



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Multi country project to strengthen institutional capacities on LMO Testing in support of national decision making			
Country(ies):	Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Lesotho, ,Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique	GEF Project ID: ¹	5283
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	936
Other Executing Partner(s):	Participating Laboratories: Angola, Congo Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Malawi, Madagascar, Mozambique; and Regional Agricultural and Environment Initiatives Network-Africa (RAEIN-AFRICA)	Submission Date:	September 5, 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	Biosafety	Project Agency Fee (\$):	366,700
	<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 FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-3: Build capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)	Outcome 3.1 Potential risks of living modified organisms to biodiversity are identified and evaluated in a scientifically sound and transparent manner.	All remaining eligible countries (about 60-70 depending on programming for rest of GEF-4) have national biosafety decision-making systems in place.	GEFTF	3,860,000	6,546,752
Total project costs				3,860,000	6,546,752

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To build and strengthen institutional capacities for LMO detection in support of national decision making processes in biosafety regulatory systems in the Southern Africa region

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Strengthening Infrastructure for LMO Detection	TA	Designated LMO laboratories fully capacitated and achieving a	1.1 Guidance document on minimal infrastructure for	GEFTF	1,302,538.60	1,107,159.04

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

		minimum level of functionality on LMO detection	LMO detection 1.2 Adequate functional equipment and facilities for LMO detection			
2. Strengthening Institutional and Human capacities for LMO detection	TA	Minimum level of competence achieved in the designated LMO detection laboratories	2.1 Laboratory personnel equipped with technical expertise in Quality Management Systems 2.2 Adequate technical backstopping in support of implementation processes 2.3 Guidance document in Best Practices in LMO detection adapted for the regional context	GEFTF	758,289.36	1,294,766.75
3. Strengthening Information sharing, lesson learning and Partnerships	TA	Sustainable Opportunities for sharing expertise, experiences and resources on LMO detection created	3.1 Platforms for information exchange established and functional 3.2 Project materials and guidance manuals well documented and published 3.3 Established Linkages and partnerships with other regional, international LMO detection laboratories and Networks as well as other institutions	GEFTF	531,616.60	1,119,879.47
4. Strengthening Biosafety Decision Making	TA	Technical support to strengthen LMO detection and biosafety decision making processes in the targeted countries	4.1 Policy makers aware of the importance of LMO testing to support decision making. 4.2 Skills and techniques for	GEFTF	378,729.48	1,049,570.32

			sampling, handling documentation of LMOs provided to regulatory chain actors (Border officials, customers and field inspectors)			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	Project Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning systems developed.	5.1 Implementation progress well monitored (Audit Reports, Lessons Learnt) 5.2 Project evaluated to ascertain achievement of objectives	GEFTF	508,825.96	999,422.43
Subtotal					3,480,000	5,570,798.01
Project management Cost (PMC) ³					380,000	975,953.99
Total project costs					3,860,000	6,546,752.00

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 – Angola	Ministry of Environment	In-kind	2,000,000
National Government – Democratic Republic of Congo	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Atomic Energy Commission (Biotechnology Laboratory), Ministry of Agriculture (Verterinary Laboratory Kinshasha)	In-kind	1,007,187
National Government – Malawi	Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining (Department of Environmental Affairs) and Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Services)	In-kind	540,500
National Government – Lesotho	Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Culture	In-kind	929,565
National Government – Madagascar	Ministry of Environment, Ecology, Sea, and Forest; University of Antananarivo, National Center for Environmental Research	In-kind	1,076,000
National Government – Mozambique	Biotechnology Center of Eduordo Mondlane University, Agricultural Research Institute of Mozamibque	In-kind	522,000
Others	University of Free State	In-kind	165,000
Others	RAEIN-Africa	In-kind	306,500
Total Co-financing			6,546,752

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Angola	440,000	41,800	481,800
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Congo Democratic Republic	684,000	64,980	748,980
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Lesotho	684,000	64,980	748,980
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Madagascar	684,000	64,980	748,980
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Malawi	684,000	64,980	748,980
UNEP	GEF TP	Biodiversity	Mozambique	684,000	64,980	748,980
Total Grant Resources				3,860,000	366,700	4,226,700

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	183,858.60	24,000	207,858.60
National/Local Consultants	103,891.71	142,998	246,889.71

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? N/A

(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).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴**

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Repc

No changes from PIF

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

No changes from PIF

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

No changes from PIF

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

In addition to the baseline highlighted at the PIF stage, all the six participating countries have ongoing national programmes which support analytical services either in research stations, the universities or laboratories of designated ministries to at least protein and chemical analysis. The level of capacity for DNA based analysis is at various levels as per tables 4 – 6 in the Prodoc.

⁴ 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.

In Madagascar, there is an ongoing Biosafety Implementation Project which led to the development of a final draft law with clearly defined interim decrees to operationally guide decisions related to handling of LMOs. Mozambique and Malawi are taking part in the Water Efficient Maize for Africa and other biosafety activities under ABNE or ICGEB all focused on strengthening biosafety education, risk assessment and risk management related to handling of LMOs and confined field trials. In addition, Malawi, has already had “hands on” experience in the confined field trial of Cotton and is currently preparing for confined field trials on cowpea. Congo Democratic Republic, Angola and Lesotho have national environmental management provisions and strategies which allows for engaging the public on issues related to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity through wider biodiversity initiatives. Through these processes, the governments continue to provide support for laboratory services to support phytosanitary and zoosanitary measures in the management of pests and safety of foods. These diverse and nationally funded interventions provides an additional baseline including laboratory resources which will be strengthened and re focused to support testing of LMOs in line with the obligations of the national biosafety systems.

Information from PIF is valid. However it has been strengthened with additional information and analysis focusing on the following

- i. An updated threats, root causes and barrier analysis. The detailed analysis can be found at section 2.3 of the UNEP project document
- ii. Baseline analysis of gaps with additional focus on the regulatory environment for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in the targeted countries and an assessment of the capacity of the designated laboratories for LMO Detection. A detailed review can be found in section 2.6 of the UNEP project document
- iii. The project components have also been reorganized from three to five components with focus on strengthening institutional, human and information sharing capacity to support the delivery of the envisaged project activities.

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:

In addition to information provided in the PIF, the following is added to update the incremental reasoning:

The six target countries have been involved in biosafety initiatives since the negotiations of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The countries have, in addition to using their own resources to develop and implement comprehensive biosafety frameworks, accessed capacity building resources under UNEP including that for the development of national biosafety frameworks and biosafety clearing house. They have also been involved in other biosafety initiatives championed by RAEIN-Africa, ABNE, Africa Bio, and Programme for Biosafety Systems, and the work at the continental level under the African Union (AU).

- The status assessment of the participating laboratories carried out by RAEIN-Africa revealed that the six countries have limited capacity to test and quantify the presence and levels of LMOs. This is so even though the target countries have prioritized biosafety as indicated in their NBSAPs. The experiences of the SANGL project will form a foundation upon which this project will be anchored and build from. The current status of the designated laboratories in the participating countries is shown in Table 3 of this project document. RAEIN-Africa and its SANGL technical partners, including the Testing Facility at the Free

State University in South Africa, will provide a leading role in facilitating the capacity development in this project.

- The existing baseline conditions in each of the target countries will give an impetus for the planned activities. The existing NBFs and interim measures, in the case of those countries that do not have advanced NBFs, will provide the needed baseline infrastructure and capacity on which the GEF support can provide a catalytic role in terms of material and human resources to assist in addressing LMO identification and handling issues related to national decision making systems.
- What is vital to note is that all the six countries have indicated willingness, through their NBSAPs, to implement the CPB. Stakeholders also agreed during the PPG, that the outputs from this project will make a case for the NBFs and in so doing create a clearer mandate for the LMO detection activities. It was therefore concluded that there was scope for the proposed LMO detection capacity in the absence of biosafety regulatory frameworks in the partnering countries.
 - The Project will build on the established baseline, which includes some level of commitment through some policy, law or an interim arrangement for decision making or commitment to the implementation of the CPB. The establishment of testing capabilities will therefore support the development of science based regulation to meet the CPB. The detection capabilities are meant to serve RA and RM of the transport and use of LMOs. The legal regulatory frameworks can be built progressively, parallel to the implementation of detection capacities.

