

# Promoting the safe application of biotechnology through Multi country Cooperation in the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Asia

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10991

**Countries**

Regional (Bangladesh, India, Mongolia, Philippines)

**Project Name**

Promoting the safe application of biotechnology through Multi country Cooperation in the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Asia

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

4/13/2022

**Review completed by PM**

6/15/2022

**Program Manager**

Jurgis Sapijanskas

**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**

JS 6/15/2022- Cleared, thank you.

JS 6/13/2022 - Thank you for the resubmission.

0- To facilitate the next review, please highlight changes made to the PIF to address the comments made in this review sheet.

1- Please remove "Law Division - UNEP" from the list of executing partners at this stage. The implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guidelines. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an "exceptional" basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF would in no way endorse any alternative execution arrangement.

**Other Executing Partner(s)** ⓘ

National Biosafety Committee, Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MONGOLIA), National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines (NCBP), Department of Environment, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (BANGLADESH), Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (INDIA), Law Division – UNEP, Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy (Republic of Korea)- Korea Biosafety Clearing House (SOUTH KOREA)

2- Please remove the Republic of Korea from the list of beneficiary countries. Please also clarify in the PIF (in the description of the alternative scenario) the role of the Republic of Korea in the project and confirm in the PIF that it will not benefit from the GEF grant.

**Part I: Project Information** 

GEF ID  
10991

Project Type  
MSP

Type of Trust Fund  
GET

CBIT/NGI  
CBIT No

NGI No

Project Title ⓘ

Promoting the safe application of biotechnology through Multi country Cooperation in the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Asia

Countries

Regional, Bangladesh, India, Mongolia, Philippines, Republic Of Korea

Agency(ies)

UNEP

JS 4/19/2022

Please resubmit using, as authorized by the respective letters of endorsement (LoE), the full remaining STAR allocation of Mongolia, India and the Philippines. In total, please increase the budget by \$77,233 with the following breakdown:

For Mongolia, please increase the budget by \$50,038. The LoE allows utilization of \$587,708, yet project only uses \$537,670 and leaves \$50,038 of Mongolia's remaining STAR unutilized.

For India, please increase the budget by \$22,095, the LoE authorizes use of \$161,567 when project uses \$136,366.00 and leaves out \$22,095 of remaining STAR allocation.

For the Philippines, please increase the budget by \$5,100. The LoE authorizes use of \$497,850 when project uses \$492,750 and leaves out \$5,100 of remaining STAR allocation.

Technical review will be carried out upon resubmission.

**Agency Response****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

JS 6/15/2022- Cleared.

JS 6/13/2022 -

1- Please remove the duplicate output 2.2, which is currently both in component 1 and 2.

2- Component 3 seems entirely dedicated to M&E. If so, please reduce the GEF grant allocated to it to 5% of GEF project financing, i.e. to a maximum of \$49,809.

During PPG, please refine output formulation. Most outputs are currently worded as outcomes.

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

JS 6/15/2022- Cleared, thank you.

JS 6/13/2022 -

1 Unless a clear justification is provided for the recurrent nature of the South Korean grant, please:

1a. Tag the grant as "Investment Mobilized"

1b. Provide an explanation under table C of how that Investment Mobilized was identified and clarify the anticipated disbursement timeframe.

2- Please provide the type and the name of the entity providing the South Korean co-financing. The type is currently reflected as "Other".

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
GEF Agency	UNEP	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	250,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Philippines	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,200,085.00
Recipient Country Government	Mongolia	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Bangladesh	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	India	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	700,000.00
Other	South Korea	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,600,000.00
Other	South Korea	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	250,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)				5,500,085.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

Not Applicable

## 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 JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

## Agency Response

### The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

## Agency Response

### The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

## 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 JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

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

**JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.**

JS 6/13/2022 - Only core indicator 11 has a target, which is acceptable given the nature of the project.

1- Please provide under table F an explanation of how the number of direct beneficiaries was derived (i.e. the method/main assumptions).

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 JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

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  
JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please develop a thorough barrier analysis. It should identify barriers to effective regional cooperation and country-specific barriers to effective implementation of Cartagena Protocol at the national level.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

We note the additional detailed baseline information provided in Annex D in the uploaded word version of the PIF.

A more detailed baseline will have to be established during PPG.

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  
JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please:

- Refine the theory of change (ToC) of the project, and notably develop a narrative. While there remain diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance: <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>
- develop component 1 dedicated to regional cooperation so that it is truly complementary and adds-value to the national-level interventions of component 2. In particular, output 1.2 seems redundant with component 2 and will have to be refined.
- tailor the country-specific interventions to the needs of each country to be precisely identified during PPG; The need for output 2.1 (baseline report) in addition to the baseline analysis to be carried out during PPG will have to be justified.
- pay particular attention to the institutionalization of the training and capacity building activities. The regional nature of the project should be leveraged, e.g. by developing training of regional trainers that would be able to replicate and upscaling the trainings in the region.

