



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: 18 January 2011

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 4010

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 00551

COUNTRY(IES): Mongolia

PROJECT TITLE: Capacity Building for Biosafety Implementation for Mongolia

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Ministry of Nature Environment and Tourism National Biosafety Committee

GEF FOCAL AREA(S):BD

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

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: BIOSAFETY

Expected Calendar (mm/dd/yy)	
Milestones	Dates
Work Program (for FSPs only)	N/A
Agency Approval date	March 2011
Implementation Start	June 2011
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	Nov 2012
Project Closing Date	May 2014

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK (Expand table as necessary)

Project Objective: Establish and operationalise Mongolia's National Biosafety Framework, to assist Mongolia to comply with its obligations as a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety so as to be able to undertake safe use of modern biotechnology for sustainable development.

Project Component s	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA ²	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing ¹		Co-Financing ¹		Total (\$) c=a+ b
				(\$) a	%	(\$) b	%	
1. Assist the Government of Mongolia to establish and consolidate a fully functional and responsive regulatory regime in line with Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and national needs and priorities	STA	1.1.Review of Mongolian policy and legal framework with respect to implementation of the Law on LMO 1.2.Gaps in national laws in relation to biosafety are identified and addressed	1.1.1 An analysis of what implementing regulations are needed to make the Law on LMO (2007) operational 1.2.1 Regulations to implement the Law on LMOs are developed and linked to environmental governance. 1.2.2 Biosafety Program is developed and integrated into the Environmental Framework Law and NBF within national strategies	38,000	79	10,000	21	48,000
2. Assist Mongolia to build implementation mechanism	STA	2.1 Strengthened human resource in administration and decision	2.1.1 Training organized for decision makers. Staff trained in administrative aspects of Biosafety implementation, including risk	108,000	64	60,000	36	168,000

for a Biosafety program including human resources and institutional building		<p>making for implementation of Biosafety program.</p> <p>2.2 Coordinated decision making on LMOs</p> <p>2.3 An effective mechanism for monitoring and inspection to ensure compliance to Law on LMOs</p>	<p>assessment and risk management, decision making and risk communication</p> <p>2.2.1 Technical manuals on decision making procedure are prepared.</p> <p>2.3.1 Organizing training for enforcement and monitoring officials</p>					
3. Capacity strengthening at institutions for implementation of a Biosafety Program	TA	<p>3.1 Strengthened institutional arrangement for effective implementation of a Biosafety Program</p> <p>3.2 Enhanced institutional infrastructure to facilitate operation of the Biosafety Program</p> <p>3.3 Improved coordination between institutions for Biosafety implementation</p>	<p>3.1.1 Key professional institutions to be strengthened are identified.</p> <p>3.1.2. Strengthening the reference laboratory</p> <p>3.2.1 Training for technicians and researchers in LMO detection; Strengthening institutional capacity for detection and verification of LMOs for regulatory compliance.</p> <p>3.3.1 Setting clear roles and responsibilities by MoU between collaborating institutions</p>	165,500	57	125,000	43	290,500
4. Public awareness and Public participation in matters related to Living Modified Organisms	STA	4.1 A comprehensive public awareness and participation strategy on biosafety that is linked to the national	<p>4.1.1 A Strategy for public awareness and participation in decision making related to LMOs.</p> <p>4.2.1 Special educational materials for schools and colleges.</p> <p>4.2.2 Outreach</p>	,0	0	100,000	100	100,000

(LMOs)		environmental policy /program and Law on LMOs 4.2. Publishing materials on biosafety in different media 4.3. Trainings, lectures, info days, public debates	materials for target groups. 4.2.3 A regularly updated nBCH as a platform for public communication and participation. 4.3.1 Organizing public lectures and trainings					
5. Establishme nt of National and Regional networking system for Biosafety	STA	5.1 Cost effective pooling of regional experts and resources, cooperation between R & D institutions and regulatory bodies	5.1.1 A database on national experts in crop science and biotechnology. 5.1.2 A network among national and regional crop science and biosafety experts and institutions	14,800	60	10,000	40	24,800
6. Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	6. 1 Monitoring and evaluation		16,000	89	2000	11	18000
8. Project management				37,000	57	28,000	43	65000
Total Project Costs				379,300		335,000		714,300

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.

