

Implementation of National Biosecurity Framework of Ethiopia

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10984

Countries

Ethiopia

Project Name

Implementation of National Biosecurity Framework of Ethiopia

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/13/2022

Review completed by PM

6/13/2022

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-27-22: The project is well aligned with the Biodiversity focal area priorities (BD 2.6 and 3.8)

06-12-22: Project title and executing entity name slightly differ between the OFP's LOE and Portal entry. Please adjust.

Letter of Endorsement:



በኢትዮጵያ ፌዴራላዊ ዲሞክራሲያዊ ሪፐብሊክ
 The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
 የአካባቢ፣ የደንገ፣ የአየር ንብረት ለውጥ ኮሚሽን
 Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission

To: Kelly West, GEF Executive Coordinator, GEF Coordination Unit
 United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
 P.O box 30552-00100, Nairobi, Kenya

ቁጥር 2/12.12726/13
 Ref. No.
 ቀን 2/17/2021
 Date

Subject: **Endorsement for "Implementation of Bio-security Project In Ethiopia"**

In my capacity as GEF Operational Focal Point for Ethiopia, I confirm that the above project proposal (a) is in accordance with my government's national priorities and our commitment to the relevant global environmental conventions; and (b) was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points.

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Agency listed below. If approved, the proposal will be prepared and implemented by Environment, forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC). I request the GEF Agency to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement.


The total financing (from GEFTF) being requested for this project is **US \$ 2,041,534** inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG), if any, and agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF Grant. The financing requested for Ethiopia is detailed in the table below.

| Source of Funds | GEF Agency | Focal Area | Amount (USD) | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | Project preparation | project | Fee | Total |
| GEFTF | UNEP | Biodiversity | 50,000 | 1,814,415 | 177,119.00 | 2,041,534 |
| Total GEF Resources | | | 50,000 | 1,814,415 | 177,119.00 | 2,041,534 |

I consent to the utilization of Ethiopia's allocations in GEF-7 as defined in the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR).

Portal Entry:

Project Identification Form (PIF) entry – Medium Sized Project – GEF - 7

Part I: Project Information 

| | | |
|--|---|--------|
| GEF ID 10984 | Project Type MSP | |
| Type of Trust Fund GET | CBIT/NGI CBIT No | NGI No |
| Countries Ethiopia | Project Title ⓘ Implementation of National Biosecurity Framework of Ethiopia | |
| Other Executing Partner(s) ⓘ Environmental Protection Authority of Ethiopia | Agency(ies) UNEP | |
| GEF Focal Area ⓘ Biodiversity | Executing Partner Type Government | |
| Taxonomy ⓘ Focal Areas, Species, Biodiversity, Supplementary Protocol to the CBD, Biosafety, Influencing models, Demonstrate innovative approaches: Strengthen institutional capacity and | | |

06-13-22: Project title and executing entity remain slightly different between the OFP?s LOE and Portal entry. Please revise and amend.

Agency Response
Response 06/16/2022

The revised OFP LoE with correct project title and executing entity has been uploaded.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-27-22: The proposed components and outputs described in Table B are appropriate.

Agency Response
Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-27-22: Proposed co-financing is adequate.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-27-22: Proposed financing indicated in Table D is adequate and concurrent with guidelines.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-27-22: Proposed financing is within the resources available for the BD focal area in the Country's STAR allocation.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-27-22: Proposed financing is within the resources available for the BD focal area.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 04-27-22: Proposed PPG request is within the allowable limits for MSPs.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-27-22: Proposed core indicators are substantial, with over estimated 150,000 ha in new terrestrial and marine PAs, and 70,000 ha in restored lands. Based on these important land-based targets, please estimate the potential CO2 mitigation for core indicator 6, using the FAO Exact methodology.

Agency Response
Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 04-27-22: The proposed project taxonomy is satisfactory.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
04-28-22: Barriers and threats are adequately described.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
04-28-22: Baseline scenario description is satisfactory.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
04-28-22: Baseline scenario description is satisfactory.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
04-28-22: Proposed project is well aligned with BD focal area strategies.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-28-22: Incremental cost reasoning is adequately described.

