GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**5720**		
Country/Region:	**Sri Lanka**		
Project Title:	**Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework in Accordance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$2,365,964**
Co-financing:	**$2,366,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$4,831,964**
PIF Approval:	**April 01, 2014**	Council Approval/Expected:	**May 01, 2014**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Subash Dasgupta**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	3-19-14 Yes. Sri Lanka is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	3-19-14 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for $2,700,231 . The letter is dated 2-20-14. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3-19-14 The request for BD $2,700,231 is within the available funding for BD Sri Lanka.	

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

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	3-19-14 The request for BD $2,700,231 is within the available funding for BD Sri Lanka ($2,920,231) Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	3-19-14 BD-3, Aichi Targets 1,2 and 13. Cleared	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	3-19-14 Yes. As stated in the PIF: "Biodiversity Conservation Action Plan (BCAP) was developed in 1998, and its Addendum was prepared in 2007 that includes the chapter for Biosafety". In addition, "The proposed project is aligned with "Mahinda Chintana: Vision for the Future", which is the Development Policy Framework of the Government of Sri Lanka for 2010-2016". Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	3-14-18 There is a very comprehensive "baseline project" description on pages 6 and 7 of the PIF. Cleared	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	3-19-14 Yes. The proposed components, outcomes and outputs are clearly stated and fit within the activities eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	3-19-14 The GEBs associated with this project will become tangible and measurable once the provisions of the CPB are fully implemented. Cleared	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the **socio-economic benefits**, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	3-19-14 There is no reference to Local Communities or Indigenous peoples. Is that the case? If not, please address the matter in Stakeholder Table and wherever else appropriate. 3-27-14 Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	3-19-14 Cleared	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	3-19-14 Yes. Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	3-19-14 As stated in the PIF, "The project is innovative in that it deploys an integrated approach for capacity development through the consolidation of institutional arrangement, human resources development and assistance in establishment of necessary infrastructures" for the implementation of the NBF. The proposed project will also take advantage of regional collaborative initiative on biosafety, "Asian Bio-Net", undertaken by FAO. Good practices and lesson-learn from the project will be disseminated and replicated in the region through this regional network. "Sustainability of the proposed project and up-scaling of its impacts are ensured through strengthening of regulatory frameworks and enhancement of institutional and technical capacities of stakeholders including government officials, academics and the public at large. Outreach campaigns to create awareness on the importance of biosafety will ensure continuous knowledge development maximizing the project's	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		long-term impacts in the country". 3-27-14 Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	3-14-19 Yes. Assuming that the "in-kind" contributions become effective during project implementation. Cleared	
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	3-19-14 Yes. Please fill-out Table D. 3-27-14 Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	3-19-14 Yes. It is 5% Cleared	
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval,	3-19-14 Yes. The project requests $100K for PPG. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	3-27-14 Yes. This PIf is recommended for clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 18, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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