GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS

Country/Region: Ethiopia
Project Title: Ethiopia: BS Implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through Effective Implementation of National Biosafety Framework
GEFSEC Project ID: **4078**
GEF Agency Project ID: GEF Agency: UNEP
GEF Focal Area (s): Biodiversity
GEF-4 Strategic Program (s): BD-6;
Anticipated Project Financing ($): PPG: $20,000 GEF Project Allocation: $616,000 Co-financing: $700,000 Total Project Cost: $1,336,000
PIF Approval Date: January 12, 2010 Anticipated Work Program Inclusion:
Program Manager: Jaime Cavelier GEF Agency Contact Person: Alex Owusu-Biney

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	09-14-09 Ethiopia ratified the CPB on 2003-10-09. Cleared	6-12-12 Cleared
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		NA
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	09-14-09 The OFP endorsed the project in a letter dated 13 January 2009. Cleared	6-12-12 Cleared
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	09-14-09 SP-6 Cleared	6-12-12 Cleared
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	09-14-09 Yes. Cleared	6-12-12 Cleared
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?	09-14-09 Ethiopia has a BD RAF of $8.1M, have used	6-12-12 Cleared

		$4.9M and has a balance of $3.1M. Cleared	
	• The focal areas?	09-14-09 Ethiopia has a BD RAF of $8.1M, have used $4.9M and has a balance of $3.1M. Cleared	6-12-12 Cleared
	• Strategic objectives?	NA	NA
	• Strategic program?	NA	NA
Project Design	6. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	09-14-09 This, as other BS projects, is unlikely to produce tangible GEB within time and budget. Only the development and continuous utilization of the NBF is likely to render tangible and measurable GEBs. Cleared	
	7. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		6-12-12 As at PIF stage. Cleared
	8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	09-14-09 This is a "standard" project for the implementation of the NBF, and has the following components: 1. Development of Biosafety and biotechnology policy 2. Regulatory Framework 3. Institutional capacity building on Biosafety 4. Public awareness, education and participation 5. Botanical filing and biological monitoring system 6. Project review and audit Please clarify the following points: 1. Although Ethiopia took part in the Development of NBFs and the BCHs, the PIF is very generic and gives very little country specific information on the issues to be	6-12-12 The project has the following components: 1. Regulatory Framework 2. Institutional Capacity building on Biosafety 3. Public awareness, education and participation 4. Botanical filing and biological monitoring system 5. Project review and audit The architecture of the project is very similar to the architecture at PIF stage. The component "Development of Biosafety and biotechnology policy" was removed and budget ($50K) reallocated to "Institutional capacity building on Biosafety" ($280K to $330K). Cleared

		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? 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. 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 needs to be defined at PPG stage? 12-11-09 These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated November 23, 2009. Cleared	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities	09-14-09 Yes	6-12-12 Cleared

	and policies?	Cleared	
	10. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	09-14-09 See comments under item 9.	6-12-12 Cleared
	11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	09-14-09 Yes Cleared	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		6-12-12 Yes. See pages 13-14 of MSP. Cleared
	13. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		6-12-12 Yes. The architecture of the project is very similar to the architecture at PIF stage. The component "Development of Biosafety and biotechnology policy" was removed and budget ($50K) reallocated to "Institutional capacity building on Biosafety" ($280K to $330K). This change does not modify the objective of the project. Cleared
	14. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	09-14-09 What elements of the NBF (dated 2007 and posted in UNEP's website) are simply outdated and need to be done all over again? (Nothing wrong with that, just wanted to know). 12-11-09 This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated November 23, 2009. Cleared	6-12-12 Yes. See p. 13 of MSP. Cleared
Justification for GEF Grant	15. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?	09-14-09 Yes. This project is unlikely to be developed and implemented without GE support. Cleared	6-12-12 Yes. pages 11-12 of MSP. Cleared
	16. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of	09-14-09 Yes. GEF is investing $616K with $700K co-	6-12-12 Yes. There is a LoC for $700K dated 2-8-11

	concessionality, appropriate?	financing. Enough if investments are targeted to critical issues. Cleared	Cleared
	17. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		6-12-12 The project may take much longer to implement or may not be implemented at all. Cleared
	18. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	09-14-09 Yes. Management is 10% of GEF funding. Cleared	6-12-12 Yes. It is 10% of the GEF funding. Cleared
	19. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		6-12-12 Yes. GEF is contributing $1000/week for local consultants (both technical assistance and project management) and $2,500/week for international consultants (technical assistance). Other expenses, including travel and office facilities, are reasonable ($19.5K in all). Cleared
	20. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	09-14-09 Is funding for Component 4 ($180,000) sufficient to pay for the dissemination via TV and Radio networks throughout the life of the project (4 years). How expensive is TV advertisement in Ethiopia? 12-11-09 These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated November 23, 2009. Cleared	
	21. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		6-12-12 Yes. All co-financing will be needed to achieve the objective of the project. Cleared
	22. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators?		6-12-12 Yes. Cleared

	23. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		6-12-12 Yes. Pages 6-7 of MSP. Cleared
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		
	Convention Secretariat		
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendation at PIF	**24. Is PIF clearance being recommended?**	09-14-09 Not at this stage. Please review outstanding issues under items 9, 15 & 21. 12-11-09 Yes. This PIF has been recommended by PM for CEO Endorsement. Cleared	
	25. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	**26. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?**		6-12-12 Yes. The MSP is recommended for approval.
Review Date	1st review	September 14, 2009	June 12, 2012
	2nd review	December 11, 2009	
	3rd review		

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project	09-14-09

	preparation appropriate?	Yes. The PPG funding is for a Stocktaking Report and travel. How much of the "Needs Assessment" can be derived from the reading of the NBF and associated reports (BCH) and now much needs to be gathered afresh? 12-11-09 Please provide an answer to this question at CEO Endorsement. Cleared Cleared
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	09-14-09 Yes. Cleared
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	09-14-09 Yes. GEF is contributing $1250 for local consultants and $1500 for international consultants. Cleared
Recommendation	**5. Is PPG being recommended?**	09-14-09 Yes. Please address issue under item 1. The point is similar to the one raised in the PIF; What are the lessons learned from the NBF and BCH that we can cite and incorporate directly into the PIF and PPG without having extra leg work? Please bring as much as possible from previous work. 12-11-09 Yes. This PPG is recommended by PM. If the MSP PIF is approved by CEO, then PPG will be presented to CEO for Approval. Cleared
Other comments		
Review Date	1st review	September 14, 2009
	2nd review	December 11, 2009
	3rd review	