

Biosecurity Implementation Framework for the Management of Biological Resources in Moldova

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10982

Countries

Moldova

Project Name

Biosecurity Implementation Framework for the Management of Biological
Resources in Moldova

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/13/2022

Review completed by PM

6/14/2022

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 5/31/2022 - Cleared.

JS 4/21/2022 - Thank you for the submission. However, the PIF was not submitted with a valid letter of endorsement (LoE) and was thus not reviewed.

The LoE was not signed by a former OFP, and not by the OFP at the time of submission.

Please resubmit with a valid LoE and consider adding \$10,723 to the project's total STAR request to make sure none of the country's STAR allocation is left unused. With the STAR used in this submission, Moldova would leave \$10,723 of GEF-7 STAR unused.

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 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 -

1- Outcome 1: Please clarify what is meant by "bioresource management", which appears to be a wide term compared to the scope of the project and underlying outputs. Please consider reformulating to reflect that the project is focused on LMOs and IAS.

2- Component 3: To avoid dispersing the project's scarce resources, please remove what appears to be very generic awareness raising and training activities (*Awareness Program set up on management of traditional knowledge and genetic resources and management of biological introductions; Short term training and educational curricula developed and mainstreamed in high education institutions on conservation of genetic resources*) or please (i) explain how they relate to the rest of the project, (ii) are critical to the proper implementation of the policies developed under component 1, and (iii) reformulate them to make the link with the rest of the project clearer.

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 5/31/2022 -Cleared.

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 5/31/2022 -Cleared.

JS 4/21/2022 - Yes, but please consider adding \$10,723 to the project's total STAR request to make sure none of the country's STAR allocation is left unused.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/31/2022 -Cleared.

JS 4/21/2022 - See above

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/31/2022 -Cleared.

JS 4/21/2022 - See above

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 JS 5/31/2022 - 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 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

The ability of the project to have a direct impact over its lifetime on the 60,000 ha reported on core indicator 4 will be reassessed at CEO approval stage.

JS 5/31/2022 - Please clarify to what the 500 ha reported under core indicator 4 correspond ? We fail to see how the project would have any direct impact on the ground, which is acceptable for this type of project:

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas) ⓘ			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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 5/31/2022 - 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 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 -

1- Please justify why it is more efficient to tackle IAS and biosafety related to LMOs together in the same project, as proposed here. Please notably clarify what institutions are mandated on these issues and how they relate to the EA.

2- Throughout the PIF, please remove all language that overpromises beyond what a \$1 million project focused on LMOs and IAS policy frameworks can realistically achieve. For example, please consider a more conservative range of stakeholders that will be meaningfully be associated to the project, and be more realistic on the delivery of economic benefits, and on the benefits that can be attributed to the project:

The project will ensure coordination and collaborative approach with various categories of stakeholders and beneficiaries e.g. vulnerable population, policy-makers, decision-makers, operational personnel and staff, laboratory personnel, researchers, community members, participants to the meetings, media people, farmers, private business people, consumers, students, young people, national minorities (Gagauz, etc.), Ukrainian refugees and migrant people, people of different demographic categories, based on gender equality and participation etc., who will be actively involved in all stages of project preparation and project implementation. The project will ensure economic benefits for women and men would be equal. Both men and women will be involved in the design, implementation and de

Global benefits. The global biodiversity benefit is the stabilization of natural and agricultural ecosystems as within and outside of protected areas (areas of app. 100,000 ha), ensuring conservation of genetic diversity, stability of ecosystems and minimize degradation of biodiversity long-term, considering the replication effect, the project will ensure the long-term integrity of fragile ecosystems at over 45% of the country (million ha), including protected areas (app. 50,000 ha) and agricultural lands.

Project activities are oriented to fulfill some of the strategic objectives as reduction of threats to biodiversity, promote sustainable biodiversity as well as mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into production landscape and sectors to contribute to the landscape management and restoration.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 -

1- Please streamline the baseline section by removing :

1a- all projects that are not directly related to biosafety or IAS. Please provide the timeframes of the projects that remain cited in the baseline, e.g. 2006-2010 for the project GEF-UNEP *Support for Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Moldova*.

1b- all elaboration that are not related to biosafety or IAS. In particular, please remove the following paragraphs, which appear over-promising and are misplaced within the PIF template:

The project will ensure coordination and collaborative approach with various categories of stakeholders and beneficiaries e.g. vulnerable population, policy-makers, decision-makers, operational personnel and staff, laboratory personnel, researchers, community participants to the meetings, media people, farmers, private business people, consumers, students, young people, national minorities (Gagauz, etc.), Ukrainian refugees and migrant people, people of different demographic categories, based on gender equality participation etc., who will be actively involved in all stages of project preparation and project implementation. The project

Global benefits. The global biodiversity benefit is the stabilization of natural and agricultural ecosystems as within and outside of protected areas (areas of app. 100,000 ha), ensuring conservation of genetic diversity, stability of ecosystems and minimize degradation of biodiversity in the long-term, considering the replication effect, the project will ensure the long-term integrity of fragile ecosystems at over 45% of the territory (over 10 million ha), including protected areas (app. 50,000 ha) and agricultural lands.

Project activities are oriented to fulfill some of the strategic objectives as reduction of threats to biodiversity, promote sustainable use of biodiversity as well as mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into production landscape and sectoral policies to the landscape management and restoration.

2- Please clarify Moldova's current regulatory and institutional framework regarding IAS and biosafety.

3- Please update the following paragraph:

... scenarios lies in the quality and speed of proliferation of advanced conservation approaches into biodiversity management systems. At the moment specific policies and instruments for integrative management of LMOs/IAS are missing thus, the baseline course of action in most of the country in 2020 with outdated evidence, monitoring and decision making system, without any account of biodiversity

Agency Response

Agency Response: 06/15/2022

The referenced paragraph is updated in both the Portal entry and the PIF and is highlighted in green

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please refine the Theory of change, and notably develop a narrative. While there remains 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>

JS 6/13/2022 -

Please include the Theory of Change diagram in the portal entry.

JS 5/31/2022 -

1- Please clarify what biosecurity means in the context of this project proposal. Please notably clarify what would be the scope of the National Biosecurity Framework that would replace the National Biosafety Framework. Is the idea to tackle in a joint framework IAS and LMOs resulting from modern biotechnology? Or would the National Biosecurity Framework tackle a larger scope of than IAS and LMOs?

2- Please include the Theory of Change diagram in the portal entry. During PPG, please refine the Theory of change, and notably develop a narrative. While there remains 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>

Agency Response

Agency Response: 06/15/2022

The Theory of Change diagram is inserted in the portal entry.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 - We failed to find an elaboration explaining the alignment with the BD-2-6 and BD-2-8 entry points in the portal entry. Please correct.

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

JS 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 -

1- Please see questions on the baseline and alternative scenario.

2- Please articulate here in plain language and in a few sentences the concrete contributions of this project to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the management of IAS in Moldova.

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 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 -- Please remove all the language that attributes very indirect effects to the project:

issues and gaps to be addressed in the next period. This will enable the country to increase efficiency of the national integrated management system for biological resources, integrate international experience, reduce environmental and ecosystem degradation, ensure conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within the ecological networks, preserve valuable ecosystems and, in this way, to contribute to the global environmental benefits. This project will contribute to reducing the rate of losses of biodiversity through early detection and efficient control from unintentional or illegal transboundary movement of IAS and LMO species, prevention of ecosystem degradation and loss of biodiversity that will allow better adaptation to climate change process. Therefore, this project can be considered as a response to an existing climate change threat and present an adaptation measure.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/31/2022 -Cleared. During PPG, please design the project to ensure the institutionalization of the training and capacity building activities developed by the project.

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 5/31/2022 -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 5/31/2022 -Cleared.

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 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/16/2022 -

It is duly noted that the project will conduct an in-depth gender analysis to mainstream gender equality throughout and include gender indicators/targets/outputs in the log frame to ensure monitoring of results. It is also noted that the project will dedicate sufficient financial and human resources to the corresponding activities.

A - Please integrate gender considerations in table B, in particular in Component 2 Output 2 (Risk Analysis Frameworks) and Component 3 Output 3 to ensure that the gender dimensions are adequately captured in the project design. An example of corresponding language would be:

Output 2: **Gender-responsive** Risk Analysis frameworks with clearly defined guidelines and manuals developed to support monitoring and detection of LMOs and IAS.

Output 3: Ten thematic workshops organized for main stakeholders and beneficiaries, **including women and gender experts** (of about 150 people) on legal provisions including liability and Redress procedures , monitoring and management mechanisms, preventive actions on the management of IAS and LMOs

JS 5/31/2022 -

1- We note that a gender analysis will be carried out during PPG and that gender will be mainstreamed in the project design. Please clarify in the portal entry whether a gender action plan or equivalent will be developed, and whether a gender specialist will be part of the PPG team.

2- Please clarify how the project is to contribute to directly (i) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources, (ii) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women, or change the tags accordingly:

closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

improving women's participation and decision-making; and/or Yes

generating socio-economic benefits or services for women. Yes

Agency Response

Agency Response:06/16/2022

Guidance noted. Outputs 2 and 3 are updated in both the PIF and the Portal entry to ensure that gender dimensions will be adequately captured in the project design.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/31/2022 -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 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 -

1- Please reformulate/clarify the following sentence in the portal entry:

The project is likely to apply the implementation and coordination activities supported by local and international experts to a number of coordination meetings, workshop and trainings addressed to all key actors and stakeholders. Decision makers and public awareness and participation will be promoted using the BCH system, large campaign of information and awareness.

2- Please explain what is meant by "*the set-up of stringent biosecurity conditions will also be priorities for post-COVID to mitigate the recurrence of such pandemic and diseases. During PPG and project implementation the importance of having a strong integrated biosecurity management system will be communicated as part of the green recovery program of the country*": in concrete terms, how the project would contribute to mitigate the recurrence of zoonotic disease spillovers?

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 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 - The PIF mentions a Project Steering Committee (PSC) and a National Steering Committee (NSC). Please clarify the difference and added-value or remove one of the two.

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 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 - Please streamline this section by removing all that is not directly related to IAS and LMOs, and be explicit on the alignment with national priorities identified in the NBSAP and gaps identified in the Fourth National Report to the Cartagena Protocol.

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 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/13/2022 - Please delete or clarify to what project output(s) correspond the "demonstrations of community based ecological practices and related policies in Moldova", "introducing environmentally sound agricultural production and conservational activity in the sector and its integration in global environmental processes".

JS 5/31/2022 - Please clarify to what project output(s) correspond the "demonstrations of community based ecological practices and related policies in Moldova", "introducing

environmentally sound agricultural production and conservational activity in the sector and its integration in global environmental processes" or delete.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 06/15/2022

Review comment is noted. The referenced text has been deleted from the Portal entry to ensure consistency with the updated PIF.

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 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/31/2022 - We note the project is rated as low risk and a SRIF is attached.

1- Please delete the risk table from this section as it is duplicative of the one in the risk section.

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 5/31/2022 - Cleared.

JS 4/21/2022 - No, the PIF was not submitted with a valid letter of endorsement (LoE). The LoE was not signed by a former OFP, and not by the OFP at the time of

submission. We note the signature by the Political Focal Point, but per Policy, only the OFP can sign endorsement letters.

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

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

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

JS 6/16/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the last remaining comments above (gender) and resubmit

JS 6/15/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the few remaining comments above and resubmit.

JS 5/31/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

JS 4/21/2022 - Not at this stage. Please resubmit with a valide LoE. For any clarification, please contact 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 and request for PPG embedded throughout this review sheet.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/21/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/15/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/16/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval