



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL
PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project
THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: 23 February 2012

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 4078

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 00560

COUNTRY(IES): Ethiopia

PROJECT TITLE: Implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through Effective Implementation of National Biosafety Frame work of Ethiopia

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP, (select), (select)

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Environmental Protection Authority

GEF FOCAL AREA(s): Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(s): BD-SP6 (see preparation guidelines section on exactly what to write)

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: BIOSAFETY PROGRAM

Expected Calendar (mm/dd/yy)	
Milestones	Dates
Work Program (for FSPs only)	
Agency Approval date	April 2012
Implementation Start	June 2012
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	June 2014
Project Closing Date	May 2016

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK (Expand table as necessary)

Project Objective: To enhance the implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through strengthening and institutional capacity building on the National Biosafety Framework for Ethiopia								
Project Components	Indicate whether Investment , TA, or STA ²	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing ¹		Co-Financing ¹		Total (\$) c=a+ b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
1. Regulatory Framework	TA, STA	A comprehensive regulatory framework for biosafety is in place, providing the architecture of an integrated administrative and management system	-Institutional arrangements and procedures for biosafety regulation, risk assessment and risk management and decision making developed and implemented, -subsidiary laws enacted -specific technical guidelines and manuals on risk assessment and risk management and decision making developed (translated into four local languages and disseminated)	80,000	47	90,000	53	170,000

2. Institutional Capacity building on Biosafety	TA, STA	National Capacity for LMO detection, risk assessment and risk management including monitoring and enforcement measures enhanced to facilitate decision making	<p>-Laboratory for LMO Detection identified and upgraded</p> <p>-Needs assessment report on inspections, monitoring and enforcement;</p> <p>-Manuals, procedures and protocols on inspections, monitoring, enforcement and emergency procedures</p> <p>-Training strategy on handling of LMOs with workshops on risk assessment and risk management, LMO detection, monitoring and enforcement, inspection procedures and policy analysis developed</p> <p>- 10 – 20 Key staff from partner organizations get first hand field experience from best practicing countries</p>	330,000	50	330,000	50	660,000
---	---------	---	--	---------	----	---------	----	---------

3. Public awareness, education and participation	STA	Public awareness regarding the safe use of LMOs in Ethiopia is augmented through a formal educational strategy and a public information sharing through greater access to the Biosafety Clearing House	Public education, public participation and awareness toolkits produced and used for training including dissemination via existing national and regional newspapers, radio and TV networks 50 – 100 Identified Stakeholders (governmental and non-organization, academic and business community) at national and sub-national levels trained (as trainers) Biosafety curriculum prepared for formal education	80,000	44	100,000	56	180,000
4. Botanical filing and biological monitoring system	TA, STA	<input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring and Enforcement system is in place to handle all uses of LMOs	Botanical files of 6 ³ important crops of origin and /or center of diversity developed (e.g. wheat) -National BCH updated with data on botanical files of specific crops for which Ethiopia is the centers of diversity	46,000	37	80,000	63	126,000

5. Project review and audit	TA, STA	Checks and balances built into the implementation	Annual Audit reports Mid-term/Terminal Evaluation Reports Lessons learnt Report	20,000	67	10,000	33	30,000
6. Project management				60,000	40	90,000	60	150,000
Total Project Costs				616,000	62	700,000	38	1,316,000

¹ List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.

² TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

³Part of a wider national biological monitoring system to generate biological data (botanical files) on 12 crops for which Ethiopia is the center of origin or diversity supported by the Government of Ethiopia and other bilateral sources, the crops highlighted in the GEF intervention are potential crops which could be introduced as LMOs

B. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT (expand the table line items as necessary)

<i>Name of Co-financier (source)</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>%*</i>
Government Contribution	Nat'l Gov't	In-kind	700,000	100
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
Total Co-financing			700,000	100%

* Percentage of each co-financier's contribution at CEO endorsement to total co-financing.

C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	<i>Project Preparation a</i>	<i>Project b</i>	<i>Total c = a + b</i>	<i>Agency Fee</i>	<i>For comparison: GEF and Co-financing at PIF</i>
GEF financing	20,000	616,000	636,000	63,600	616,000
Co-financing	20,000	700,000	720,000		700,000
Total	40,000	1,316,000	1,356,000	63,600	1,316,000

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY (IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY (IES)¹ NOT APPLICABLE

<i>GEF Agency</i>	<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Country Name/ Global</i>	<i>(in \$)</i>		
			<i>Project (a)</i>	<i>Agency Fee (b)²</i>	<i>Total c=a+b</i>
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
Total GEF Resources					

¹ NO need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

² Relates to the project and any previous project preparation funding that have been provided and for which no Agency fee has been requested from Trustee.

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF amount(\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	60.5	60,500	74,400	134,900
International consultants*	20.1	50,200	60,000	110,200
Total	80.6	110,700	134,400	245,100

* Details to be provided in Annex C.