JS 6/13/2022 -

1. Please clarify the role of South Korea in the project, justify their involvement and confirm in the PIF that the GEF grant will be used only to the benefit of the eligible GEF recipient countries that contributed their STAR to the project.
2. Component 1: Please clarify in the PIF how many countries are targeted in this component. Please correct the typo below (reference to three countries when at least India, Mongolia, the Philippines Bangladesh, and the Republic of Korea should be involved) and clarify whether the component will also aim at having an impact beyond these 5 countries.

- Component 1: **Multi country** collaboration and cooperation on biosafety issues;

The objective of this component is to strengthen technical capacity, establish mechanisms for multi country cooperation and elaborate strategies, approaches, mechanisms and methodologies on biosafety science-based issues such as risk assessment, risk management, monitoring of GMOs. This is in line with Articles 14 (bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and arrangements) and 22 (cautionary approach) of the Cartagena Protocol, specifically their emphasis on joint country interventions harnessing the potential of shared expertise. In area of LMO detection, the project intervention will focus on training and capacity strengthening of designated regulatory agencies for sampling and detection. Specific thematic guidelines on sampling and detection including protocols, will be developed, harmonized **with the three countries** for review and integration in the national biosafety system. There will also designated training for customs review and handling of LMOs at the port. Relevant guidance documents including manuals on sampling procedures will be developed for inspectors. Designated ports will be equipped and laboratory facilities upgraded to support handling of large volumes of agricultural products for inspection in the participating countries mainly through development of harmonized operating procedures and upgrades when needed.

3. component 2: Likewise, please be explicit in the PIF on the list of countries that will benefit from this component.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

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

Cleared.

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

JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/13/2022 - Please delete the last four bullets as they appear, at PIF stage, to be very minor or indirect results of this project, or not related to GEBs:

- Reducting the use of pesticides and agro-chemicals;
- Strengthening engagement of local communities in governance systems;
- Increasing awareness of the contribution of biodiversity to people's lives;
- Mobilizing resources from private and global funds.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

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

JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

We note that the stakeholder analysis remains very preliminary at this stage. The PIF also indicate that Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society organizations and Private sector Entities have been consulted during the project identification phase but does not provide any information on these stakeholder consultations

During PPG, please

- ensure meaningful consultations with IPLCs and civil society organizations and document them, along with all other consultations, in the CEO approval package;

- develop separate and complementary stakeholder analyses and engagement plans for the regional and the national components of the project. The plan should include detailed, country-specific analyses and information on future engagement.

- ensure that the GEF policies on stakeholder engagement and environmental and social safeguards are implemented in full.

JS 6/13/2022 -

1- Please provide a short elaboration in the PIF on the consultations made to develop this proposal.

Agency Response

**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

JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/13/2022 - 1- Please confirm in the PIF that a gender analysis and a gender action plan or equivalent will be developed during PPG.

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

JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

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

JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/13/2022 -

1- COVID: Please correct the following typos:

Although the three countries seemingly escape  
d the full impact of the pandemic as compared t  
o total and active cases of other countries, the g  
lobal economic slowdown will have an economi  
cal impact on the three countries. For example, t  
ourism is a major contributor (14.5%) to XXX's G  
DP, and created 18.2% of all employment pre-CO  
VID. This will have a major impact on the econo

2- Climate: Please clarify to what region/country the climate projections correspond?  
The references in the footnotes are for DR Congo, Madagascar, and Namibia. Please  
remove all that is not directly relevant for the countries involved in this project.

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

JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/13/2022 -

1- As already commented in the first comment box of this review sheet, please remove the reference to execution by UNEP of component 1 at this PIF stage:

The project component 1 on multi-country cooperation and collaboration would be only partially funded by the project. The project would be executed by the Korea Institute for Promoting Asia Biosafety Cooperation (KIPABiC) and UNEP. Some funding would be provided by the GEF.

2- Please remove the sentence "Additionally, GEF-eligible countries in Asia who already have ongoing biosafety projects will be able to use their GEF allocation to purchase services and products from this component". While we encourage the project to expand the relevance and impact of its regional component in other Asian countries, it is not possible in practice for additional countries to use any of their GEF-7 anymore.

3- Please clarify what is meant by "*purchase* these services and products" in "countries not eligible for GEF funding will also be able to purchase these services and products". To whom would which services and products be purchased? We, of course, encourage the regional component of the project to make possible the participation of other countries to the project, as long as it is at their own expense and that the component benefits as planned the countries that contributed their STAR to the project.

4- Please justify the choice of Korea Institute for Promoting Asia Biosafety Cooperation as the EA for component 1.

## 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

JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

## 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

JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

## 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

JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared. We note the attached SRIF and the low risk rating.

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

JS 6/10/2022 - Cleared.

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

JS 6/16/2022. The project is recommended for clearance.

JS 6/13/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the comments above and resubmit.

JS 4/19/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the comment in the first comment box of this review sheet and resubmit. For any clarification, please contact [jsapijanskas@thegef.org](mailto:jsapijanskas@thegef.org)

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please see guidance for PPG embedded in throughout the review sheet, including on stakeholder engagement.

#### **Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	4/19/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	6/13/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	6/16/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**