



## 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:	\$950,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,828,000
PIF Approval:	May 08, 2014	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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	12-06-13 Yes. Cleared	11-13-15 Cleared
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	12-06-13 Yes. There is LoE from the OFP for \$999,735 dated June 16, 2013 Cleared	11-13-15 Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• 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	11-13-15 Cleared

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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 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.	11-13-15 Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives?</b> <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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	12-6-13 Yes. BD-3. Please add the corresponding Aichi Target to the text (Target 13).	11-13-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	12-6-13 The project is in line with the NBSAP, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and the NPFE. Cleared	11-13-15 Cleared
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	12-6-13 What is the baseline project for which the 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?  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.  If Mauritania simply needs to update the status and capacity for the safe use of biotechnology, please reconsider Outputs and Outcomes of Component 2. 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.	11-13-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>12-6-13 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 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</p>	<p>11-13-15 Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		relevant information for all stakeholders in accordance with the requirement of the Cartagena protocol.  Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	12-6-13 This is a capacity building project. All GEBs should result from the full implementation of the CPB. Cleared	11-13-15 Cleared
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		11-13-15 Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	12-6-13 is there a role for CSOs and/or indigenous peoples in developing this project? If not, please state it.	11-13-15 Cleared
	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)	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.  Are there any risks associated with not having enough human and institutional capacity on biosafety?	11-13-15 Cleared
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12-6-13 Cleared	11-13-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>12-6-13</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>11-13-15</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>11-13-15</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	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?		<p>11-13-15</p> <p>Cleared</p>
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?	<p>12-6-13</p> <p>All the funds (cash form GEF and in-kind from the Government of Mauritania) need to become available during project implementation.</p> <p>Is the budget for Component 3 sufficient to implement all the provisions of the CPB?</p>	<p>11-13-15</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	11-13-15 Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	12-6-13 Are \$70K enough to run this 2.5 years project? This means \$28,000/year!	11-13-15 Cleared
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the 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?	12-6-13 Yes. It is under \$50K for projects up to \$1M. Cleared	11-13-15 Cleared
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		11-13-15 Yes Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		11-13-15 Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>12-6-13 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 4, 10, 11, 16, 17 and 18. Thanks.</p> <p>4-02-14 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>11-13-15 Yes. This MSP is recommended for approval.</p>
	First review*	December 06, 2013	November 13, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 02, 2014	
	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.