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:

Risk	Rating	Mitigation measure
Slow administrative and political response to biosafety issues	High	Cooperation between government structures, institutions and special awareness programs for targeted and relevant authorities will be organized at the inception of the project, with follow ups to strengthen the political support for the NBF implementation process. Efforts will be made to ensure biosafety is placed on a higher level in the agenda of government and the national assembly. Project component 4 will be used to strengthen designated stakeholder institutions to do continuous outreach, lobby and network as a means of getting political leverage
Inadequate mechanisms for institutional coordination in the management of biosafety	Medium	Regular coordination meetings for relevant ministries and agencies will be held, defining clear procedures and responsibilities for all the key stakeholders identified. Institutional capacity building will be placed on a high priority level throughout the planned project activities. The steering committees and the information sharing activities will be used to consciously support coordination and management of biosafety. Similar processes will also be initiated through the regional component of the project. Where feasible, concerted efforts will be put in place to develop guidance and easy to read materials to support the coordination mechanism. Entry points will also be created

		for key non-governmental stakeholders including private sector, NGOs, farmers and women groups to be represented in the steering committees as part of the coordination mechanism
Low institutional capacity to manage handling of LMOs in SADC	Medium	Capacity building activities coupled with strengthening of existing facilities will equip designated regulatory agencies to effectively execute their mandate. A high priority will be placed on building a critical mass of resource persons through the Trainer of Trainers approach, mentoring and training in “soft skills” as focal points who will contribute to the enhancement of public awareness through intensification of the contribution of national experts in this process. Through the planned initiatives at the regional level, efforts will also be made to get a full “buy in” by the SADC secretariat through coordination of similar interventions, lobbying and periodic briefs.
Climate change related risks	Low	Measures will be put in place to protect Laboratory equipment from potential damages that may be caused by flooding through the spatial design and set up laboratories. In addition to voltage regulators to absorb potential surges and outages that may arise especially due to cyclones. Standard Laboratory Operating and Emergency Management procedures will be put in place and staff trained on emergency responses. Data generated will be stored in back up servers as part of the planned e-platforms.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The proposed project intervention is related to ongoing UNEP GEF projects on Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks and the Biosafety Clearing House. DRC, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi and Mozambique have all participated or are participating in UNEP-GEF supported interventions supporting implementation of National Biosafety systems. This proposed project aims to develop supportive measures to facilitate decision making for the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks or interim measures intended to ensure countries meet their international obligations under the CPB.

Furthermore, this project falls under the UNEP Medium-term Strategy of the sub programme on Environmental Governance, whose objective is to ensure that environmental governance at country, regional and global levels is strengthened to address agreed priorities. Specific UNEP expected accomplishments for this sub programme that are relevant to this project are: (a) That the United Nations system demonstrates increasing coherence in international decision-making processes related to the environment, including those under multilateral environmental agreements (MEA); implementing this and other MEA defined projects will help UNEP accomplish this vision; (b) That States increasingly implement their environmental obligations and achieve their environmental priority goals, targets and objectives through strengthened laws and institutions. The biosafety projects already implemented or ongoing direct a lot of assistance towards states in fulfilling their obligations to the CPB. In addition, UNEP through its Regional sub programme coordinator on Environmental Governance and staff members involved in UNEP’s Programme of work on Enforcement and

Compliance has been providing continuous support to the implementation of MEAs, especially in the area of liaison assistance to the wider UNEP and its partners. This will be further boosted through direct call up assistance on Biosafety Protocol related issues. This support will be in addition to in-house expertise on the Biosafety Protocol to be provided by the designated UNEP Task Managers, the Regional Office for Africa and the regional support officers (South Africa, Malawi and Mozambique) in the sub region.

Synergies will be developed with other projects to ensure sharing of lessons and cooperative measures are put in place. For example with the Caribbean regional biosafety project, under which a regional lab-detection network has been created, a strategy will be developed to ensure cooperative measures, sharing of best practices with other labs around the world.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

Stakeholder engagements in this project will be guided by the need for successful fulfilment of the project goal; of ensuring effective implementation of the CPB thus, safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs. The project will promote effective participation of a broad range of stakeholders at national and regional levels in Biosafety regulatory chain including in decision making. These include policy makers, regulatory agencies, testing laboratories, research and development organizations, training institutions, Border officials, civil society, the media and the consumers and producers at large. The needs assessment phase gave an indication of the various stakeholders that either participate in LMO detection and decision making or have a stake in the benefits and impacts of the project. Detailed national stakeholder mapping is planned for and will be carried out with the participation of the broader representation at all levels. Based on the findings of the status analysis, the following stakeholder groups were identified as essential participants in the project. The identified stakeholder groups at the national and regional levels are lighted in the tables below.

Periodic stakeholder review at the national and regional levels will be undertaken annually to broaden the list and also assessed for potential synergies and “buy ins” to the project.

Identified potential stakeholders in the participating countries of the LMO Detection for strengthening decision making project

Participating Country	Sector	Specific stakeholder
Angola	Government Ministries	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ministry of Environment , Ministry of Energy and Water Resources, Ministry of Fisheries, Ministry of Science and Technology, Ministry of External Relations Ministry of Health
	Academia & Research Institutes	Central Laboratory of Angola (CLA), Agostinho Neto University, Angolan Catholic University, National Institute for Fisheries Research, National Centre for Scientific Research, National Technological Centre Luanda Herbarium
	Regulatory agencies	National Institute for Nature Conservation, National Institute for Environmental Promotion, National Educational Development Institute, Directorate for Natural Resources, Directorate for the Environment

		Forest Development Institute, Environmental Protection Associations, National Centre for Phytogenetic Resources, National Museum for Natural History
DRC	Government Ministries	Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation, Waters and Forests, Ministry of Scientific Research, Ministry of Rural Development Ministry of External Trade, Ministry of Industry and Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises
	Academia & Research Institutes	University of Kinshasa, University of Kasingani General Atomic Energy Commission / Regional Centre for Nuclear Studies Kinshasa (CGEA / CREN-K), Veterinary Laboratory of Kinshasa (VLK), National Natural Science Research Centre (CRSN-Lwiro), National Institute For Agronomic Study and Research (INERA), Agri-food Research Centre (CRAA) National Seed Service (SENASA), Maize Research Centre (CRM), National Livestock Development Authority (ONDE), National Institute of Biomedical Research (INRB), Animal and Plant Quarantine Service
	Regulatory agencies	The Biosafety Focal Point, The National Biosafety Consultative Council, The National Competent Authority, The Technical and Scientific Committee The National Biosafety Clearing House
Lesotho	Government Ministries	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Ministry of Communications Science and Technology, Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship Affairs, Ministry of Education and Training, Ministry of Finance , Ministry of Development Planning
	Academia & Research Institutes	National University of Lesotho (NUL), Health Research and Laboratory Services, Agricultural Research
	Regulatory agencies	National Executive Agency - National Environment Secretariat, National Coordinating Authority (NCC) Focal Points, Competent Authorities, Scientific Advisory Committee, Socio-Economic Panel, Disaster Management Authority
Madagascar	Government Ministries	Ministry of Environment, Water, Forests and Tourism Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fishing Ministry of Industrialization, Trade and Private Sector Development, Ministry of Health and Family Planning, Ministry of National Education and Scientific Research
	Academia & Research Institutes	Molecular Biology Laboratory - University of Antananarivo (MBL-UA), Environmental Laboratory of Microbiology (ELM), Environment National Research Center, Industrial and Technological National Research Center , Horticultural Technical Center of Antananarivo, Malagasy Institute of Applied Research Malagasy Institute of Veterinarian Vaccines Plant Protection Management Research Centers
	Regulatory agencies	National Office for Environment (CNA - Competent National Authority), The National Association for the

		Management of Protected Areas (ANGAP) (NEA), Biosafety National Committee, Scientific and Technical Committee, Official Service of Mixed Control, Standards Office of Madagascar, Office of Public Participation, Making Investments Compatible with the Environment, Control Unit of the Foodstuffs Quality
Malawi	Government Ministries	Ministry of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Ministry of Industry and Trade, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Local Government
	Academia & Research Institutes	Chitedze Agricultural Research Institute (CARI), Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources (Bunda) Chancellor College, Central Veterinary Laboratories University of Malawi, University of Mzuzu, Natural Resources College, Forestry Research Institute of Malawi National Herbarium & Botanical Gardens, Mokoka Research Station, Bvumbwe Agricultural Research Station, Lunyangwa Agricultural Research Station
	Regulatory agencies	National Commission for Science and Technology (NCST), National Biotechnology Committee, Department of Environmental Affairs (EAD), National Biosafety Regulatory Committee (NBRC), Agricultural Biotechnology and Biosafety , Committee (ABBC), Biosafety Regulatory Authority of Malawi
Mozambique	Government Ministries	Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Coordination of Environment Affairs, Ministry of Industry and Trade, Ministry of Science and Technology, Ministry of Fisheries, Ministry of Finance/Customs
	Academia & Research Institutes	Biotechnology Centre of Eduardo Mondlane University (CB-UEM), Mozambique Research Institute Biotechnology Laboratory (MRIBL), Agriculture Research Institute of Mozambique (IIAM), National Institute for Disasters Management
	Regulatory agencies	National Biosafety Committee (NBC), National Biosafety Competent Authority (NBCA), National Biosafety Committee (NBC), Biosafety Technical Secretariat (BTS) National Biosafety Focal Point (NBFP), National Coordinating Committee, Biosafety Working Group, National Directorate of Agriculture, National Directorate for Livestock, National Directorate for Environment Impact Assessment, National Directorate for Environment , Management, National Directorate of Health, Department of Seeds

Key Stakeholder groups and their envisaged role in the LMO testing for strengthening decision making in biosafety project

Stakeholder	Potential roles
Government Ministries (multi-sectoral) Ministries with the following portfolios participate in decision making: Environment; Agriculture and Food Security; Health; Trade and Industry and, Science and Technology	Involved in the Project Steering Committee, development of regulatory instruments and technical execution of project activities through designated agencies.
Academia (universities, Laboratories & research institutes)	Technical execution of the project, provide technical support in the development of operational manuals and delivery of training
Regulatory agencies	Development of monitoring and enforcement instruments and contribute capacity on regulatory oversight
Parastatals/NGOs	Supportive role to communities in terms of Public awareness creation, public education and advocacy on LMO detection, the usefulness of informed decision making processes and safe handling, transport and use of LMOs
Private sector and civil society	Involved in activities on public awareness and capacity building
Farmer Groups and Seed companies	Involved as end users of the technology and will be involved in knowledge sharing and distribution/handling of genetic material/seeds. In addition to be potential sources of information to the biosafety authorities on use of unauthorised germ plasm of seeds/on handling of genetic material/seeds, emergency or accidental releases or illegal transboundary movements
Regional Institutions (eg. SANbio)	Collaborative partnerships to link jointly review and add inputs to developed biotechnology and biosafety instruments to support policy direction. Support public awareness engagement on biotechnology innovation in a sound regulatory environment and uptake with outreach materials. Collaborate with RAEIIN-Africa to provide a platform to provide technical advice to SADC member states on Biotechnology and

The Key Stakeholders identified are the policy makers, regulatory agencies and the LMO testing laboratories. Farmers, civil society organizations, academia and the media will participate in project inception workshops at regional and country levels so they are aware of the project goals and, can input into decision making processes as provided for the CPB. These stakeholders can also participate in the review of progress and use the results of this project in their own programming.

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):

The Cartagena protocol in its Article 26, highlights the importance of socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially with regard to the value of biological diversity to indigenous and local communities.

In relation to gender as a key issue in socio-economic considerations, gender awareness and capacity should be created among the Parties under the CP to recognize the gender differences in relation to the use of biological biodiversity. These differences should be considered when implementing the Protocol and evaluating the socio-economic impacts that can arise from GMO introduction on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. In this sense the project will promote the participation of both, men and women in project related activities such as trainings, meetings, decision-making and the implementation of technical and decision-making bodies.

Women's involvement in the biotechnological field is crucial given their different needs and concerns about GMOs. Encouraging women to become scientists would be key in the assessment and possible production and/or introduction of GMOs. Unfortunately, women are not encouraged to do so; a smaller proportion of girls receive training in science and technology (Huyer, 2006); college-educated women are less than half as likely to be employed in science and technology; and women employed in these fields earn 20% less than men (Graham and Smith, 2005). The project will support the development of women in science by providing support through components 2 and 3, which are expected to create technical capacities in biosafety /biotechnology and raise awareness of the subject.

Finally, gender considerations will also be taken into account in the process of recruitment of project personnel and consultants, trying whenever possible to balance the number of beneficiaries between male and female. Likewise gender balance will be considered when selecting trainees and beneficiaries of opportunities derived from the project.

The safe use of new detection technologies and operating procedures could open new opportunities for development. Moreover, a science-based risk management approach with a supportive detection capacity will also bring benefits to the environment, assist decision making that products would be assessed through a rigorous analysis to safeguard biodiversity.

The project is planned to ensure cost effectiveness. The project is systematically planned to ensure maximum return per dollar invested. Among the cost reduction actions will be:

1. A number of regional activities are planned back to back to reduce the costs
2. Planning and review meetings are to be held back to back with task force and regional project committee meetings.
3. Virtual meetings will be held where issues to be discussed can be handled through such

4. In countries where other biosafety related projects are being implemented certain activities, e.g. awareness creation meetings will piggy bag on the original plans by the other projects.
5. On human capacity building, training of trainers is implemented at regional level and the trained personnel will train others at national level
6. Non performing contracts and/or processes will be terminated.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

In-line with UNEP Evaluation Policy and the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, the project will be subject to a Terminal Evaluation and, additionally, a Mid-Term Review will be commissioned and launched by the Task Manager before the project reaches its mid-point. If project is rated as being at risk, a Mid-Term Evaluation will be conducted by the Evaluation Office.

The project Steering Committee will participate in the MTR/MTE/TE and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented.

The Evaluation Office will be responsible for the Terminal Evaluation (TE) and will liaise with the Task Manager and Executing Agency (ies) throughout the process. The TE will provide an independent assessment of project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of impact and sustainability. It will have two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP, the GEF, executing partners and other stakeholders. The direct costs of the evaluation will be charged against the project evaluation budget (see Appendix 7). The Terminal Evaluation will be initiated no earlier than six months prior to the operational completion of project activities and, if a follow-on phase of the project is envisaged, should be completed prior to completion of the project and the submission of the follow-on proposal. Terminal Evaluations must be initiated no later than six months after operational completion.

The draft TE report will be sent by the Evaluation Office to project stakeholders for comments. Formal comments on the report will be shared by the Evaluation Office in an open and transparent manner. The project performance will be assessed against standard evaluation criteria using a six point rating scheme. The final determination of project ratings will be made by the Evaluation Office when the report is finalised and further reviewed by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office upon submission. The evaluation report will be publically disclosed and may be followed by a recommendation compliance process.

A detailed step wise process for monitoring and evaluation is provided in Section 6 of the UNEP Project document. The M& E plan is costed as shown in the table below

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget from GEF	Budget co-finance	Time Frame
Inception Meeting (Agreement on M&E Framework and Indicators) (E1)	RAEIN-Africa/ 6 Countries	0	78 782	Within 2 months of project start-up
Inception Report (GEF-Under 4101)	RAEIN-Africa	4 528	54 029	1 month after project inception meeting
Measurement of project indicators (outcome, progress and performance indicators, GEF tracking tools) at national and global level (E3)	RAEIN-Africa(Regional) and Countries (National)	130 670	174 195	Outcome indicators: start, mid and end of project Progress/perform. Indicators: annually
Semi-annual Progress/ Operational Reports to UNEP	RAEIN-Africa	130 164	49 414	Within 1 month of the end of reporting period i.e. on or before 31 January and 31 July
Project Steering Committee meetings and National Steering Committee meetings	RAEIN-Africa(Regional) and Countries (National)		85 537	Once a year minimum
Reports of PSC meetings	RAEIN-Africa(Regional) and Countries (National)	29 500	60 006	Annually
PIR	RAEIN-Africa	0	127 788	Annually, part of reporting continuous routine

Monitoring visits to field sites-Covered from Technical backstopping-B5)-(Budget lines 5301+1601 added together)	RAEIN-Africa	8 912	106 766	As appropriate
MTR/MTE	UNEP Task Manager/Evaluation Office	50 000	20 062	At mid-point of project implementation
Terminal Evaluation	UNEP Evaluation Office	65 000	83 070	Within 6 months of end of project implementation
Audit	RAEIN-Africa	64 046	22 255	Annually
Project Final Report	RAEIN-Africa(Regional) and Countries (National)	2035	39 610	Within 2 months of the project completion date
Co-financing report (5302)	RAEIN-Africa	-	23 162	Within 1 month of the PIR reporting period, i.e. on or before 31 July
Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents (GEF Budget Lines 1201 +1101)	RAEIN-Africa	23 970	74 746	Annually, part of Semi-annual reports & Project Final Report
Total M&E Plan Budget		508 826	999	

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. Carlos Avelino Manuel Cadete	GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, ANGOLA	01/24/2013
Mr. Vincent Kasulu Seya Makonga	GEF Operational Focal Point/Secretary General	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, CONSERVATION OF NATURE	01/22/2013

		AND TOURISM, CONGO DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	
Mr. Stanley Damane	GEF Operational Focal Point/Director – Department of Environment	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, TOURISM AND CULTURE, LESOTHO	01/28/2013
Ms. Christine Edmee RALALAHARISOA	GEF Operational Focal Point/Director General (Environment)	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, ECOLOGY, SEA AND FOREST, MADAGASCAR	01/23/2013
Dr. A. M. Kamperewera	GEF Operational Focal Point/Director of Environmental Affairs	DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS, MALAWI	01/28/2013
Ms. Marila Telma Antonio Manjate	GEF Operational Point/Director of Cooperation	MINISTRY FOR COORDINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS, MOZAMBIQUE	02/15/2013

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		September 5, 2016	Alex Owusu- Biney Task Manager	+254 20 7624066	Alex.Owusu- Biney@unep.org

ANNEXES:

ANNEX A: Logical framework

ANNEX B: Responses to GEF reviews (GEF STAP)

ANNEX C: Status of implementation of project preparation activities and the use of funds.

ANNEX D: Calendar of expected reflows

ANNEX E: Consultants to be hired

Annex A: Logical Framework

See Appendix 4 of the UNEP Project Document

ANNEX B: Responses to GEF reviews

STAP Review

Climate change related risks, however, are not presented in the risk table - however the relevance of climate change related risks should receive further attention during the PPG. The relationship of this project to other relevant ones and coordination requirements are mentioned but the specific coordination arrangements are to be determined at the PPG stage. STAP looks forward to seeing evidence of these arrangements

The relevance of Climate Change related risks was reviewed during the PPG stage. The relevance will be more on impact of the potential harm to laboratory set up and this is taken into account in the spatial development and set up of the project.

The linkages to relevant project and required coordination mechanisms have been specifically addressed in the UNEP Project Document (refer to sections 4 and 5) and is also schematically presented in Appendix 10. Relationship with other projects is also reviewed and updated in section 2.7 of the UNEP Project Document and A7 of the CEO Endorsement template.

The consolidated response to Project Reviews at the PIF Stage is attached as Annex B.

AT CEO Endorsement Stage

The UNEP Prodoc has been reviewed and updated to further address STAP comments. The additional comments are highlighted in green and the specific sections indicated in the response matrix. The Stakeholder table has been updated and the risk matrix is also updated with identified measures in relation to climate change.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$115,000			
<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 Logical Framework Analysis	20,000	25,000	0
Stakeholder Consultative meetings (National/Regional)	75,000	80,000	0
Final drafting and review of Project Proposal	20,000	10,000	0
Total	115,000	115,000	0

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

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)

N/A

ANNEX E: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF/LDCF/SCCF RESOURCES

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ Person Week*</i>	<i>Estimated Person Weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks To Be Performed</i>
For Project Management			
Local			
Regional Project Manager	1,826.92	208	See TORs for Regional Project Manager
Justification for travel, if any:			
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
Laboratory and Biosafety Administration Expert(s)	2,000	52	See TORs for Consultants
International			
Senior Technical Advisor – Laboratory Spatial Development and GMO Detection Specialist	4,000	32	See TORs for Technical Advisors
Training Specialist	2,500	10	See TOR for Consultants
Information, Education and Communication Specialist	2,500	4	To assist in developing IEC materials, knowledge sharing and partnership
Justification for travel, if any:			