



REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL
PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Stocktaking and Update of National Biosafety Framework for Mauritania			
Country(ies):	Mauritania	GEF Project ID:	5639
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	00532
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment and sustainable development	Submission Date:	October 19, 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	30
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	Biosafety	Project Agency Fee (\$):	83,410
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
(select) BD-3	Outcome 3.1	Output 3.1	GEF TF	878,000	950,000
Total project costs				878,000	950,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To assist Mauritania to update the status and capacity for the safe use of biotechnology and to strengthen Mauritania institutional capacity in the development and implementation of the National Biosafety Framework

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Establishing baseline for information on the safe use of biotechnology through stocktaking analysis	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory of the current national human, technical and institutional capacities to implement a workable and effective biosafety management system in Mauritania established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocktaking report on national biosafety capacity in Mauritania including existing national, bilateral or multilateral cooperative programs in capacity building. Assessment report including a review of all relevant legislations, policies and plans that may affect the use of modern biotechnology. A guidance paper on laboratory and technical requirements of a reference LMO detection reference laboratory 	GEF TF	138,000	190,000

Development of a biosafety policy, administrative, regulatory and technical biosafety frameworks for Mauritania in line with the CPB	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Biosafety policy drafted and made available for approval and integration into National plans. •System for handling of requests, carrying out risk assessment and decision making for LMOs including handling, storing and exchange of information in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Unified biosafety policy developed and made available for approval by the government •Primary and secondary legislation on biosafety finalized, and made available for approval •Training guideline on regulatory issues related to biosafety. •Roles, responsibilities of the different governmental institutions with regard to biosafety clearly identified and approval process initiated by the government. •Internal manual on procedures for handling requests and decision making on LMOs developed. •National framework for conducting environmental risk assessment for LMOs prepared. •National Biosafety Committee trained in Decision making procedures 	GEF TF	310,000	310,000
Public Awareness, Public participation and Education	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Enhanced public awareness tools/measures and improved information flow to the public with regards to biosafety related issues through the national Biosafety Clearing House •Tools to facilitate implementation of the Protocol are easily accessible to all stakeholders through the BCH in line with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Functional and updated national Biosafety Clearing House with data entry protocols formulated. •Representatives from key relevant institutions trained to use the Biosafety clearing house for searching and registering information. •Manual for using the BCH prepared. •Public education and involvement plan highlighting mechanisms for stakeholder involvement including civil society, academia and private sector developed and approved. 	GEF TF	300,000	300,000

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Outreach materials on biosafety prepared and disseminated •Reports of national meetings, inventories, relevant regulations and guidelines published and made national BCH (nBCH). 			
Monitoring and evaluation	TA	Tools and adequate measures developed to facilitate effective and efficient execution of project	Audit Report Mid Term Review/Terminal Evaluation Reports Lessons Learnt	GEF TF	60,000	50,000
Subtotal					808,000	850,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ¹				GEF TF	70,000	100,000
Total project costs					878,000	950,000

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	In-kind	950,000
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			950,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				0	0	0

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	145,000	0	145,000
National/Local Consultants	117,000	23,500	140,500

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? (Select)

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

¹ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF²

- A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. **NA**
- A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. **NA**
- A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: **NA**
- A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: **NA**
- A. 5. Incremental / Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project: **NA**
- A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: **NA**
- A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives **NA**

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

- B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

The project is addressing policy-makers, government departments and all relevant institutions (including research centres, universities and civil society organisations) to be involved in the biosafety system in Mauritania. Their involvement will ensure a high level of acceptance of the legislation "Biosafety Law of Mauritania" aimed to be approved by the parliament during the development of the project. Major categories of stakeholders and their engagement in the execution of the various project' activities are summarised in the table below:

Stakeholder	Roles
The Ministry of Environment and sustainable Development (MESD)	National Executing Agency of this project and will appoint the National Project Coordinator and establish the Project Steering Committee.
Government Ministries (multi-sectoral) and Regulatory agencies including: Ministry of Commerce, Handicraft, & Tourism, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Fisheries & Maritime Economy, Ministry of Habitat, Urban Affairs, & Territorial Administration, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Industry & Mines, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Public Function, Employment, & Professional Training, Ministry of Rural Development and Ministry of Social, Child, & Family Affairs	Involved in the Project Steering Committee, development of regulatory instruments and technical execution of project activities Development of monitoring and enforcement instruments and contribute capacity on regulatory oversight
Academia (universities & research institutes) Including: University of Nouakchott	Technical support in the development of operational manuals, delivery of training

² For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

Private sector and civil society	Involved in activities on public awareness and capacity building, development and trading in new seeds and planting materials NGOs and indigenous and local communities will play a partnership/collaborative role in sensitization, mass education and will be associated with most activities especially the development and dissemination of communication tools.
----------------------------------	---

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Modern biotechnology, as it is applied to agriculture, poses a common challenge to countries and societies worldwide: the need for careful decision-making to ensure that society enjoys the benefits of this technology while minimizing or avoiding its potential costs has to be ensured. The project will assist Mauritania in developing approaches to risk assessment, management and communication in addition to developing approaches to ethical, religious and socio-economic considerations for decision-making on LMOs.

The project also emphasizes public awareness and participation. Public participation helps to identify, clarify, and resolve socio-economic concerns and issues related to modern biotechnology. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety includes the right to public participation by urging Parties to the Protocol to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation in dealing with LMOs.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The structure of the proposed project responds directly to the areas of weakness in the biosafety framework identified during the consultation process developed as part of project preparation. Key foci are: the establishment of a baseline for information on the safe use of biotechnology, the preparation of a biosafety policy; the preparation and the issuance of relevant regulations; the development of effective mechanisms to manage LMO applications and make decisions; training in the practical implementation of the system; raising awareness among decision makers and providing technicians with appropriate tools; investing in education and training; and improving public perception on biotechnology and biosafety.

Many of the actions to be carried out to address each of these issues have as an underlying goal ensuring the sustainability of the system, which is vital if the State is to act transparently and effectively in combining its CPB commitments, the benefits of modern biotechnology and the primary objective of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Likewise, raising the levels of public awareness, education and training in biosafety is considered a long-term investment, whereby better use and knowledge of the potential of LMOs are requisites if modern biotechnology is to become a valued development tool. Indeed, there is an urgent need to initiate a training process based on an education plan designed for the needs of the country that stretches beyond the life of this project and draws on national resources available for formal education. In this respect, the project is cost-effective in attending to both short-term gaps and long-term needs, and balancing GEF and national resources in doing so.

This approach should prove cost-effective as not only is it targeted but also strategic. Thus, the project is of utmost importance to raise awareness and create an enabling regulatory framework about the safe use of modern biotechnology for decision makers whose consent is needed for the adoption of relevant legislation and effective implementation of the NBF. Although it would be possible to develop independent technical capacity,

its internalization and its institutional relevance would be weakened by the absence of such regulations. The project also includes collaboration and synergies with other initiatives to achieve long-term impacts.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

Refer to appendix 7 of the UNEP Prodoc


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Dr. Mohamed Yahya LAFDAL	GEF Political and Operational Focal Point	Ministère délégué auprès du Premier Ministre chargé de l'Environnement	06/16/2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan Van Dyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP		October 19, 2015	Alex Owusu-Biney Task Manager	+254207624066	Alex.Owusu-Biney@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

See Appendix 4 of the 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 FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5639		
Country/Region:	Mauritania		
Project Title:	Stocktaking and Update of National Biosafety Framework of Mauritania		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$878,000
Co-financing:	\$930,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,808,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Alex Owusu-Biney

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ³	UNEP & Partners Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	12-06-13 Yes. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12-06-13 Yes. There is LoE from the OFP for \$999,735 dated June 16, 2013 Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	12-6-13 No. Mauritania originally committed all BD GEF-5 resources to the GGWI. Making use of the revised LoE for that project where the BD resources have been reduced to \$1M, the GEFSEC is working with the WB to reallocate the BD resources to Mauritania for this Biosafety project to be fully processed. This review deals with all technical	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

³ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ³	UNEP & Partners Response
		matters and final clearance awaiting the resolution of the financials.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	12-6-13 No. Mauritania originally committed all BD GEF-5 resources to the GGWI. Making use of the revised LoE for that project where the BD resources have been reduced to \$1M, the GEFSEC is working with the WB to reallocate the BD resources to Mauritania for this Biosafety project to be fully processed. This review deals with all technical matters and final clearance awaiting the resolution of the financials.	The GEF OFP confirms that ministry has secured the half of the BD allocation (for the Biosafety Project) under the GEF 5 STAR. What has been endorsed for the GGWI is the LD allocation plus the half of the BD allocation.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	12-6-13 Yes. BD-3. Please add the corresponding Aichi Target to the text (Target 13).	Additional text on Aichi Targets has been added to section B2 page 10 of updated PIF.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NC, NAMAS, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP? ⁴	12-6-13 The project is in line with the NBSAP, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and the NPFE. Cleared	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address,	12-6-13 What is the baseline project for which the	Please refer to page

⁴ NPFE=National Portfolio Formulation Exercise, NC=National Communications, NAMAS=Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions, NAPA=National Adaptation Program of Action, NCSA=National Capacity Self Assessment, NBSAP= National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, NAP=National Action Program

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ³	UNEP & Partners Response
Project Design	sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>GEF funds will serve to cover the incremental costs? In other words, what is the GoM planning on doing over the next 3 years in support of biosafety, whether or not there is a GEF grant?</p> <p>Neither the title (Stocktaking and Update of National Biosafety Framework of Mauritania), not the objective of the project (To assist Mauritania to update the status and capacity for the safe use of biotechnology and to strengthen Mauritania institutional capacity in the development and implementation of the National Biosafety Framework) reflect the depth of the project, especially when considering the scope of Component 2.</p> <p>If Mauritania simply needs to update the status and capacity for the safe use of biotechnology, please reconsider Outputs and Outcomes of Component 2.</p> <p>When was the draft National Biosafety Framework (NBF) developed in the Pilot Phase project completed? If significantly or partially outdated, this probably means that the present project is more in lines with the title and objective than with the Component 2.</p>	<p>5 last paragraph under “baseline scenario and associated projects”</p> <p>The draft NBF or inventory was developed in 1997 under the pilot phase, same is referenced in the PIF under 5) incremental reasoning’ page 6 para 2</p> <p>Component 2 was guided by outcomes and reviews of the earlier PIF submitted in GEF 4 which helped shaped the new PIF. The approach in component 2 allows the additional innovation and dynamism to not only review the status of the NBF but use the opportunity based on component 1, to develop a policy, legal, administrative and technical framework for biosafety which then ties in well with component 3 which allows for public engagement and awareness in rebuilding the NBF. It allows for the “resetting of the clock on the NBF</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ³	UNEP & Partners Response
			and BCH” and to set up a framework which can be used for further capacity building with or without GEF support. Guided by the review, PIF is designed to focus on the development or update of the NBF with some Biosafety implementation “like” activities in Components 2 & 3.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>12-6-13</p> <p>Yes. The project has the following components:</p> <p>1. Baseline established for information on the safe use of biotechnology through stocktaking analysis: i) Inventory of the current national human, technical and institutional capacities to implement a workable and effective biosafety management system in Mauritania, ii) Accurate information on how biosafety can be harmonized with National laws, policies and plans, and build into existing Monitoring and enforcement measures.</p> <p>2. Development of a biosafety policy, administrative, regulatory and technical biosafety framework for Mauritania in line with the CPB; i) Biosafety policy developed, approved and integrated</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ³	UNEP & Partners Response
		<p>into National plans, ii) Workable and responsive regulatory regime on biosafety in line with national needs, priorities and international obligations, iii) System for handling of requests, carrying out risk assessment and decision making for LMOs including handling, storing and exchange of information in place.</p> <p>3. Public Awareness, Public participation and Education: i) Raised public awareness and improved information flow to the public with regards to biosafety related issues, ii) Access to relevant information for all stakeholders in accordance with the requirement of the Cartagena protocol.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>12-6-13</p> <p>This is a capacity building project. All GEBs should result from the full implementation of the CPB.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means	<p>12-6-13</p> <p>is there a role for CSOs and/or indigenous peoples in developing this project? If not, please state it.</p>	The Government of Mauritania confirms by an email of

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ³	UNEP & Partners Response
	for their engagement explained?		<p>12/12/2013 that is its practice in execution of projects, NGOs and indigenous and local communities have and will play role in sensitization, mass education and will be associated with most activities especially the development and dissemination of communication tools.</p> <p>Changes made in updated PIF under A2</p>
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>12-6-13 There is no reference to the institutional capacity (i.e. laboratories and research institutions) to carry out risk assessments mentioned in Component 2. Please clarify.</p> <p>Are there any risks associated with not having enough human and institutional capacity on biosafety?</p>	<p>The objective of this project based on earlier interactive reviews was refocused to allow for a review of the status of national biosafety system post Pilot phase project and develop interventions to ensure Mauritania updates its NBF in line with article 2.1 of the Cartagena Protocol. Such efforts will create the needed platform for further incremental developments. Like any other projects, UNEP agrees that there could be risks associated with</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ³	UNEP & Partners Response
			limited human and institutional capacity. See page 8 of the updated PIF under the risk table
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12-6-13 Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	12-6-13 There is little innovation in this project. Mauritania is trying to comply with its obligations as a party of the CPB. The sustainability of the project depends entirely on the willingness of the GoM to sustain the effort. Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12-6-13 All the funds (cash form GEF and in-kind from the Government of Mauritania) need to become available during project implementation.	Government of Mauritania confirms by an email of 12/12/2013 that additional in kind

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ³	UNEP & Partners Response
		Is the budget for Component 3 sufficient to implement all the provisions of the CPB?	cofinance will be made available during the project implementation when the need arises. The project team will be monitoring closely the execution of activities and where necessary additional in kind support and dedication of additional staff time will be made available Due to the time lag from the pilot phase to the current project, UNEP agrees with the review comments. In consultation with the Project team, the allocations have been revised to provide additional support for component 3.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	12-6-13 Yes, but only if the co-financing in-kind becomes effective during project implementation. There is no co-financing from UNEP. Chances of adding some?	Please see response under item 16. Additional cofinance of \$20,000 from UNEP to provide technical support and review services
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12-6-13 Are \$70K enough to run this 2.5 years project? This means \$28,000/year!	Please see response under item 16
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the	12-6-13 Yes. It is under \$50K for projects up to \$1M. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ³	UNEP & Partners Response
	level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	•STAP?		
	•Convention Secretariat?		
	•The Council?		
	•Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	12-6-13 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 4, 10, 11, 16, 17 and 18. Thanks.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 06, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.

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

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Stocktaking and Capacity Building needs assessment	\$3,500	\$3,500	0.00
Logical Framework Analysis	\$3,500	\$3,500	0.00
Stakeholder Consultative meetings	\$16,000	\$16,000	0.00
Total	\$35,000	\$35,000	0.00

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

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

NA