Support to Preparation of the Fourth National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - AFRICA REGION

GEF Secretariat Review for Enabling Activity – GEF - 7

Basic Information

GEF ID
10638

Countries
Regional (Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Congo DR, Cote d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Tunisia, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe)

Project Title
Support to Preparation of the Fourth National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - AFRICA REGION

GEF Agency(ies)
UNEP

Agency ID
UNEP: 01818

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

8-4-20

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

8-4-20

Yes. As a result of this project, 46 parties (45 according to the count of the GEFSEC - Please check), will receive the financial resources to prepare the Fourth National Report on the measures taken to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

Cleared

Agency Response

08092020

The Parties are 46, Tunisia was inadvertently left out in the list above even though it was listed in the EA request

See below

Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Congo DR, Cote d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

8-4-20

Yes. Parties will provide co-financing in the amount of $1,246,750. A ratio of 1:1

Cleared

Agency Response

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

8-4-20
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

8-4-20

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

8-4-20
Yes. Financial resources to be provided by this project are within the range of values provided for the previous 3rd Report and should be sufficient.
Cleared

Agency Response

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

8-4-20

All parties to the CPB requesting financial assistance for the 4th National Report completed and submitted the 3rd report.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-4-20

Project Goal:

The overarching goal is the 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

8-4-20

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

8-4-20

Yes. The data to be captured is envisaged to identify and highlight measures that will facilitate women's participation in decision making and potential areas for generating socio-economic benefits or services for women and the youth. . While drafting of the fourth national report may not have direct benefits to women and the youth, it is the "off shoot" policies that are developed as a result of this report, that may be of benefit to parties e.g. drafting of regulations that ensure introduction of LMOs does not negatively impact on a countries' population especially women and youth or provide data to guide national processes for enforcement of the national biosafety framework and capturing data that will allow for cost benefit analysis of introduction of LMOs through dedicated *ex ante* and *post ante* socio economic studies.

Cleared

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-4-20

Yes. 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.

Cleared

Agency Response

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-4-20

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-4-20

No. Cost per country is within the range of the cost of the 3rd National Report

Cleared

Agency Response

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

8-4-20

No.

1. In sixteen (16) countries, the names of the OFP are different from those in the GEF web site, most likely due to turn-over of OFPs. The countries are: Angola, Chad, Comoros, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan and Tanzania.
2. In three (3) countries, the LoE are signed but no name associated with the signature so I can't check against the Web site. The countries are: Algeria, Cape Verde and Zambia.
3. In two (2) countries we need the letter to be translated from French to English. CAR, Congo DR.

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

9-8-20
All LOEs are correct
CLeared

Agency Response

08092020

1. Updated Letters received from the following countries - : Angola, Chad, Comoros, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan and Tanzania

2. Signed LoEs updated with names of the GEF OFPs for Algeria, Cape Verde and Zambia

3. Letters of the following countries, Central Africa Republic and Congo Republic not Congo DR, have been translated from French and

English and re-signed.

See attached completed package with a table of all LoEs including the revised LoE

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?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-4-20

No. This EA is not recommended for approval. Please resubmit with a COMPLETE SET OF REVISED LoE. Thanks.

9-8-20

All LOEs are submitted

Cleared

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/4/2020	9/8/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The objective of this EA is to assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare their 4th National Reports on measures that each Party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33. The GEF Agency will provide financial and technical resources to the participating countries to draft and submit the 4rd National Report to the CBD Secretariat. In context of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the national reporting provides an update on the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and hence facilitate intervention measures under Strategic Objective “BD-3-8 -Further development of biodiversity policy and institutional frameworks through the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety” under the GEF 7 Biodiversity Strategy. The requested enabling activity support will provide data to support revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) in line with the CBD’s new strategic plan adopted at COP-10 and the BS Strategy 2011 - 2020, national reporting guidance as provided under COP/MOP 9 Decisions CP 9/4b and CP 9/5 with support from the Focal Area Set Aside funds. It will also provide data to support the final review of the Biosafety Strategy 2011 – 2020 and provide lessons and best practices for the Post 2020 Biodiversity Framework.