F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

<i>Cost Items</i>	<i>Total Estimated person weeks/months</i>	<i>GEF amount (\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	40.5	40,500	20,500	61,000
International consultants*				
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*		5,000	8,000	13,000
Travel*		5,000	8,500	13,500
Others**		9,500	53,000	62,500
Total	40.5	60,000	90,000	150,000

* Details to be provided in Annex C

** The budgeted costs include a Government contribution of \$53,000 for project staff costs [\$40,000] and for training/meetings [Government contribution - \$13,000 and GEF Cost - \$9,500] (see Appendix 1 and 2 of UNEP prodoc and Appendix 11 which spells out the Terms of Reference),

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? yes no

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your agency and to the GEF Trust Fund).

H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN: Monitoring will be conducted at the national level by the Project Steering Committee. The Implementing Agency (UNEP) in collaboration with GEF will monitor progress at the international level. As this is not part of a global project, there is no Global Steering Committee to monitor at the global level. Ongoing evaluation is the analysis, during the implementation phase, of continuing relevance, efficiency and effectiveness and the present and likely future outputs, effects and impact. Monitoring of the progress of project activities and financial expenditure which reflect and support project activities will be undertaken in accordance with UNEP’s internal guidelines for project supervision, monitoring and evaluation. The cost of monitoring the project at the national and international level is built into the project cost and the IA fees respectively. The costed M&E plan is attached as Appendix 7 of UNEP Project Doc and summarised in the table below.

The monitoring and evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNEP/ GEF procedures. Monitoring will assess whether the management and supervision of project activities are efficient and will seek to improve efficiency and overall effectiveness of project implementation. It is a continuous process, which will collect information about the execution of the planned activities, allow for improvements in method and performance, and compare accomplished results with planned tasks. This activity will be under direct responsibility of the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC). The UNEP Task manager will, in collaboration with the NPSC, track these indicators. The M & E plan is outlined in Table 1 and costed in Appendix 7 of the UNEP Project Document.

Table 1: Indicators and Means of verification

Indicator	Means of Verification	Responsibility	Budget
Half-yearly and annual activity and progress reports are prepared	Reports submitted to UNEP	National Project Coordinator NPSC	None
Half-yearly disbursement plans, half-year and annual financial reports are prepared	Reports submitted to UNEP	Finance officer National Project Coordinator	None
Yearly GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports are prepared	Reports submitted to UNEP	National Project Coordinator NPSC	None
Tracking Tools are updated at mid-term and end of Project	Reports submitted to UNEP	National Project Coordinator NEA	None
Performance targets, outputs, and outcomes are achieved as	Half-yearly and Annual progress reports	National Project Coordinator NPSC	None

specified in the work plans			
The annual work plans are reviewed	Work plans, minutes of NPSC meetings	National Project Coordinator NPSC	None
Disbursements are made on a timely basis, and procurement is achieved according to the procurement plan.	ANUBIS Reports at UNEP and Bank Account statements of executing agency	UNEP task manager NPC Finance Officer	None
National Coordinating Committee is tracking implementation progress and project impact, and providing guidance.	Minutes of NPSC meetings	NPC NPSC	None
National Coordinating Committee is providing policy guidance, especially on achievement of project impact.	Minutes of NPSC meetings	NPC NPSC	None
Audit reports and other reviews show sound financial practices.	Annual Audit reports	NPC Finance officer NEA/NPSC External auditor	6,000
Mid Term Review and Terminal Evaluation	Mid Term Review Report Terminal Evaluation Report	UNEP task manager/UNEP Evaluation office NPC/NEA Finance officer	12,000
Learning	Lessons Learnt Report	NPC Finance officer	2,000
Total			20,000

UNEP will monitor project execution through interaction via email, peer reviews and supervisory missions and undertake an independent evaluation. Throughout the project, implementation approaches will be integrated with feedbacks, lessons learnt and best practices gained. The task manager will facilitate exchange of experiences between countries that are in the process of implementing their NBF.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION: In addition to the following questions, please ensure that the project design incorporates key GEF operational principles, including sustainability of global environmental benefits, institutional continuity and replicability, keeping in mind that these principles will be monitored rigorously in the annual Project Implementation Review and other Review stages.

A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED: Ethiopia is the center of origin and center of diversity for a number of crops including wheat, barley, sorghum, finger millet, teff and their wild relatives. The total land area of Ethiopia is 1.1 million sq km (450,000 sq miles). The country is one of the richest genetic resource centres in the world in terms of crop diversity. This is principally attributed to the diverse farming systems, socio-economics, cultures and agroecologies. Crop plants such as coffee (*Coffea arabica*), safflower (*Carthamus tinctorius*), tef (*Eragrostis tef*), noug (*Guizotia abyssinica*), anchote (*Coccinia abyssinica*), and enset (*Ensete ventricosum*), are known to have originated in Ethiopia. Very high genetic diversity is found in Ethiopia in four of the world's widely grown food crops (wheat, barley, sorghum and peas); in three of the world's most important industrial crops (linseed, castor and cotton); in the world's most important cash crop (coffee); in a number of food crops of regional and local importance (teff, noug, Ethiopian mustard, enset, finger millet, cowpea, lentil) and in a number of forage species of world importance (clovers, medics, oats) (IBC, 2008). Ethiopia is an agrarian country and agriculture accounts for 54% of the gross domestic product (GDP). Agriculture employs about 80% of the population and accounts for about 90% of the exports (CSA, 2000; 2005). The country is one of the least developed in the world, with a per capita gross national income (GNI) in 2004 of US\$110 (World Bank, 2006). (State the total land area covered by Ethiopia, its total population and proportion of this population dependent on agriculture, Also give proportion of the country that is arid or semi-arid, to justify the need for innovative methods to improve productivity of land without undermining the conservation of wild crops, land races/ traditional varieties and crop relatives) Besides crop diversity, 31 species of mammals, 29 species of birds, 6 species of reptiles, 33 species of amphibians and 4 species of fish are endemic to Ethiopia. Ethiopia forms an agro-biodiversity hotspot due to its location between Eurasia and Sub-Saharan Africa with a large variety of ecosystems and (micro) climates, and the mix of various ethnic groups and cultures. Locally, it has a highly dissected terrain inhabited by agriculturalists for very long periods of time, allowing for crop species to be subjected to varying microclimates and agricultural conditions. The country is designated as a "Vavilov Centre" one of eight areas in the world where crop plants were originally domesticated from wild species. Ethiopia still hosts a large array (> 200 taxa) of Crop Wild Relatives (CWR), across a variety of crops, from coffee, cereals, pulses, spinaches, oil plants and fibers. The taxonomic level of many of these crop relatives are at variety, sub-species levels and so of immediate importance for breeding with the main "global" crop itself. Whilst some taxa may be conserved in Ethiopia's network of Protected Areas, many others exist as small populations within diminishing and overused patches of common grazing land, hedgerows etc. The heterogeneous environment and diverse cultural history have made Ethiopia an important primary and secondary gene centre for many cultivated crop species, serving as an economically and ecologically valuable source of germplasm. There is an overriding economic interest on these biodiversity which Ethiopia holds in trust for the rest of the world. In effect, risk to Ethiopian biodiversity will have adverse impacts on the rest of the world. On the other hand, under normal conditions, Ethiopia hosts a population of about four million people who face chronic food insecurity. With these historical and recent developments in the food production sub-sector, as well as the increased interest for agro-fuel, it is expected that there will be increased interest for application of modern biotechnology in agriculture, including use of LMOs. The high levels of agricultural biodiversity and that of their wild relatives, coupled with the need for more food, feed, fibre and medicine necessitate the need for use of modern biotechnology as one of the tools, with extra care being taken to ensure that the germplasm of crops, livestock, fish and their wild relatives are not undermined. There is therefore need for capacity building in Risk Assessment, Risk management and tracking and monitoring; GMO testing capacity, information exchange among other things to ensure that Ethiopia can tap potential benefits from

modern biotechnology and minimize the potential risks. Because of Regional integration processes among African countries, the African Union agenda is expected to increase cross border mobility of people and commodities. Notably, it is expected that as a result of the economic integration process, there will be an increased flow of goods and services across the borders of countries in the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) sub- region. Ethiopia is also in the process of acceding to the WTO. The potential impacts on biodiversity, therefore, arises from the high possibility of transboundary movements of LMO via trade, mobility of people or physical means as well as from increased domestic interest. Ethiopia is under serious ecological and biodiversity risks posed by these anthropogenic and physical means.

Ethiopia took part in the UNEP/GEF Project on "Development of National Biosafety Frameworks" and the BCH Project, out of these interventions, a Draft Biosafety Proclamation and guidelines were produced through these earlier biosafety projects. Through the national processes, a National Biosafety Proclamation with six technical guidelines (directives) and a background assessment document have been promulgated as part of the terminal processes followed by eight national stakeholder consultations and public awareness meetings to gather public interest in the proposed National Biosafety System. However, having a developed NBF in place does not guarantee automatic implementation and achievement of identified policy goals and objectives. The assessment and internal progress review identified some key barriers which should be addressed through a capacity building initiative on biosafety. The key issues identified were low coordination and enforcement capacity, coordination with port countries, enhanced public awareness and stakeholder involvement, enhanced scientific and technical capacity in Risk Assessment and LMO Detection, networking and harmonization/mainstreaming biosafety into the national policy agenda. The new project will focus on ensuring building capacity to facilitate the implementation of the developed instruments. Further capacity gaps and major issues for support will be identified through national stocktaking consultative processes during the PPG and will be used to guide the design of the new project. Furthermore, the project will build on the ongoing efforts to establish a national biosafety clearing house in line with article 20 of the Protocol to meet and serve as the main information sharing hub on biosafety for Ethiopia. The proposed biosafety implementation project will assist Ethiopia to meet its obligations to the Protocol by building on and strengthening the existing capacity developed during the project on "Development of a National Biosafety Framework for Ethiopia" (see<http://www.unep.org/biosafety/files/ETNBFrep.pdf>) .

The proposed activities will be executed in collaboration with other relevant government sectors, NGOs, academic and research institutions and CBOs. Ethiopia had developed its NBSAP in 2005 that strengthened policy, legislative and institutional frameworks and the implementation of intervention measures aimed at the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable utilization of its components and equitable sharing of benefits. Ethiopia has coordinated the development of NBF process through an eclectic process involving key stakeholders.

The proposed project would help Ethiopia to strengthen the existing institutional and technical structures and infrastructure needed to meet the obligations of the Protocol especially as it pertains to handling and decision making related to LMOs. The additional activities envisaged in the national biosafety implementation project include the following:-

- Development and implementation of Biosafety Regulations (subsidiary legislations to make the biosafety law operational);
- Review and update of earlier developed National Biosafety Guidelines and preparation of specific technical guidelines as identified in the NBF project;
- Strengthening of appropriate institutional structures for risk assessment, risk management, and decision making;
- Implementation of policies on biotechnology and biosafety;
- Training of regulators, decision makers, scientists, administrative and technical staff on legal and

technical matters related to handling of LMO application;

- Reinforcement of the existing infrastructures (laboratories) to strengthen monitoring and detection of LMOs;
- Setting up and making operational the proposed mechanism for monitoring and enforcement;
- Strengthening of communication and information exchange relating to Biosafety both at the national level as well as through the central Portal of the BCH; and

Putting in place systems for strengthening public awareness, education and participation in decision making on LMOs including the use and access to the BCH.

The proposed project will therefore build on the installed capacity though limited and will seek to ensure sustainable biodiversity conservation through implementation of Ethiopia's National Biosafety Framework by enhancing National and Regional institutional and regulatory capacity, risk assessment and management, public awareness and strengthened national and regional biosafety clearing houses. It will focus on enhancing institutional capacity through training activities and finalization of technical instruments to enhance the operational mandate of the EPA and its allied institutions to be able to make science based decisions related to handling LMOs. By implementing the proposed project, Ethiopia will have a sound national mechanism for biosafety that will ensure that each decision on the intentional introduction of a LMO is based on scientific assessments with the capacity for follow up to ensure compliance and the management of potential risks to biodiversity of global importance which Ethiopia holds in trust for mankind.

B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL AND/OR REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS: Ethiopia is party to the United Nations Convention on Biodiversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, all of which are the integral part of the law of the land, according to the Ethiopian constitution. Ethiopia has also developed a National Biosafety Framework to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The project aims at an effective implementation of the NBF as required by article 2.1 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and Article 8(g) of the CBD. The proposed project addresses one of the Ethiopia's priorities in the conservation and sustainable utilization of its biodiversity. In addition, the Ethiopian biodiversity strategy and action plan has prioritized the need to conserve agro biodiversity of Ethiopia and their wild relatives and raises biosafety concerns arising from modern biotechnology as one of the biodiversity and human health issues (section 2.3.14, page 53) which need to be addressed. The Environment Policy of Ethiopia in its section 3.3 page 10 on "Genetic, Species and Ecosystem Biodiversity" stipulates that "the importation, exportation and exchange of genetic and species resources" should be subjected to legislation to ensure the safeguarding of community and national interests, the filament of international obligations and quarantine among others. Above all biological material which is self-regenerative and impossible to control once allowed to get out of control may result in the most insidious and damaging form of pollution which is biological pollution, thus the importation and use of biological material including those genetically engineered should be under stringent regulations". Given the fact that the Ethiopian economy directly or indirectly depends on the biodiversity resource of the country, the project is in line with the country's effort to eradicate poverty and assist in the implementation of different strategic goals and policies such as the Plan for Accelerated and Sustainable Development to End Poverty (PASDEP) and Agricultural Development Lead Industrialization (ADLI). PASDEP elaborates a five year comprehensive development program that focuses on poverty sensitive sectors. One of the key sectors in this regard is agriculture and rural development. Food security and rural household livelihood improvement is also an important subcomponent. Given the current and emerging threat to agriculture, especially from the changing climate, biodiversity of the country is regarded as extremely important for the sustainable development of the agriculture sector and thereby the rural₁₀

development in Ethiopia. ADLI is an umbrella strategy that focuses on agriculture as a key tool for industrialization of the country. This strategy highlights biodiversity as an important input to the development of the country.

- C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH GEF STRATEGIES AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:** Ethiopia is party to the Convention on Biological diversity which it signed in 1992 and ratified in 1994 while the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was signed in 2000 and ratified in 2003. One of the strategic objectives of GEF 4 is Safeguarding biodiversity (S03), with a Strategic Program (SP6) on "Building Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety". In order to safeguard biodiversity, countries require management systems and frameworks that have the capacity to detect, exclude, eradicate, control, and effectively manage introduced organisms that may pose a risk to biodiversity. This particular project intervention is in line with SP6 and will help build the country's capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through the implementation of its National Biosafety Framework. The envisaged interventions will therefore ensure strong public and institutional inputs in driving the process to ensure safe use of modern biotechnology with avenues for access to benefits without compromising on the safety goals of the country in relation to biodiversity conservation.
- D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES:** Ethiopia is home to about 600 endemic species and is centre of origin and genetic diversity of several crops mentioned above whose protection is of critical importance to humanity, yet the country cannot single handedly manage to foot the costs involved. The country is thus requesting GEF financial support specifically to address gaps identified in the terminal consultative processes on the ongoing Biosafety Development Project so as to assist the country meet its obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This will help protect and ensure sustainable utilization of the high diversity of crops and livestock that are important gene pools not only for Ethiopia but the entire world as a whole. The requested financing will contribute to the safe application of modern biotechnology to ensure that the genetic resources of Ethiopia are protected for future use by Ethiopia and the rest of the world. Ethiopia has prepared an NBF but lacks the resources to fully implement it, hence the need for GEF support. The type of Financing support is a GEF grant from the RAF allocation under biodiversity. The identified interventions which contribute to the overall goal of GEF's biodiversity strategy is in the area of biosafety for which allotments are in line with priorities identified under the GEF Strategy for Funding biosafety.
- E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:** The project will build on the achievement of the completed enabling activity supported by UNEP/GEF for the Development of a National Biosafety Framework for Ethiopia and the BCH Project. The interface and potential linkages of the proposed project will be assessed and coordinated with the UNDP/GEF Project on "Sustainable Development of the Protected Area System". The project will also benefit from the mechanisms, practices and lessons learnt especially in the area of policy and regulatory frameworks from the ongoing UNEP/GEF Regional Project on "Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa". Furthermore, the botanical filing component will be done in coordination with the ongoing Government bilateral donor supported post graduate study research through the Addis Ababa University expected to generate basic biological data on specific endemic crops of global importance to facilitate risk assessment and risk management practices so as to facilitate handling of potential related LMOs. Efforts will also be made to build on the existing practices and infrastructure of the plant quarantine (division?/ Department? of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural development so as to enable handling of LMO plants for assessments, commensurate with their life cycles before release into the Environment. Refer to section 2.7 of the UNEP project document for additional information on related initiatives.
- F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :** The GEF funding in this project implementation is critical to add value to assist Ethiopia meet its obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. It will assist in the₁₁

conservation and management of the country's unique floral and faunal biodiversity of global importance. It will help the country to fulfill its commitment in implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

The development of fully functional and responsive regulatory regime in line with Cartagena Protocol and national needs and priorities which can handle applications on LMOs in an environmentally sustainable manner. In the absence of the GEF involvement, the government would find it hard to fully meet its international obligations under the Cartagena Protocol, the baseline scenario without the proposed intervention would be the introduction of products of modern biotechnology in a poorly-regulated manner due to limited human and institutional capacity supported by a biosafety policy without the required legal backing due to the slow enactment of the biosafety bill into law coupled with on going developments of LMOs in the region including Bt Cotton which is being commercialised by Kenya.

GEF involvement would allow Ethiopia to have its legal instruments coupled with additional capacity building in identified areas to facilitate the safe use of the products of modern biotechnology. The proposed interventions will therefore build on the earlier enabling activities thus supporting the national objective as spelt out in the NBSAP and the Biosafety Policy on protection of Ethiopia's rich biodiversity against the potential risks associated with the introduction of LMOs into the environment. This will be achieved through the development of science-based risk assessment, management and communication methods in compliance with the CPB. In Ethiopia currently there are no commercialized transgenic crops in a neighbouring country, Kenya. Therefore with time, it is likely that LMOs will enter into the country and may be released into the environment.

In the absence of the GEF intervention, even though the EPA has the legal mandate to implement the Protocol, it will not be able to fully generate the required tools/toolkits or national instruments nor bring the needed international collaboration and support to enhance institutional capacity or build on the existing capacity developed during the Project on Development of National Biosafety Framework for Ethiopia to implement Ethiopia's obligation to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This will lead to a poor regulatory oversight of LMOs which could have adverse effects on biodiversity of global importance.

G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES: The major handicap identified is the low institutional capacity to handle LMOs including risk assessment, risk management and detection. A long term training strategy to address gap is the planned interventions to strengthen the identified regulatory agencies to build a solid base to sustain the national processes in specific target intervention areas including risk assessment, risk management, post release monitoring and risk communication.

Another potential risk identified is the institutional conflicts in management especially between the biotechnology and biosafety sector in the management of LMOs. Potential mitigations measures include development of a complementary approach to the mandate of the National Biotechnology Development Agency to ensure safe use of modern biotechnology through institutional arrangements, development of appropriate complimentary legal instruments, an integrated approach to awareness creation and information sharing across the identified targets with a biosafety mandate and also through operational MoUs to spell the different roles required for Ethiopia to meet its obligations ensuring the principle of common but differentiated approach to the obligations of the obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The key potential risks and mitigation measures are summarised below

Potential Risks	Risk Mitigation Measures	Risk Level
<i>Critical dependence on the Ethiopian government's commitment (through EPA, Ministry of Science & Technology) towards the implementation of policies and inter-agency collaboration.</i>	<i>EPA, as the executing branch of the project, will consolidate the agencies support through administrative agreements and decisions, and will foresee any changes in government structures, posts and administration or shifts in sectoral positions towards modern biotechnology.</i>	<i>L</i>
<i>NGOs and civil movements from detractors(skeptics?) of the technology could compromise the achievement of project objectives by putting pressure on Ministers and Heads of Agencies</i>	<i>NGOs and civil society representatives have been and will be consulted constantly in order to increase awareness, transparency and where possible, achieve consensus during the project.</i>	<i>M</i>
<i>Official approval of strategic, legal and regulatory proposals does not occur within the required or predicted timeframe.</i>	<i>This risk will be mitigated through the strategic use of lobbying and communications to inform and raise awareness of political representatives, decision makers, and policy makers.</i>	<i>M</i>
<i>Key stakeholders not continue to have at least the present levels of interest in being involved in Project activities and acquiring and using the new knowledge and skills provided through the Project</i>	<i>The Project was designed and will be implemented with strong input from a broad range of stakeholders. Training strategies will be based on training needs assessments and will guide learners through activities, in which they will be required to participate and apply their knowledge. The project will promote incentives for personal and career development.</i>	<i>L</i>
<i>UNEP-GEF projects fail to deliver expected outcomes</i>	<i>UNEP-GEF Task Manager where relevant will help to mitigate this risk and determine at early stages the extent to which current outputs may need to be reformulated or delivered to the extent possible.</i>	<i>L</i>
<i>Failure by government to commit resources to ensure continuity of the NBF implementation</i>	<i>Project to get written commitment from government and ensure that sustainability measures are put in place and are embedded in the national biosafety law and the relevant structures created under the project are institutionalized by the end of the project</i>	<i>M</i>

H. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN: .The project will build on the experiences gained in the development of NBF, strengthening of existing national capacity, the BCH project and existing institutions. In addition the project will through its interventions focus on the following:

- i. Upgrade existing laboratories to handle LMO Detection and network such centers to ensure maximum use of equipment and human resources;
- ii. Maximise the utilisation of national resources by building on earlier biosafety interventions through institutional synergies as identified in the terminal process of the NBF Development project so as to avoid duplication;

- iii. Enable more efficient use of capacity building activities including developing a long term national strategy on risk assessment and management;
- iv. Develop tools and methodologies to address identified gaps in the area of socio-economic considerations, labeling and transboundary movement of LMOs with neighbouring countries such as Kenya;
- v. Ensure the enactment of the regulatory instruments needed to give the needed legal effect to ensure that all requests for LMOs are handled in a safe and transparent manner;
- vi. Build on the strong stakeholder network developed through the earlier biosafety development project and the BCH project (Phase I and II) focusing on the gaps and interventions identified through the terminal reports on the UNEP GEF Project on Development of National Biosafety Frameworks.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:

The Project will be executed by the Government of Ethiopia, through the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as the National Executing agency (NEA) and Competent National Authority (CNA). All participating institutions, agencies and participants have had an active role in executing previous biosafety projects, including the development of the NBF and the BCH projects. Accordingly, all have participated in the planning and design process during the discussion of the current proposal, and have shown interest and disposition in sharing the responsibility of executing the project. Their accumulated experience in executing GEF projects is therefore an asset. As the government executing agency, EPA will be responsible for the coordination and management of the project and will monitor compliance with work plans as the basis for Project execution. EPA will ensure the political oversight of the project, and will be ultimately responsible for overall project performance and delivery. Among its attributions will be the approval and review of Annual work plans and budgets, the designation of responsible persons or institutions for the execution of different component of the project, and any substantial changes to the project management tools. A Project Coordinator will be appointed as a consultant to work under the overall supervision of the EPA Chief Executive Officer. In addition, an officer Administrator / Accountant and an Administrative Assistant will also be identified from a suitable government agency and seconded to the project to assist the Project coordinator. These being government employees will get their salaries from government. The EPA chief Executive Officer will be the overall Project manager to provide management oversight and approve all expenditures in accordance with UNEP/GEF and government of Ethiopia Accounting and Procurement requirements/ regulations/ guidelines.

Furthermore, each member of the National Biosafety Advisory Committee (NBAC) represents a stakeholder of the biosafety system, and as such, will carry out communication and coordination functions, and supervise the activities, strategies and expected outcomes that are of interest to their respective institution. In this spirit, the EPA has the added advantage of providing not only managerial services, but also a means for participation and consultations within the project.

To act as NEA, EPA will be supported by various functional structures for which the implementation arrangements are described below and depicted schematically in Appendix 10 notwithstanding this division of functions, EPA will ultimately (and legally) remain responsible to UNEP for the entirety of the project.

Meetings of the EPA as the CNA, and other partners/stakeholders will be planned on regular basis to monitor the project's development and to make adjustments as required. The NBAC will be re-constituted into a National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) for the project to provide technical back-stopping and bring in views and inputs from the different institutions represented on the NBAC. Their experience and expertise would come in handy at this time since they already understand the Biosafety and biotechnology environment, needs and challenges in Ethiopia.

National Biosafety Advisory Committee (NBAC)

The NBAC will fulfill a role in facilitating participation and consultations with groups not represented within the EPA, such as representatives from social groups and NGOs, industrial sector representatives, members of the academic world and researchers. Its function as a "steering committee" will ensure general project oversight, in as far as reviewing the validity of the project and its objectives as time progresses is necessary to guarantee its effectiveness. This Committee is expected to meet on a quarterly basis; further details on the NBAC are provided in Section 5 of the UNEP Project Document.

Project Management Unit (PMU)

A Project Management Unit (PMU) will be based and supported within EPA to administer the project. The PMU will be responsible for the day to day coordination of project activities, and among its main functions it will be required to draft the project's Annual work plan and Annual budget, coordinate project implementation with key partners, keep records and files in order, and draft TOR's for project consultants and other consultancies commissioned by the project. The PMU will follow instructions and directives of EPA. The PMU will consist of a Project Coordinator, an Administrator/ Accountant and an Administrative Assistant/Secretary.

Project Coordinator (PC)

The Project Coordinator will be appointed by the NEA (EPA) according to the TORs included in Appendix 11, and will be responsible for running the project's day-to-day operations, leading and managing project activities and ensuring that the project progresses on schedule and delivers the expected results. The Project Coordinator will implement work plans and overall strategies approved by the EPA Director and the NBAC, and will report to both. The Project Coordinator will prepare and disseminate information on the project, and will have monthly meetings with the EPA Director and every three months meet with the NBAC to present periodic reports and updates. The Project Coordinator will be in charge of contracting services for the project and supervising the work of consultants, and will lead efforts to coordinate field activities with associated programmes taking into account those areas in which synergies between ongoing WB-GEF, the UNEP-GEF Projects and the MDG Project have been established. The Project Administrator/ Accountant will prepare work-plans, budgets and procurement plans and submit them to the project Coordinator who will subsequently submit them to the EPA Director for approval. The same officer will also prepare financial statements and books of accounts and related accountability reports for submission to EPA Director who will subsequently submit them to the responsible officials in UNEP/GEF.

UNEP shall be implementing agency for the project. The institutional arrangement for the proposed project is outlined in Appendix 10.


B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:

The project shall be implemented by UNEP and executed at the national level by the Environmental Protection Authority. The day to day execution of the project shall be handled by the Project Coordinator. The Project Coordinator shall be supported by staff of the Project Management Unit. The execution of the project shall be under the direct supervision of UNEP, the Environmental Protection Authority and the National Biosafety Advisory Committee.

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF: The project design is fully aligned with the original PIF, however since the focus of component 6 (Public Awareness, education and participation) & 7 (regional networking /collaboration) are related to public awareness and participation as per article 23 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the two components were merged as component 6 in the project.

PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Maryam Niamir- Fuller Director, Global Environment Facility Coordination Office, UNEP.		02-23-2012	Alex Owusu- Biney	+254 20 7624066	Alex.Owusu- Biney@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

SEE APPENDIX 4 OF UNEP PROJECT DOCUMENT

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF)

GEF Secretariat Review for Medium-Sized Projects

Country/Region: Ethiopia
Project Title: Implementation of Cartagena Protocol on biosafety through Effective Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework
GEFSEC Project ID: 4078
GEF- 4 Strategic Prog: SP 6

GEF SEC Comments of 14 th September 2009	UNEP Response
<p>9. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?</p> <p>1. Although Ethiopia took part in the NBF and BCH, the PIF is very generic and gives very little country specific information on the issues to be tackled with this new project. The only reference to these two previous project is on p. 4. "...out of these interventions, a Draft Biosafety Proclamation and guidelines were produced through this earlier biosafety project, and this new project will focus on ensuring its approval (NBF), building on and implementing the developed instruments". Are there any conclusions or recommendations from these projects and their evaluations worth citing as the starting point for this new project?</p> <p>2. What are the "Botanical Files" on crops of global importance? They are mentioned in the Results Framework only with no further development of the component in the body of the PIF. Although it is easy to see the importance of these species, it is not clear how these "files" will be used. This is a rather expensive component if the files are compiled from bibliographic sources (\$21K a piece). Please explain this item as it is the first time it appears in a BS PIF.</p> <p>3. Is it realistic to think that awareness can be raised in 50% of the Ethiopian population (85M+ people)? What is the target audience for the Public Awareness, education and participation anyway? Does everybody need to know about this, or is the target audience something that</p>	<p>1. The revised PIF is updated with additional information in pg 4 to support the justification for a new project</p> <p>2. A botanical file is an easily accessible data base that provides biological data on characteristics of a plant ie. - what the plant is; where it is distributed, the place of its origin, the presence of its wild relatives; the mechanism of hybridization; the where about of progenitors etc- and on the possibilities and likely hood of a transgenic to become endemic in the country. Above all botanical files provide data on the geographical distribution of native plant species that are similar or related to specific genetically modified crops and responds to location specific features which are very important in decision making on biosafety especially in cases where a country such as Ethiopia is a center of origin/diversity with several landraces and wild relatives of crops of global importance</p> <p>The file is developed through literature review and field assessments. It involves identification of crop wild relatives for key target crops for with Ethiopia is known as the centre of origin and diversity. Given the ecological diversity and size of Ethiopia, the amount proposed is not exaggerated as the data generated will facilitate risk assessment/risk management and decision making in the introduction of LMOs. The files can also be replicated in other countries within the region. This activity has become necessary because of lot of the current botanical files developed by the OECD do not cover the target crops and is a country specific request to facilitate the implementation of its National Biosafety Framework.</p>

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week*</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
For Project Management			
Local			
Project Management Expert	1000	10.5	To assist and provide technical support in the start- up of the project and in networking activities to facilitate consultative meetings
Project Coordinator	1000	30	To lead in the day to day coordination and management of the Project (see detailed Terms of Reference under Appendix 11 of the UNEP GEF Project Document
International			
Justification for Travel, if any:			
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
Regulatory Framework Expert/s/ legal expert/s	1000	13	To work with international expert on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional arrangements and procedures for biosafety regulation, risk assessment and risk management and decision making developed and implemented; • specific technical guidelines and manuals on risk assessment and risk management and decision making developed (translated into four local languages and disseminated • Review and update existing laws and enact - subsidiary laws; • Prepare cessation and revocation orders facilitate national consultative meetings on the proposed biosafety regulatory regime
Biosafety Expert/s (Risk Assessment/Biosafety management) and LMO experts	1000	21.5	Work with International Expert to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting survey on existing facilities at universities and research institutes; • Work for the establishment/ strengthen capacity (laboratory) for LMO detection ; • Training strategy on handling of LMOs with workshops on risk assessment and risk management, LMO detection, monitoring and enforcement, inspection procedures; • Identify the right number of technical staff to run such laboratories; • Develop technical documents for handling requests; • Conduct training workshops on risk assessment and risk management; • Preparation guidelines/testing protocol on LMOs detection for the reference laboratories;

Public awareness, education and communication expert(s)	1000	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide training on LMO detection techniques; • Identification of institutions and related measures for public engagement • Develop a document on entry points for public participation • Assist in the preparation of public awareness, education and involvement plan • Contribute to the design and carry out awareness raising activities including workshops
Botanical and IT experts	1000	6	<p>Work in collaboration with international expert on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Botanical files of selected important crops of origin and /or center of diversity developed; • To develop website for Botanical Files and link to national BCH • Update National BCH
Monitoring and enforcement expert (– scientists/lawyers)	1000	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry out a needs assessment for inspections, monitoring and enforcement; • Prepare relevant manuals, procedures and protocols on inspections, monitoring and enforcement • Develop emergency procedures and use for training • Provide training on monitoring and enforcement • Advise project team on integration of a biosafety inspections, monitoring and enforcement system into national Biosafety regulatory regime
International			
Regulatory Framework Expert/s/ legal expert/s	2500	6	<p>To provide expert advice on the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional arrangements and procedures for biosafety regulation, risk assessment; • specific technical guidelines and manuals on risk assessment and risk management and decision making developed (translated into four local languages and disseminated • Review and update existing laws and enact - subsidiary laws Materials for the national consultative meetings on the proposed biosafety regulatory regime.
Biosafety Expert (Risk Assessment)	2500	7	<p>Peer review in the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work for the establishment/ strengthen capacity (laboratory) for LMO detection ; • Training strategy on handling of LMOs with workshops on risk assessment and risk management, LMO detection, monitoring and enforcement, inspection procedures <p>Lead facilitator in the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct training workshops on risk assessment and risk management
Botanical expert and BCH Expert (IT expert)	2500	4	<p>Provide advice on setting information management system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and update a National BCH with botanical files

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and update of national Biosafety website • Help in the preparation of the data entry protocols for the BCH • Help in conducting and providing the training on registering and searching information using the BCH
Monitoring and enforcement expert (scientist/lawyer)	2500	3.08	<p>To peer review documents and provide guidance on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs assessment for inspections, monitoring and enforcement; • Setting up systems for inspections, monitoring and enforcement; • Preparation of relevant manuals, procedures and protocols on inspections, monitoring and enforcement <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate training on a biosafety inspections, monitoring and enforcement and emergency procedures
Justification for Travel, if any:			

* Provide dollar rate per person week. ** Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.

The objective of the project as spelt in the PPG was achieved with an MSP as the output and also a stock taking report.

B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY: The execution period for the PPG was longer than anticipated due to internal measures in translating the PPG into the national measures for execution and also stakeholder inputs and feedback was very slow

C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
Capacity Building Needs Assessment in relation to the key components of the NBF	Completed	16,500	16,500	16,500		10,000
Stakeholder Consultative Meetings	Completed	0	0	0		6,000
Travel related to the meetings	Completed	3,500	3,500	3,500		4,000
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
Total		20,000	20,000	20,000		20,000

* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)