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>
Project Government Contribution	(select)	(select)	335,000	100
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
	(select)	(select)		
Total Co-financing			335000	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	27,000*	379,300	406,300	37,930	379,300
Co-financing	18,000	335,000	353,000		335,000
Total	45,000	714,300	759,300	37,930	714,300

The fee for the PPG has already been received

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)¹

<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*	104 weeks	63,900	36,200	100,100
International consultants*	12 weeks	16,000	2,000	18,000
Total		79,900	38,200	118,100

* 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*	144 weeks	37,000	28,000	65,000
International consultants*				
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*				
Travel*				
Others**				
Total		37,000	28,000	65,000

* Details to be provided in Annex C. ** For others, it has to clearly specify what type of expenses here in a footnote.

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 of the progress of all activities will be undertaken by UNEP in accordance with its Monitoring and Evaluation procedures. The indicators identified in the project will be used for monitoring the development of the project activities. A mid-term independent evaluation will be undertaken. The evaluation will include an assessment of on-going activities including a diagnosis of possible problems and recommend any corrective measures. A final evaluation of the project will be undertaken in accordance with UNEP. Dissemination of results will take place via the stakeholders meetings, via periodic meetings between the project management team and the government departments, publications and via the public media.

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.

STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED: This project will assist Mongolia, as Party to the Protocol to meet its obligations by building and strengthening the capacity needed to implement or operationalize the Law on LMO enacted in 2007. This will ensure that every request for intentional movement of LMOs across national borders as well as for all types of use will be administered and assessed by an administrative and regulatory system, that is consistent with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Mongolia has successfully completed a draft NBF under the UNEP/GEF funded project on NBF development. The draft NBF formed the basis of a new "The Law on Living Modified Organisms (LMOs)". However, Mongolia has very limited capacity to implement this Law, which has also to comply with the CPB. In order to implement the law, supporting implementing regulations/rules are urgently needed. Additionally, other existing policies/programmes may need to be integrated with biosafety elements under the newly enacted law. Therefore, this project will enable Mongolia to draft these essential regulations to help Mongolia to make the Law on LMOs workable and consistent with its international obligations.

Mongolia is a landlocked country which presently imports most of its food and feed from neighbouring countries like China and Russia. Since Mongolia does not have the technical capacity to detect LMOs, LMOs could enter the country without detection and prior risk assessment. The porous border of Mongolia, coupled with the inadequate capacity of border controls to regulate the entry of LMOs could allow unapproved LMOs to enter into Mongolia and cause unintended adverse effect to the various fragile ecosystems and environment. Therefore, this project is timely as it will help build institutional and technical capacity in Mongolia to allow the country to implement its Law on LMOs so that the country can apply modern biotechnology with biosafety measures in place.

Benefit from increased yields through the adoption of safe agricultural biotechnology can help to achieve food security, which ultimately also contributes to global environmental benefit. The safe application of agricultural biotechnology can also have concomitant improved natural resource management through reduced use of agro-chemicals, resulting in less contamination of water resources, minimise loss of precious soil moisture with reduced tillage and mitigate desertification, thereby contributing to global environmental benefits.

The project will also assist in the conservation and sustainable use of the vast national biodiversity comprising 2,823 known plants species, 133 species of mammals, 274 species of breeding birds, 23 species of reptiles and 8 species of amphibians of Mongolia. Mongolia also houses some of the world's last expansive and relatively pristine ecosystems and grasslands like the steppe. However, these unspoiled ecosystems are now under threat because of human activities like mining and over-exploitation. This capacity building project will enhance public and farmer awareness on the importance of the integration of biosafety into agriculture to address national food needs with minimal harm to fragile ecosystems, wild and cultivated agricultural biodiversity, especially wheat and potatoes, which are the most important food crops in the country. These will ultimately contribute to global environmental good.

Describe the consistency of the project with national and/or regional priorities/plans: This project is consistent with national priorities stated in the National Environmental Policy and Programs of Mongolia. The project is also supportive of the 1995 Law on Environmental Protection that is built upon 3 basic principles, namely, prevention of adverse impacts; creation of favorable environmental conditions for human life, labour and recreation; and ensuring the development of sustainable economy. Since this project aims to help Mongolia to avert adverse environmental impact that could be caused by unregulated use of LMOs, this project is also supportive of the one of the 3 objectives of the Mongolian law of Environmental Protection. This project also falls within the medium term goals (MTG) of the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism, especially MTG 2 and MTG 3, which are respectively "protect biodiversity..." and "increase appropriate use and conservation of water resources". This project comprises component activities which also

address 3 of the 6 priorities identified by the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) process for Mongolia (2007-2010). These relevant UNDAF priorities are “Improving natural resources and environmental management”, “Improving responsible and democratic governance” and “Landlockness and global, regional and South-South cooperation”. Additionally, this project reinforces several of the 30 Environmental Programmes and Policy documents issued under the Sustainable Development Policy of Mongolia. Since the project empowers its citizens to have access to information, participate in decision-making on LMOs and to have the choice and capacity to adopt agricultural biotechnology, it is also consistent with the Human Rights Charter to have the right to have a clean environment and the right to participate.

DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [gef strategies](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: This project is consistent with the recently approved GEF Programmatic Approach to Finance Biosafety in GEF4. It belongs to the Biodiversity Focal Area and is relevant to Strategic Objective 3 and Strategic Program 6: Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as well as Strategic Objective 2 and Strategic Program 4: Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy.

JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES. The financial support in the form of GEF Trust Fund will play a critical and catalytic role for Mongolia, which is a poor developing country in Asia. According to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) World Economic Outlook database (April 2009), Mongolia is ranked with Bhutan and Philippines at the lower end of GDP scale for the region. The real GDP for Mongolia for 2009 is estimated to be only 2.7%. Apart from a shrinking economy and a global financial crisis, Mongolia faces extra challenges being a land-locked country. Without GEF financial support, Mongolia will not be able to have national resources to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and thus unable to comply with its international obligations as a Party. This can adversely impact the overarching goal of GEF as a financial mechanism to assist developing countries to achieve the objectives of the CBD, generate environmental benefits in the area of biodiversity and especially to assist CPB Parties to implement the CPB.

OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES: Mongolia participated in two GEF/UNEP Capacity building projects before prior to project proposal. These are respectively the NBF Development project (Sept.2002- Oct. 2005) and the Capacity Building in Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) project (Feb.2007-June 2008). Both these project have completed successfully. These two projects being executed by the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism (MNET) were well coordinated at both the national level as well as at the project implementation level of UNEP/GEF Task Managers. Coordination with the present project is expected to operate similarly. The present project shall be executed by the same National Executing Agency (NEA), which is the MNET. Another capacity building project which is currently in progress is the “Avian influenza control and human pandemic influenza preparedness and response”. This World Bank-funded project is executed by the National Emergency Management Agency of Mongolia from 2008-2010. Since one of the outputs of this project is the establishment of a Biosafety Level 2 Laboratory, which will focus on human and animal health, it will complement rather than overlap the capacity building objectives of this project. Apart from the above, there are no other related capacity building initiatives in Mongolia.

DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH

[incremental reasoning](#) : In the absence of GEF support, Mongolia will be unable to build the human, infrastructural and institutional capacity needed to implement its Law on LMOs effectively and meet its obligation as Party to the CPB. The NBF Development project completed with a small core of biosafety staff who need further training and legal basis to operate. In the absence of GEF resources, this critical group of local experts will be dispersed and the foundation and momentum built by the previous two projects in biosafety management and awareness will be lost. Poor administrative and institutional infrastructures as well as lack of coordination will persist without GEF support, making it impossible for effective implementation of the Law on LMOs. Requests for imports could be delayed, capacity for decision making will be insufficient, if GEF resource is lacking. This will result in hampering food import, especially GM-food and GM-feed.

Being a landlocked country with no possibility to be self-sufficient for food, Mongolia needs to have a smooth and efficient process for moving food and feed into the country. GEF support is urgently needed to enhance awareness among policy makers, so that political will to incorporate biosafety into national development plans will be realised. This will ensure that biosafety activities will be continued after the project is completed.

There is no mechanism for public involvement in biosafety matters at present. With GEF support, a mechanism for public access to information will be established and public education will be increased. This will empower the public and enable public participation in decision-making.

There is also a current project between UNEP and MNET on the revision of the environmental policy Law of Mongolia allowing for the opportunity to integrate elements of Biosafety into the Mongolian framework environmental Law. Additionally, without GEF support, Mongolia will not be able to protect its vast fauna biodiversity and its pristine but vulnerable grasslands like the steppe. This will result in irreversible loss of biodiversity and ecosystems which contribute to global and environmental services and benefits. GEF intervention through this project will synergize with several recent initiatives which had been set up by the Mongolian Government. These include the establishment of a National Biosafety Committee in April 2008, a Registration system for LMOs under Government of Mongolia Resolution #258, establishment of Working Groups for the Standard of Labeling for LMOs and LMO products and the preparation of a chapter on “Biotech and Biosafety” for inclusion in the Secondary school Program 2009-2010.

C. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES: Biotechnology and biosafety are new subjects and are not well understood in Mongolia. Therefore the lack of awareness among key agencies to support biosafety, coupled with the existing weak institutional coordination and lack of human resources and infrastructure for biosafety implementation can all pose serious risk to the success of this project. The absence of useful technical tools and manuals in local language is another barrier. This project aims to build not only capacity in various fields of biosafety implementation with enhanced inter-agency coordination but also create a critical mass of the needed human resources, so that these risks can be minimized. Through active awareness raising activities coupled with an inclusive consultative approach of this project, policy makers will have a better understanding of how biosafety and biotechnology are linked to national development. This will result in better sustainability of biosafety. To broaden the understanding of biotechnology and biosafety, technical tools will be translated into the major local language, so that target stakeholders can understand the information and issues easily. Sustainability and progress of the project will depend greatly on the national team who will manage the project. Experience from previous Biosafety implementation projects has demonstrated that staff movement away from the project is not unusual. This is particularly critical if project implementation is carried out by a single person. Movement of that one key person away from the project puts the project at risk. However, a lesson learned to avert this situation is to train a team and not a single person for project implementation. This will ensure that staff attrition will not adversely impact project progress and that institutional memory is not lost. Hence this project is designed to be implemented by a team comprising 3-4 members, to manage the risk of loss of staff during the project cycle.

D. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN: This project will be cost effective because the stocktaking exercise, as the first component of project preparation, will undertake a capacity needs and situation analysis. This will identify as well as ensure that only priority activities will be undertaken to allow completion of the National Biosafety Framework. After completion of the NBF, the government will continue its programme of environmental capacity building, which includes biosafety to some extent, and it will prioritise a follow-on programme to build capacity in LMO detection and public awareness in GEF-5. The GEF-4 project will focus on inter-agency coordination and collaboration, thus avoiding duplication of effort, and further increasing cost effectiveness. Training will be targeted and aimed at training future local TRAINERS; so that training can be amplified effectively at district/local levels with minimal additional cost. To further reduce operational cost, national training in biosafety will be coordinated, where possible, with other similar trainings in environmental governance, management etc. By having the same NEA, which had managed the earlier GEF-UNEP NBF Development project, to implement this project will also be cost effective, as the NEA and core staff have already been trained in GEF and UNEP management and financial procedures, and thus time and effort are not required to train these key project personnel.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

The National Executing Agency (NEA): The Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism of Mongolia, the focal point to the CPB, will be the National Competent Authority (NCA) as well as the National Executing Agency (NEA) for this project. The Ministry will work on behalf of Government of Mongolia to manage the project, ensuring that its objectives are met by the end of the project. The NCA will also provide the necessary scientific, technical, financial and administrative support to the project, working in close cooperation with relevant government agencies, the scientific community and the public.

National Biosafety Committee: The National Biosafety Committee (NBC) has been established by the National Executing Agency (NEA) to advise and guide the implementation of the National Biosafety Framework. This committee includes representations of all government agencies with mandates relevant to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and also includes representations from the private and public sectors. This Committee is multi-disciplinary and multisectoral in fields relevant to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The NEA may also establish sub-working groups as necessary with clear Terms of Reference (TOR) that are found in Appendix 11.


The National Project Coordinator: The National Project Coordinator will be named by the National Executing Agency, after dialogue with the UNEP, and will remain for all the duration of the national project. The National project Coordinator will be responsible for coordination, the management and the general supervision of all the aspects of the national project. He/she will report to the National Biosafety Committee and UNEP, and liaise closely with the chair and members of the National Biosafety Committee and National Executing Agency in order to coordinate the work plan for the National Project. He/she shall be responsible for all substantive, managerial and financial reports from the National Project. He/she will provide overall supervision for any staff in the NBF Team as well as guiding and supervising all other staff appointed for the execution of the various National Project components. The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the National Project Coordinator (NPC) are in Appendix 11.

B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT: The project will be implemented by UNEP and managed at the country level by a National Project Management team, under the direct supervisory oversight of the National Biosafety Committee (NBC) which will be a cross sectoral and multistakeholder committee with membership drawn from various line Ministries and Agencies. The National Project Management team shall be made up of the National Project Coordinator and 1-2 administrative cum financial assistants and possibly an IT staff to maintain the website/nBCH. Progress in implementation will be monitored against the work plan (Appendix 5), the half yearly project progress reports and quarterly expenditure reports. The NBC will also be assisted by Scientific and Technical Advisory Committees, either on a fixed term or an ad hoc basis. Members of these committees will represent multi-stakeholders.

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF: Project activities has been planned in line with the components included in the original PIF. Differences between PIF and logframe are minimal, the most important differences are: added outcome 4.3. Trainings, lectures, info days, public debates. Explanation: only published materials and internet pages is not sufficient for public awareness, so this activity was added, providing that the overall budget will remain the same as foreseen in the PIF. Deleted output 5.2.1 Documentation of lessons learned by NPCs from other Biosafety Implementation projects. Explanation: this is not a separate output, but rather an everyday work of NPC and should not appear as individual activity in the workplan or budget.

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 UNEP GEF Coordination Email: maryam.niamir- fuller@unep.org		Dec 15, 2010	Alex Owusu- Biney	+254 20 7624066	Alex.Owusu- Biney@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Summary	Output	Baseline	Target	Indicator	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Goal: To establish and operationalise Mongolia's National Biosafety Framework, to assist Mongolia to comply with its obligations as a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety so as to be able to undertake safe use of modern biotechnology for sustainable development.	Mongolia's NBF established and operationalized thus Mongolia complies with its obligations on Cartagena Protocol and able to undertake safe use of modern biotechnology.	<p>Law on LMOs exists but lacks implementation regulations</p> <p>Government institutions lack in experiences and expertise.</p> <p>Few professional LMO labs exist and their coordination is lacking</p> <p>Limited public awareness and participation in matters on LMOs</p>	<p>With strengthened legal environment, well trained administrative and professional staff,</p> <p>Mongolia's National Biosafety Framework will be operationalized and complies with Cartagena Protocol to which Mongolia is a Party</p> <p>Educated public and fully established networking at national and regional levels</p>	<p>By end of 2013, regulations; National Biosafety Program (NBP), Strategy on Public Awareness and Technical Manual on Decision making in place;</p> <p>2 overseas and 18 various trainings completed and 14 different educational and outreach materials on LMOs published</p>	<p>Periodic Progress Reports (PPR) to UNEP; Websites, Minutes of meetings, Official Registries of Executive Decrees, Ministerial Acts, Publications, Training curricula, Reports, Methodology, Bulletin of the Government News, media coverage, public awareness materials and MoU</p>	<p>Government of Mongolia supports National Biosafety Program and Biosafety policy is stable</p>
<u>Objective 1: Assist the Government of Mongolia to establish and consolidate a fully functional and responsive regulatory regime in line with Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and national needs and priorities</u>	GoM has fully functional and responsive regulatory regime on Biosafety in line with Cartagena Protocol	<p>Law on LMOs exists but implementation regulations need to be developed along with National Biosafety Program</p>	<p>Biosafety regulations and NBP will support Mongolia to fulfill its obligations under Cartagena Protocol.</p>	<p>By end of 2012, regulations and NBP developed and adopted by appropriate authorities</p>	<p>PPR , Report, website, Minutes of the meeting, Official Registries of Executive Decrees and Ministerial Acts and Bulletin of the Government News</p>	<p>It is assumed that Government bodies will be supportive and experts will be effective in developing the documents</p>

Outcomes: 1.1.Review of Mongolian policy and legal framework with respect to implementation of the Law on LMO	1.1.1 An analysis of what implementing regulations are needed to make the Law on LMO (2007) operational.	Law on LMO adopted in 2007.	Having regulations and policy needs analysis, Mongolia will be ready to draft relevant regulations and therefore implement Law on LMOs adopted in 2007	By end of 2010, review of policy and legal framework to implement of Law on LMOs complete	PPR , Report on the Review results is available on MNET website (www.mne.mn) NBC Meeting's Minutes	It is assumed that relevant experts will be participating actively in reviewing process and also NBC and the Government will support effectively
1.2.Gaps in national laws in relation to biosafety are identified and addressed	1.2.1 Regulations to implement the Law on LMOs are developed and linked to environmental governance.	No regulations on implementation of Law on LMOs especially on procedures for the risk assessment, thus linkage to environmental governance	Biosafety regulations necessary for implementation of Law on LMOs will support Mongolia to fulfill its obligations under Cartagena Protocol.	By end of 2011, necessary regulations developed and approved	PPR, Official Registries of Executive Decrees and Ministerial Acts.	It is assumed that review working group members will mostly be involved in developing the regulations which will move things rapidly. Government will support the process.
	1.2.2 Biosafety Program is developed and integrated into the Environmental Framework Law and NBF within national strategies	National Biotechnology 2 nd Symposium held in 2009 and recommended to develop National Biosafety Program (NBP).	Integration of National Biosafety Program with National Environmental Framework Laws will enhance sustainable development	By end of 2012, National Biosafety program developed and get approved	MNET website and BCH website Bulletin of the Government News	Due to need to involve public for discussions over NBP, it could be delayed time wise.
<u>Objective 2: Assist Mongolia to build implementation mechanism for a Biosafety program including human resources and institutional building</u>	Mongolia's Implementation Mechanism for Biosafety Program is established at the administrative level	National Biosafety Committee is established to play a role of the main decision making body. General Inspection and General Customs Agencies operate as main inspection and	Involvement of the Government organizations including their human and institutional resources will improve effectiveness for decision making	12 training sessions of different stakeholder groups Technical manual for decision making procedure	PPR , Publication of Technical manual, MNET and BCH websites, Training curricula and contents and Reports of each training	It is assumed that implementation measures taking by professional institutions will be easier due to well trained decision makers

		monitoring bodies. However, Government institutions lack in experiences and expertise.	towards sustainable development			
Outcomes: 2.1 Strengthened human resource in administration and decision making for implementation of Biosafety program.	2.1.1 Training organized for decision makers. Staff trained in administrative aspects of Biosafety implementation, including risk assessment and risk management, decision making and risk communication.	Personnel from the NBC and other key Governmental institutions have limited training in biosafety Risk assessment concept on LMOs is new to Mongolia and lacks experience in decision making	Involvement of the administrative staff of Government institutions will improve effectiveness for decision making towards sustainable development	By 2013 all the trainings are completed	PPR , Training and technical courses curricula and contents Summary reports of courses given, with participants listing	Administrative staff are looking for advanced training for effective decision making particularly for risk assessment.
2.2 Coordinated decision making on LMOs	2.2.1 Technical manuals on decision making procedure are prepared.	No technical manuals exist in Mongolian thus requires involvement from international expertise.	Having training materials, manuals in national language will enhance coordinated decision making on LMOs	By end of 2011 “Technical Manual on Decision making Procedure”	PPR, Publication of Technical manual MNET and BCH websites Training curricula and contents	Administrative staff are interested in procedure for decision making on LMOs since it is lacking
2.3 An effective mechanism for monitoring and inspection to ensure compliance to Law on LMOs	2.3.1 Organizing training for enforcement and monitoring officials	General Inspection Agency and General Customs Agency are operating for monitoring and inspection, however experts with sufficient knowledge on LMOs are lacking	Trained and equipped staff from Law Enforcement and Monitoring agencies will greatly enhance implementation of Biosafety thus ensuring effective mechanism	By 2013, all training completed	PPR , Training curricula and contents Reports of each training	It is assumed that the timeframe is sufficient to setup the training and participants are interested to be trained
Objective 3: Capacity	Key professional institutions and	Few professional Labs exist and their	Training of experts on detection and	Report, 2 overseas training and 6	PPR , Reports, Training curricula,	It is assumed that professional

strengthening at institutions for implementation of a Biosafety Program	experts are sufficiently strengthened for implementation of Biosafety Program	coordination is lacking	verification of LMOs and effective coordination will improve professional capacity of relevant institutions and Biosafety implementation	national trainings	Methodology and MoU	institutions will be supportive and willing to participate in trainings
Outcomes: 3.1 Strengthened institutional arrangement for effective implementation of a Biosafety Program	3.1.1 Key professional institutions to be strengthened are identified.	Few Laboratories e.g. of Ministries of Health; Food, Agriculture and Light Industries have equipment to detect the presence of LMOs in crops and food, and none is devoted wholly to this activity. Most of the Labs belong to the private sector.	Identification of key institutions to be strengthened will enhance effectiveness of capacity building	By 1 st quarter of 2011, Report on key institutions with their current capacity and staff training needs particularly on LMO detection	PPR , Report on situation analysis of biotech laboratories and their infrastructure PPR , Document containing plan for reference laboratories	It is assumed that this project will lay out a ground for future projects on Biosafety National Program implementation
	3.1.2. Strengthening the reference laboratory	There is no reference laboratory in Mongolia	Strengthening the reference laboratory would enable to detect LMOs and perform surveillance	LMO detection lab will be established by end of 2010.	Regular reporting	It is assumed that government and academia will support the help to improve the reference laboratory
3.2 Enhanced institutional infrastructure to facilitate operation of the Biosafety Program	3.2.1 Training for technicians and researchers in LMO detection; Strengthening institutional capacity for detection and verification of LMOs for regulatory	Institutional and expert level capacity is insufficient particularly on detection and verification of LMOs	Training of experts on detection and verification of LMOs will improve professional capacity of relevant institutions	By end of 2012 trainings completed.	PPR , Training curricula and contents PPR , Reports of each training PPR , Methodology for sampling and detection of LMOs	It is assumed that the number of trainings organized will be sufficient

	compliance.					
3.3 Improved coordination between institutions for Biosafety implementation	3.3.1 Setting clear roles and responsibilities by MoU between collaborating institutions	Absence of professional institutional, e.g. Labs, coordination for detection and verification of LMO's	Effective coordination among professional institutions will improve Biosafety implementation	By June 2011 National Biosafety MoU will be signed between relevant professional institutions	PPR , Signed National Biosafety MoU	Coordination between the professional institutions for signing MoU without delays
Objective 4: Public awareness and Public participation in matters related to Living Modified Organisms (LMOs)	Public is increasingly aware and ensured to participate in matters related to LMOs	Limited public awareness and participation in matters on LMOs	Strategy and different media coverage on Biosafety will ensure public to be aware on LMOs and participation in decision making	By June 2011 Strategy; 14 different educational and outreach materials on LMOs	PPR , Strategy, different media coverage and public awareness materials	It is assumed that media's willingness to participate in reporting on LMO related actions is high
Outcomes: 4.1 A comprehensive public awareness and participation strategy on biosafety that is linked to the national environmental policy /program and Law on LMOs	4.1.1 A Strategy for public awareness and participation in decision making related to LMOs.	Public participation in decision-making on biosafety policy has been very limited. No public awareness strategy in place	Strategy on Public awareness will enhance participation of general public into decision making and implementation of Biosafety	By June 2011 Strategy for Public Awareness developed and approved	PPR , Strategy for Public Awareness published	Government is supporting the adoption of public awareness strategy; public and media cooperating and supportive

4.2. Publishing materials on biosafety in different media	4.2.1 Special educational materials for schools and colleges.	No educational and awareness materials as well as means for communication for schools, colleges and general public	Educational and public outreach materials for target groups	By 2013 at least 3 different sets of educational materials for high school students on modern biotechnology and LMOs published and disseminated	PPR , Outreach materials made available on MNET website BCH and MNET website	There is media willingness to cooperate in providing periodic information; schools and colleges are cooperating and willing to use the materials.
	4.2.2 Outreach materials for target groups.	There is very few materials available in Mongolia about biosafety	Materials will enhance public awareness about biosafety	By 2012 At least 3 national TV broadcasts By 2012 At least 6 national newspaper articles covering biosafety issues By 2011 Two outreach materials (Customs and Inspection Agencies; in the forms of video)	Agreements with providers of information Public opinion polls show an increase in the percentage of people who knows about biotechnology and biosafety as a result of the communication strategy	Good public attitude towards biosafety, support from media and good cooperation and understanding among media and project staff
	4.2.3 A regularly updated nBCH as a platform for public communication and participation.	No nBCH created	nBCH will enhance public awareness about biosafety and provide updated information about LMOs	By 2012 nBCH created	Website on nBCH linked to central portal	Not all the stakeholders will be able to use the website
4.3. Trainings, lectures, info days, public debates	4.3.1 Organizing public lectures and trainings	No public information available on safe use of modern biotechnology	General public	By 2013 at least 4 public lectures organized covering general info on safe use of modern biotechnology By 2013 Three	Agreements with lecturers and PPR Events' plans	General public will be willing to receive information on safe use of modern biotechnology

				public debates/events on biosafety	PPR	
Objective 5: Establishment of National and Regional networking system for Biosafety	Mongolia's LMO Database is openly networked within National and Regional system for Biosafety	Limited database and networking between national experts and no networking at regional level	Database, networking and information sharing will strengthen Biosafety implementation	By October 2013 database, Network and documentation of lessons learned	MNET and BCH websites	National experts are willing to be part of the international efforts on LMOs
5.1 Cost effective pooling of regional experts and resources, cooperation between R & D institutions and regulatory bodies	5.1.1 A database on national experts in crop science and biotechnology.	Database about experts, institutions and projects related to biosafety is outdated and incomplete.	Complete and operational database, networking and information sharing among both national and regional experts will strengthen Biosafety implementation in line with regional expertise	By end of 2012 database developed and fully operational.	National database and National and Regional Network	National experts are willing to share information and get informed on database.
	5.1.2 A network among national and regional crop science and biosafety experts and institutions	No working network system for Biosafety at national and regional level	Complete and operational database, networking and information sharing among both national and regional experts will strengthen Biosafety implementation in line with regional expertise	By October 2013 network among experts and institutions at national and regional levels developed and operational	National database and National and Regional Network	Experts and institutions from other countries are willing to cooperate

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)

sRESPONSE TO 2ND GEF REVIEW COMMENTS

Review Question	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Response
<p>5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The RAF allocation?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The focal areas?</p>	<p>07-13-09 Mongolia has a BD RAF of \$4.15M, has used \$3.7M, leaving a balance of \$447.0K. Since the request for this BS project is for \$726.6 (PIF+PPG), it would leave Mongolia in the red with a short-fall of -\$279.6K.</p> <p>07-13-09 Mongolia has a BD RAF of \$4.15M, has used \$3.7M, leaving a balance of \$447.0K. Since the request for this BS project is for \$726.6 (PIF+PPG), it would leave Mongolia in the red with a short-fall of -\$279.6K.</p>	<p>Justification: Changes have been made to the proposal to reduce or remove components considered to be too high or inappropriate</p> <p>Change made in PIF: Revised budget with reduced GEF request reduced to \$446,980 and cofinance reduced to \$335,000</p>

<p>8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?</p>	<p>07-13-09</p> <p>This is a conservative BS project with the following outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An Environmental Law with rules and regulations. 2. Increased human (i.e. Gov Staff) for the implementation of the BS program. 3. Increased Institutional capacity (i.e. infrastructure & Equipment) 4. Increased Public Awareness 5. A National and Regional networking Systems for Biosafety. <p>Please address the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The budget for Component 4, both GEF contribution (\$230,000) and co-financing (\$176,500) is exceedingly high. It takes 1/3 of the GEF budget. ii. Component 5. The establishment of a Regional Network system for Biosafety (including a network of information exchange), should be a regional effort with contributions (technical and financial) from participating countries. This component is not appropriate for the implementation of the NBF in Mongolia. Would be possible (desirable) to significantly reduced Components 4 and 5, and still make a viable project? Please take into consideration the financial limitations listed under item 5. 	<p>Justification: In order to meet the allocation constraint yet still initiate a biosafety implementation project in GEF-4 to avoid significant loss of already-built capacity, components 4 and 5 have been greatly reduced and will be developed in a follow-on project in GEF-5, following the next prioritization exercise for the biodiversity focal area.</p> <p>Change made in PIF: GEF contribution to compoment 4 has been reduced to zero, and GEF contribution to Component 5 has been reduced by eliminating the regional networking activities.</p>
---	--	---

<p>11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?</p>	<p>07-13-09 No. Please address issue of budget allocation to components 4 & 5 (item 8 of this review). Reallocation of funding is advised even without considering the BD RAF shortfall.</p>	<p>Justification: The project has been reduced to those components which are required to complete a CPB-complaint national biosafety framework. This will increase the likelihood that a function system can be included in the national budget process in future, whilst the effectiveness of the system can be further supported by a later public awareness and participation programme.</p> <p>Change made in PIF: Same changes as described above</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 coordination	257	144	Every-day project management work
International			
Justification for Travel, if any:			
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
National consultants	614	104	Conducting baseline surveys, drafting implementation manual about LMO law, Developing national biosafety program and strategy, organizing workshops about the strategy, organizing RA, RM and enforcement trainings, drafting training materials, manuals and materials for wider public, organizing public lectures and workshops.
International			
	1333	12	Helping to identify key institutions to be strengthened, advise governmental officers in regard of policy, lab equipment and budget, composing of MOU for governmental agencies, other issues related to setting laboratories and institutional set up
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.

YES

B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY: N/A

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>	
1. Conduct a needs	Completed	3,000	3000			1,000

analysis						
2. Conduct an impact analysis to identify areas of maximum impact, national gaps and weakness	Completed	1,000	1000			1,000
3. National consultation with related Ministries	Completed	4,000	4000			3,000
4. Draft a project proposal	Completed	7,000	7000			7,000
5. Wider discussion	Completed	12,000	12000			6,000
Total		27,000	27000			18,000

* 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)