the country is included in the "FY26 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations." Please reconsider the risk ratings to ensure coherence across PIF and SESP and clarify how risks associated with the country's listing as a Fragile and Conflict-affected Situation will be addressed.

The country where the project will be implemented is included as countries with conflict in the WBG "FY26 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations." During the PPG, please ensure conducting conflict-sensitive analysis and integrating mitigation measures into the project design.

Please clarify whether Indigenous Peoples are going to be affected by the project. In the SESP supporting document, Annexes 1 and 2 appear to be incomplete. Several fields do not indicate "yes," "no," nor "to be confirmed." Complete all fields by indicating "yes," "no," or "to be confirmed," or provide an explanation for any omissions.

During the PPG phase, the implementing agency should prepare an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), a

Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan and Grievance mechanisms. In the budget preparation ensure their a clear line for stakeholder engagement.

Agency's Comments

UNDP 1 March 2026

Thank you for the comment. Please note that there is no contradiction between SESP Overall Risk assessed as 'Moderate' and Overall Project Risk rated as 'Substantial'. SESP estimates the environmental and social risks that are likely to be generated by the project itself through delivery of the project Outputs. While **'Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation'** includes all risks including external risk that can impact the project. The external risks, including risk of conflict and fragmented governance drives overall project risk to 'Substantial'. During PPG stage the risks will be re-assessed again.

In accordance with UNDP SESP procedures, only risks triggered by the project are marked as Y/Yes, if not 'N/No' in the SESP Annex 1 (the annex has been edited accordingly to add Ns). The SESP Annex 2 is not completed at PIF stage. The project is not going to affect Indigenous People in any way in accordance with SESP that is quite specific and detailed.

We acknowledge that Yemen is classified by the World Bank Group as a Fragile and Conflict-affected Situation (FCS) and agree that conflict and insecurity are material contextual risks for project design and delivery. During the PPG, we will conduct a conflict-sensitive analysis to identify how conflict dynamics may affect stakeholder relations, access and logistics, institutional functionality, inclusion (women, youth, vulnerable groups), and potential grievances, and we will integrate corresponding mitigation measures into the final project design.

During the PPG phase, UNDP will prepare the required safeguard and inclusion instruments in line with UNDP and GEF requirements, including an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) (and any site-/activity-specific management measures as needed), a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), a Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan, and an operational Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) (with clear procedures, roles, referral pathways, and provisions for SEA/SH-related complaints, as applicable). We will also ensure the full project budget includes dedicated and clearly costed budget lines for stakeholder engagement and inclusion activities (e.g., consultations, community dialogues, communications/IEC materials, translation and accessibility measures, travel/logistics, facilitation, and GRM operation and reporting), with responsibilities and deliverables reflected in the workplan and M&E framework.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

02/09/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

02/09/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

03/27/2026

The project is recommended for technical clearance.

03/18/2026

The project is not yet ready. Please address the comments.

03/10/2026

The project is not yet ready. Please address the comments.

02/09/2026

The project is not yet ready. Please address the comments.

Agency's Comments

UNDP 19 March 2026

The comment has been duly addressed.

UNDP 1 March 2026

Thank you. The feedback provided above has been incorporated and addressed.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

1. During the PPG phase, please prepare an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), a Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan and Grievance mechanisms. In the budget preparation ensure their a clear line for stakeholder engagement.
2. In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please ensure that the GAP aligns with the project components. Please ensure that in the development of the results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's Comments UNDP 1 March 2026

Thank you for the comment. During the PPG phase, we will develop a Gender Analysis and a Gender Action Plan (GAP) that is explicitly mapped to each project component and output, with clear gender-responsive actions, responsible parties, timelines, and resourcing. We will also ensure the results framework includes gender-specific indicators (and sex-disaggregated targets, where relevant) to enable robust monitoring and reporting of gender results across policy and coordination (Component 1), risk assessment and border/lab capacity (Component 2), and awareness and stakeholder engagement (Component 3).

To facilitate effective GAP implementation, the full project budget will include dedicated budget lines for gender-related activities (e.g., gender-responsive stakeholder engagement, targeted outreach, participation support, SEA/SH risk mitigation measures, capacity-building, and monitoring), and GAP delivery will be integrated into the annual workplans and the project's M&E system (regular monitoring, quarterly risk/log reviews, and adaptive management to adjust actions if targets are not being met). We will also include explicit requirements to report on gender-specific results and GAP implementation in PIRs, and to assess progress, challenges, lessons learned, and any adaptive adjustments in the MTR and TE.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	2/9/2026	3/1/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/10/2026	3/12/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/18/2026	3/19/2026

Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Review
3/27/2026

Agency Response