Agency Response

6. Are the project?s/program?s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-28-22: The proposed targets are substantial and will deliver GEBs.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-28-22: Description of potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up is satisfactory for PIF stage.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project?s/program?s intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-28-22: Map presented is very preliminary. Given the substantial targets for Core Indicators 1,2,3 and 4, please add a more detailed geo-referenced map outlining intended project locations.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: A Stakeholder analysis was conducted to identify the major stakeholders from Government institutions, non-governmental institutions and international agencies their potential roles and interests in IAS prevention, control and management.

06-12-22: It is well noted that the project includes indicative information on how stakeholders will be engaged in the project preparation. In addition to this information, please provide information on stakeholder consultations during project preparation. The project indicates that consultations have been carried out with civil society and indigenous peoples, please provide information on these consultations conducted during project development.

06-13-22: It remains unclear what kind of stakeholder consultations were carried out during project design with civil society and indigenous peoples. Please, explain and provide the information required. If there has been no consultations, please uncheck the boxes and provide an explanation on why such consultations were not conducted.

Agency Response

Response 06/16/2022

Consultation with civil society group and local communities during the project design was meant to ensure their participation during project preparation and implementation. Though limited, Local communities were identified as high-power interest groups as they have been assisting in the management of IAS in the Lake Tana area through manual removal of IAS which is a hinderance to their fishing and related farming activities. In addition, the proposed objective of the project was presented and the envisaged participation, interest and support from Civil Society and Local communities in project preparation and implementation including site-based outreach activities were captured and reflected in pages 29-30, 35 and 38 of the PIF (highlighted in green). There were no consultations with indigenous peoples who are mainly pastoralists and hunter gathers in Ethiopia (<https://www.iwgia.org/en/ethiopia.html#:~:text=The%20Indigenous%20Peoples%20of%20Ethiopia,of%20the%20country's%20total%20landmass>). Extensive and dedicated consultative discussions will be undertaken in the proposed selected pilot sites regions focused on identification and engagement of Civil Society, local communities and indigenous peoples in project preparation and implementation during the PPG Phase.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: Please include more contextual information on the relevant laws, cultural norms and traditions shaping behaviors that might hinder or accelerate gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment.

06-12-22: The initial gender analysis and approach to incorporating gender perspectives and women's empowerment had been adequately captured in Section 3 on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. As a good gender mainstreaming practice, please include in the project components (e.g., through outputs or indicators) the gender issues presented in Section 3 and other gender perspectives from future stocktaking exercises.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: Please provide a rationale and include a few examples on the instruments for engagement with private sector entities in section 4 of the PIF template.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: Please indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks, and potential mitigation measures in section 5 of the PIF template.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: Description of proposed institutional arrangements and coordination is satisfactory.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: Proposed project is aligned with the country's national strategies.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed knowledge management (KM) approach in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: Knowledge management is an important element of the proposed project. Please indicate how the lessons learned from previous projects have been incorporated into the proposed KM approach. Will the project include plans for strategic communications?

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: Please provide more specific information and justification for the 'low' risk classification for the safeguards standards triggered by the project. Please also describe the proposed project grievance mechanism for IPLCs.

Agency Response

Part III ? Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04-29-22: The Letter of Endorsement is adequately signed by the current country's GEF Operational Focal Point listed in the data base.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-29-22: Please address the comments above and resubmit for further review. Thanks!

06-12-22: Please address the comment above and resubmit. This resubmission is very urgent, given the fast approach June 17, 2022 deadline for approval of PIFs under GEF-7. Thanks!

06-13-22: Please address the remaining comment above and resubmit. This resubmission is very urgent, given the fast approach June 17, 2022 deadline for approval of PIFs under GEF-7. Thanks!

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review Agency Response

| |
|---|
| First Review |
| Additional Review (as necessary) |
| Additional Review (as necessary) |
| Additional Review (as necessary) |
| Additional Review (as necessary) |

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval