

Implementation of the National Biosafety Mechanism in the Kyrgyz Republic in accordance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10813

Countries

Kyrgyz Republic

Project Name

Implementation of the National Biosafety Mechanism in the Kyrgyz Republic
in accordance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

4/19/2021

Review completed by PM

6/1/2021

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

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

May 28, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

May 6, 2021 HF:

1.) The Executing Agency in Portal (Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Kyrgyz Republic) is not the same Executing Agency in the LoE (State Agency on Environmental Protection of the Kyrgyz Republic). Please fix. There are three options: (i) leave the EA blank or TBD in Project Information section of the Portal and remove Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Kyrgyz Republic and from Section 6 ? Coordination; (ii) get an email from the OFP supporting State Agency on Environmental Protection of the Kyrgyz Republic as the Executing Partner and upload the emails in the Documents tab; (iii) get a new LoE supporting State Agency on Environmental Protection of the Kyrgyz Republic as the Executing Partner.

Agency Response

RE May 6: Thank you for your advice. We updated the Portal following the suggestion

(i).

Section 6 (Coordination) of the PIF has been updated.

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

June 7, 2021 HF:

4.) Comment cleared.

May 28, 2021 HF:

1-3.) Comments cleared.

4.) Please address original comment. Please take out "project management" from the title of Component 3 and please note that any execution or project management expenses need to be separate out and covered by the PMC since that is the whole purpose of having PMC funding.

April 29, 2021 HF:

1.) Please make the level of detail of the description of the three project components more commensurate (including further development/description of Components 1, but especially 3).

2.) Component 1 on policy, regulatory and institutional framework seems to contain capacity building elements, should these be captured in Component 2 instead? Or is Component 2 on technical capacity building (detection, identification etc), whereas C-1 capacity building is on policy/regulatory requirements? Please clarify in project documentation.

3.) The first indicator under Project Outcome 1.1 is 'coherent national implementation of Cartagena Protocol' seems like a higher/project objective-level indicator (e.g. for the entire project with contributions of all three Components) rather than under C-1 only. Further, the PIF doesn't make clear what metrics would be used to measure this...Please clarify/revise.

4.) Please modify the name of Component 3 to minimize the risk of confusion/accidental inclusion of execution or project management costs in this component. Any execution or project management expenses should be separate and covered by the PMC since that is the whole purpose of having PMC funding.

Agency Response

RE 29 Apr:

1) Please see more detailed elaboration of Components 1 and 3 in Section 3 (alternative scenario) of the PIF. We have added a description of a KM strategy that includes a dialogue with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) and also the submission of project reports and case studies under an information resources platform already available by the SCBD.

2) Please see changes made in the PIF table and descriptions of Components 1 and 2 in Section 3 (alternative scenario). The training elements in Component 1 are to support development and implementation of the policy, regulatory and institutional framework, whereas Component 2 is focused on technical capacity building.

3) Thank you for the suggestion, and indeed, this indicator does not provide a good metric and was removed.

4) The name of Component 3 has been revised as well outputs and outcomes have been adjusted to reflect KM strongly.

RE 28 May:

Thank you for your comment. We have updated Component 3's title accordingly.

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

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes.

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
April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes. The Agency fee is below 9%.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes, STAR is available.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes, will assume marginal adjustment to BD to cover this MSP.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

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
April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes. PPG is at \$50,000 limit.

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
April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes.

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
April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes.

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

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 28, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

April 29, 2021 HF:

1.) The baseline mentions a previous GEF project in 2005, and mentions how the draft legislation under that project was never passed, and the further institutional/legislative challenges that have been encountered since. Please expound on what has shifted in the context or approach to ensure greater progress/success under this investment.

Agency Response RE 29 Apr: A new paragraph has been added in Section 2 (baseline scenario) to address this point

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes. Please see previous questions on contents of Table B.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes. BD 3-8.

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

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes.

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

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 28, 2021 HF:

All comments cleared.

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes, but needs further development at PIF (and PPG) stage. For example:

- 1.) Please address any financial sustainability challenges and measures this project will take to ensure continuing implementation of the Protocol and related activities-including the future financial viability of the three laboratories included in Component 2.
- 2.) Please address the issue of scaling-up at the national level as this project is focused, it seems, exclusively on activities that will be happening at the national level (policy,

capacity, regulatory, technical), whereas there would need to be sub-national and field engagement to fully realize implementation of the Protocol. Please address how the project envisions scaling from this perspective (likely beyond the project budget/timeframe), and if any scaling or KM is envisioned beyond national-boundaries please further develop this in Component 3 or under a new KM component.

Agency Response

RE 29 Apr:

1) A new paragraph has been added on Section 7 (innovation, sustainability, scaling up) to address this point

2) The project is very small, and it would be the first step to establish the process at the national level. Component 2 includes activities for public awareness, education and participation, which will also include sub-national and field engagement. In addition, technical capacity building activities will also include officials from sub-national agencies and institutions. Component 3 has been restructured to include KM activities and awareness-raising campaigns. During the PPG phase, the mapping and identification of the stakeholders from sub-national levels, who should be involved in the training and capacity building process, will be done. Also, a dialogue with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (and its Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety) will be established and ways to act beyond national boundaries, including at the regional level, will be explored jointly. We have further detailed an information resource platform under the Convention that will be used for knowledge sharing among Parties and other stakeholders.

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

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes.

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

May 28, 2021 HF:

All comments cleared.

April 29, 2021 HF:

- 1.) Please include "means of future engagement" in the stakeholder table.
- 2.) If the private sector is considered a key stakeholder in this project (which is assumed given what is written in the private sector section), please mark "private sector entities" under #2 Stakeholders.
- 3.) Please include in the stakeholder table any key private sector entities the project is planning on engaging, or the private sector as a whole with as much detail as possible at this point regarding private sector stakeholders for engagement.

Agency Response

RE 29 Apr:

- 1) Updated in the PIF Section 2 (stakeholders)
- 2) Updated in the PIF Section 2 (stakeholders)
- 3) Unfortunately, this will only be done during the PPG phase due to the ongoing COVID restrictions. The team tried to reach the private sectors partners online but the process was unsuccessful. To properly engage this sector, face-to-face meetings are necessary.

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

May 28, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

April 29, 2021 HF:

1.) This section has provided indicative gender statistics/information on gender, but please include info on barriers for gender equality that the project will encounter and aim to overcome.

2.) Potential gender activities in relation to Component 2 could consider personnel and hiring practices, access to training and promotion etc at the three laboratories that will be central to the work of the project. Please consider in PPG/gender assessment.

Agency Response

RE 29 Apr:

1) One of the main barriers that the project will help to overcome is that of women's leadership and participation in the decision-making processes in Kyrgyzstan, which has declined in the past years. The project will ensure equal participation for men and women (target of 50% of women participation) assuring that women will be properly involved and trained on the topics of this project.

2) Thank you for the suggestion, this will be considered during the PPG phase and a gender engagement plan will be prepared.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes, though during PPG please undertake a much more complete analysis and engagement with the private sector and fully develop the project's approach to private sector engagement. The formation of partnerships and concrete means for engagement are also welcomed.

Agency Response RE 29 Apr: Thank you for your suggestion during the PPG phase. We will take action accordingly.

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

May 28, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

April 29, 2021 HF:

The climate change risk in the Project Risks box of the PIF refers to an "additional document 'climate change screening' " but it is not attached in the documents tab of the PIF. Please upload and resubmit.

Agency Response RE 29 Apr: The climate change screening report has been uploaded.

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

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes

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

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes

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

May 28, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

April 29, 2021 HF:

Please further develop the approach to KM, both in this PIF, and throughout the PPG, in the KM section, but also throughout the project components-considering including it as an Outcome in revised Component 3 as well (see previous comment). In particular:

- 1.) Please provide an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the proposed project concept, and
- 2.) Include plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations during project design and implementation. The PIF should include a brief discussion regarding these element and/or if these will be identified/prepared later using PPG, then the PIF should clearly mention this intention in the KM section (and include it as part of proposed PPG funded actions).

Agency Response

RE 29 Apr:

Please see revised Component 3 in the PIF table and description in Section 3 (alternative scenario). The revised PIF includes one new outcome "3.2 Knowledge and results shared with relevant actors" and three new outputs as follows: 3.2.1 Outcomes of this project shared with inter alia, the CBD Secretariat, other Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, particularly from the region, and other stakeholders; 3.2.2 Submission of National Reports on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; 3.2.3 Submission of project reports and other relevant information to the Biosafety Information Resource Centre.

- 1) Please see revised Section 3 (alternative scenario). The revised section includes reference to the recently developed document on the draft Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and Capacity-Building Action Plan (2021-2030) as an existing initiative and best practice document to inform this proposal.

2) Please see the revised KM section within Component 3. The revised section indicates that such plans will be covered during the PPG stage. Relevant projects will be identified, inter alia, among the 136 capacity-building projects that have been initiated in different countries/regions, according to the information registered in the Biosafety Clearing House, from which to draw lessons.

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

April 29, 2021 HF:

Yes

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

April 29, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared. Valid LOE is attached.

April 21, 2021 HF:

Please secure a current LOE from the OFP. The letter submitted is out-dated and contains the former OFP's signature (Mirslav Amankulov). The current OFP's name contact information is available on the GEF website and pasted below:

Mrs. Dinara Kutmanova

Operational Focal Point since 2021-02-01

Director

The State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry of the Kyrgyz Republic

142 Gorky St.

Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan 720005

Kyrgyz Republic

Tel: +996 312 54 50 57

Fax: +996 312 54 50 91

Email: envforest(a t)elcat.kg; dkutmanova(a t)ecology.gov.kg

Agency Response Addressed - Apologies for this mistake.

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

NA

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

June 7, 2021 HF:

Yes, PM recommends clearance of this MSP. Thank you.

May 28, 2021 HF:

No. Please address remaining comment on the title of Component 3 regarding 'project management'. Thank you.

April 29, 2021 HF:

No, not at this time. Please address comments in review sheet and resubmit. Thank you.

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	4/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/28/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/7/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval