

GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS¹

Country/Region: Mozambique
 Project Title: Mozambique: BS: Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Mozambique
 GEFSEC Project ID: **3649**
 GEF Agency Project ID: GEF Agency: UNEP
 GEF Focal Area (s): Biodiversity
 GEF-4 Strategic Program (s): BD-6;
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$0 GEF Project Allocation: \$755,000 Co-financing:\$755,000 Total Project Cost:\$1,510,000
 PIF Approval Date: July 07, 2009 Anticipated Work Program Inclusion:
 Program Manager: Jaime Cavalier GEF Agency Contact Person: Alex Owusu-Biney

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion ²	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	04-17-08 Yes. Mozambique is a party of the Cartagena Protocol on BioSafety since 2003-09-11. Cleared	1-4-11 Cleared
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		1-4-11 Cleared
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	04-17-08 Yes. There is a letter of endorsement from the OFP dated January 3rd 2008, with a budget of \$ 830,500 inclusive of a PPG and IA Fees. Cleared	1-4-11 Cleared
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	04-17-08 It fits the Strategic Objective 3 to Safeguard Biodiversity and the Strategic Program 6, Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on BioSafety. Cleared	1-4-11 Cleared
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	04-17-08 Yes. UNEP has a comparative advantage. Cleared	1-4-11 Cleared
Resource	6. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including		

Availability	the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?	04-17-08 Mozambique has an allocation of \$6.3 M in Biodiversity and a balance of \$6.0 M as of today. Cleared	1-4-11 Cleared
	• The focal areas?	NA	NA
	• Strategic objectives?	NA	NA
	• Strategic program?	NA	NA
Project Design	7. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	04-17-08 Although there is a heading for Global Environmental Benefits under Project Justification (p. 5), there is no reference to country specific GEB for Mozambique. Please address this issue. 06-02-09 While the biodiversity significance of Mozambique is now stated in the PIF, it is difficult for a Capacity Building project like this to identify the especific GEBs linked to the proposed activities. Impact on the ground is likely to occur if all the proposed items are put in make and make operation. This is likely to happen behind the life of this project. Cleared	
	8. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		1-4-11 As stated in the PIF Cleared
	9. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	04-17-08 There are several issues that require attention at this stage.	1-5-11 The design for the CEO Endorsement follows that of the PIF. Some components have been merged but the outputs remain clear.

¹ Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. Please do not answer if the field is blocked with gray.

² Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of PIF of FSPs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. For MSPs, once the PIF is approved by CEO, next step will be to continue project preparation until the project is ready for CEO approval.

		<p>First, it is difficult to see how Mozambique is going to have a fully operational National Biodiversity Framework by the end of the project (2012) by tackling the 5 components all at once and with a budget of only \$755 K GEF + co-funding (\$ 188 K). Since Mozambique has a Biodiversity allocation, it could use more resources if it wants to achieve all objectives and have a NBF in place at the end of the project. Otherwise, this project should take some strategic decisions regarding the most important components to be financed with this grant. This project has set overoptimistic objectives for the time and funds allocated to it.</p> <p>Second, it is necessary that the outputs and outcomes in each of the 5 component are tailored made for Mozambique. As currently stated, the list of outputs and outcomes looks more like a cut-and-paste exercise, than the result of the analysis of the situation and needs in the country. Mozambique has several documents, including the draft of the NBF that could be used as a source of information. One component of the PIF that should have been explicitly stated and budgeted for is the "stocktaking". This was identified in the BioSafety strategy as a key step for the development of all other components. Please address this issue in the revised version of the PIF.</p> <p>Third, please review the language used to describe outputs and outcomes to make sure that it is easy to understand what the actual deliverables are and how they fit in the overall structure and function of the NBF. Turn activities (i.e. workshops) into outputs. No need to specify the number of each of these</p>	Cleared
--	--	---	---------

		<p>activities.</p> <p>Forth, please address the issue of the financial and technical sustainability of the project beyond the terms of this project. Please state the level of commitment of the Government to allocate fresh financial resources to cover the recurrent costs associated with running the national Bio-safety Framework (i.e. salaries, maintenance of laboratories, operations on the ground, etc.).</p> <p>06-02-09 These issues were addressed in the revised PIF and on the Response to GEFSEC comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?</p>	<p>04-17-08 Yes. This project is consistent with the NBF (2005) and the Decree on the BioSafety regulations (2007). Cleared</p>	<p>1-5-11 Yes. Cleared</p>
	<p>11. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>04-17-08 Please clarify how this is going to take place. Please include information on GEF and non-GEF supported initiatives. Cleared</p>	<p>1-5-11 In the CEO, the text of II.B. (Consistency of the project with National and/or regional priority plans) is the same (cut-and-paste) as with the text under Describe the consistency of the project with GEF STRATEGIES and strategic programs. This comes back from the PIF. 3-15-12 Cleared</p>
	<p>12. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?</p>	<p>04-17-08 Please briefly address the cost-effectiveness issue at this stage. This could be done by providing a description of the alternative activities to achieve the same results (if appropriate), that were ruled out as part of the development of the PIF.</p>	

		06-02-09 This issue was addressed in the revised PIF and on the Response to GEFSEC comments. Cleared	
	13.Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		1-5-11 No. The text presented is mostly about the Agency's comparative advantage, not on cost-effectiveness. The text should be about the cost-effectiveness of the project design vs. alternative designs. 3-15-12 No. In the Response to GEF Comments, the Agency states that this issue was revised as requested. Nevertheless, the text under II-H in the revised CEO Endorsement is the nearly identical as in the approved PIF. There is no additional information in the Prodoc. Please point to where the changes were made or address them. 12-16-13 Cleared
	14.Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		1-5-11 Yes. Some components were combined but the output and objective of the project remain the same. Cleared
	15.Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	04-17-08 Please make these risks and associated mitigation measures be more country specific? This can be facilitated by providing the information in the form of a table. 06-02-09 This issue was addressed in the revised PIF and on the Response to GEFSEC comments. Cleared	1-5-11 The text is a cut-and-paste from the PIF! Please elaborate. 3-15-12 Cleared
	Justification for	16.Is the value-added of GEF	04-17-08

GEF Grant	involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?	Please clarify if the incremental reasoning has to do only with the speed at which the NFB will be implemented. 06-02-09 This issue was addressed in the revised PIF and on the Response to GEFSEC comments. Cleared	Without GEF this project may not happen. Cleared
	17. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?		1-5-11 Yes. Assuming the co-financing in-kind becomes effective. Cleared
	18. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		1-5-11 They will be delayed. Cleared
	19. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	044-08-08 The management cost is 10% of the GEF funding. Cleared	1-5-11 It is 10% of GEF funding. The budget is being used to pay for Project Coordinator and supporting staff. Cleared
	20. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		1-4-11 The GEF is contributing \$1000/week and \$2000/week for local and international consultants for Technical Assistance. It is also providing \$64,800 for PM staff for the length of the project (4 years) at weekly rate of approx. \$300/week. The GEF is also contributing \$10,700 for office facilities, etc. Please address the following: 1. APPENDIX 14 (Draft Procurement Plan for Equipment) is missing (\$245,000). This needs to be submitted for CEO Endorsement. 2. GEF is contributing \$50,000 for Research

			<p>Facilities (Annex 2a, line 4302). What are these facilities for which there is no Government co-financing?</p> <p>3-15-12 Issues properly addressed in the revised CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>
	<p>21. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?</p>	<p>04-17-08 As stated in item 8, it is difficult to see how the proposed objectives could be achieved with the level of GEF funding + co-financing. Is it possible to concentrate the focus on fewer activities rather than to try to cover them all?</p> <p>06-02-09 This issue was addressed in the revised PIF and on the Response to GEFSEC comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>22. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?</p>		<p>1-4-11</p> <p>Co-financing for this project is very low (GEF=\$775K; Co-financing=\$188K) for a co-financing ratio of 1:0.24. This is very low and did not increase since PIF approval.</p> <p>Please provide Activities-based budget.</p> <p>3-15-12</p> <p>Activities-based budget provided.</p> <p>The co-financing did not increase since last review. If the National Executing Agency is programming additional request for support on the national biosafety process, that additional support should be reflected at CEO Endorsement, not during project implementation.</p>

			12-15-13 Cleared
	23.Has the Tracking Tool ³ been included with information for all relevant indicators?		1-5-11 No. Please submit TTs. 2-15-12 TTs submitted. Cleared
	24.Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		1-5-11 Yes. Cleared
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		
	Convention Secretariat		
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendation at PIF	25. Is PIF clearance being recommended?	04-17-08 No. This PIF is not recommended for clearance in its current state. Please review items 6, 8, 11, 14, 15 & 19. 06-02-09 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	26.Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	27. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		1-5-11 No. Please address issues under items 11,13,15, 20, 22 & 23. Thanks. 3-15-12 No. Please address issues under items 13 and 22.

³ At present, Tracking Tools apply to Biodiversity projects only. Tracking Tools for other focal areas are currently being developed.

			12-16-13 Yes.
Review Date	1 st review		January 04, 2011
	2 nd review		March 16, 2012
	3 rd review		December 16, 2013

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	
Recommendation	5. Is PPG being recommended?	
Other comments		
Review Date	1 st review	
	2 nd review	
	3 rd review	

wb21049
C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf
8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM