



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: 15 December 2010

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 00329

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3211

COUNTRY(IES): Tajikistan

PROJECT TITLE: Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of the Republic of Tajikistan

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP,

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): National Center on Implementation of National Environmental Action Plan

GEF FOCAL AREA(S): BD-SO3

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): 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)	Dec 2012
Project Closing Date	May 2014

### A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK (Expand table as necessary)

**Project Objective:** To assist the Republic of Tajikistan to implement its National Biosafety Framework (NBF) in order to comply with the Cartagena Protocol

Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA <sup>2</sup>	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing <sup>1</sup>		Co-Financing <sup>1</sup>		Total (\$) c=a+ b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
1. Stocktaking and integration of biosafety issues	TA	National consensus on strengths and weaknesses in national capacity and integrated into national plans and strategies	1.1. Existing strengths and weaknesses identified  1.2. Strategy to process developed  1.3. An approved National Strategy and Action Plan on Biosafety (NSAPB)	95,000	55	78,000	45	173,000
2. Regulatory regime	TA	An efficient and operational regulatory framework with full public participation	2.1. Implementing regulations developed  2.2. Technical documents and tools developed	100,000	54	85,000	46	185,000
3. Administrative framework	TA	An operational institutional structure for effective decision making and an efficient	3.1. Administrative body to handle requests established  3.2. Guidelines and procedures	261,000	69	117,000	31	378,000

		system for administrative processing of requests	<p>for administrative handling of requests developed</p> <p>3.3. Staff trained to handle confidential information in requests</p> <p>3.4. Technical experts trained in RARM</p> <p>3.5. Checklist and technical tools developed and made available</p> <p>3.6. Equipping reference laboratory</p>					
4. Monitoring and enforcement	TA	An operational and integrated system for post-release monitoring, enforcement and emergency response	<p>4.1. Staff trained in post-release monitoring and enforcement</p> <p>4.2. Developing technical guidelines for monitoring</p> <p>4.3. Developing emergency response plans</p>	140,000	61	90,000	39	230,000
5. Public awareness and participation	TA	An effective platform for public dialogue, awareness raising and participation in the decision making process	<p>5.1. A mechanism for public access to information and information sharing set up via the national BCH</p> <p>5.2. A platform for enhancing public awareness and education on biosafety issues in place</p> <p>5.3 Organizing public opinion poll</p>	150,000	57	115,000	43	265,000

6.Project Co-ordination: - Project monitoring and evaluation	TA		Monitoring and evaluation	15,500	89	2,000	11	17,500
- Project Management	TA		Project Management	78,500	60	53,000	40	131,500
<b>Total Project Costs</b>				<b>840,000</b>		<b>540,000</b>		<b>1,380,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.

<sup>2</sup> 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>
National Center on Implementation of National Environmental Action Plan			60 000	11
Ministry of Finances			480000	89
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			540000	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		840,000	840,000	84,000	840,000
Co-financing		540,000	540,000		540,000
<b>Total</b>		1,380,000	1,380,000	84,000	1,380,000

**D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)<sup>1</sup>**

<i>GEF Agency</i>	<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Country Name/ Global</i>	<i>(in \$)</i>		
			<i>Project (a)</i>	<i>Agency Fee ( b)<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Total c=a+b</i>
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					

<sup>1</sup> No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

<sup>2</sup> 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*	159	159000	156000	315000
International consultants*	66	99000		99000
<b>Total</b>		258000	156,000	414000

\* 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*	1 person (NPC) 1000 USD per month, 1 person (project assistant) 833 USD per month)	<b>66000</b>	<b>10000</b>	<b>76000</b>
International consultants*				
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*		<b>8000</b>	<b>35500</b>	<b>43500</b>
Travel*		<b>3000</b>	<b>6000</b>	<b>9000</b>
Others (meetings,etc)**		<b>1500</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>3000</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>78,500</b>	<b>53,000</b>	<b>131,500</b>

\* 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 refloes to your agency and to the GEF Trust Fund).

**H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:** The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are summarized in Appendix 7. Reporting requirements and templates are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument to be signed by the executing agency and UNEP. The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework presented in Appendix 4 includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in Appendix 6 will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. The means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators are summarized in Appendix 7. Other M&E related costs are also presented in the Costed M&E Plan and are fully integrated in the overall project budget. The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Indicators and their means of verification may also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the project management team but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators. It is the responsibility of the Project Manager to inform UNEP of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion. The project Steering Committee will receive periodic reports on progress and will make recommendations to UNEP concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Results Framework or the M&E plan. Project oversight to ensure that the project meets UNEP and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility to the Task Manager in UNEP-GEF. The Task Manager will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of scientific and technical outputs and publications. At the time of project approval approximately 50 percent of baseline data is available. Baseline data gaps will be addressed during the first year of project implementation. A plan for collecting the necessary baseline data is presented in Appendix 5. The main aspects for which additional information are needed are baseline capacity in modern biotechnology and Biosafety across the full range of stakeholders. Project supervision will take an adaptive management approach. The Task Manager will develop a project supervision plan at

the inception of the project which will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop. The emphasis of the Task Manager supervision will be on outcome monitoring but without neglecting project financial management and implementation monitoring. Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed with the Steering Committee at agreed intervals. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and UNEP. Risk assessment and rating is an integral part of the Project Implementation Review (PIR). The quality of project monitoring and evaluation will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost-effective use of financial resources. A mid-term management review or evaluation will take place in February 2012 as indicated in the project milestones. The review will include all parameters recommended by the GEF Evaluation Office for evaluations and will verify information gathered through the GEF Tracking Tools, as relevant. The review will be carried out using a participatory approach whereby parties that may benefit or be affected by the project will be consulted. Such parties were identified during the stakeholder analysis (see Section 2.5 of the project document). The project Steering Committee will participate in the mid-term review 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. An independent terminal evaluation will take place at the end of project implementation. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) of UNEP will manage the terminal evaluation process. A review of the quality of the evaluation report will be done by EOU and submitted along with the report to the GEF Evaluation Office not later than 6 months after the completion of the evaluation. The standard terms of reference for the terminal evaluation are included in Appendix 9. These will be adjusted to the special needs of the project. The GEF Tracking Tools are attached as Appendix 15. These will be updated at mid-term and at the end of the project and will be made available to the GEF Secretariat along with the project PIR report. As mentioned above the mid-term and terminal evaluation will verify the information of the tracking tool.

**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.*

**A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:** Tajikistan has globally important components of biological diversity and genetic centers of origin and diversity of genetic resources important for food and agriculture. Therefore, biosafety has utmost importance for food security both at national and global levels. The unregulated introduction of products of modern biotechnology could lead to loss of wild and agricultural biodiversity and thus an operational biosafety framework with adequate capacity is required to ensure that the potential benefits of modern biotechnology can be captured in a fully legal and transparent manner. Tajikistan is one of the centers of species origin and possesses significant genetic resources, the preference is given to traditional methods of agricultural activities. Along with this, it is necessary to establish strict control over import and dissemination of LMOs and their products. The Government is eager to make steps on developing application of environmentally friendly alternative activities on crop raising, reduction of land degradation, etc. It is also important to conserve local breeds of animals and varieties of agricultural plants. On the one hand, the National Biosafety Framework is to ensure an adequate level of protection of human health and the environment from possible adverse effects resulting from the products of modern biotechnology, and on the other hand to provide a basis for public confidence building and for providing legal certainty for research organizations and industry. In respect of the above, the unregulated introduction of products of modern biotechnology could lead to loss of wild and agricultural biodiversity and thus an operational biosafety framework with adequate capacity is required to ensure that the potential benefits of modern biotechnology can be captured in a fully legal and transparent manner. Consequently, the unregulated introduction of products of modern biotechnology could lead to loss of wild and agricultural biodiversity and thus an operational biosafety framework with adequate capacity is required to ensure that the potential benefits of modern biotechnology can be captured in a fully legal and transparent manner.

**B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL AND/OR REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:** Republic of Tajikistan ratified the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety on February 12, 2004. This project aims to support Tajikistan in meeting its obligations foreseen under the Protocol by providing the needed capacity building. This project is consistent with the priorities on conservation of genetic resources and providing of biosafety stipulated in National Strategy and Action Plan on Conservation and Sustainable Use of

Biodiversity (approved by the Government Decree №392 dated September 1, 2003). In particular, the document underlines the necessity in improvement of the legislative base to meet requirements of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. As priority activities the Action Plan includes development of the law and by-laws on genetically modified organisms, establishment of a Center on genetic resources. National Sustainable Development Report (approved by the Government Decree №297 dated July 13, 2002) includes the chapter on environmentally friendly use of biotechnology. Tajikistan has already started to promote biosafety. Thus, in 2004 development of the National Biosafety Framework was completed. At the same time economic situation in the country does not allow to implement this document and the stated objectives and activities to a full extent. In this direction, recently, as one of the NBF component, there has been developed and approved the Biosafety Law (№88 dated from March 1, 2005), that has become the base for further actions. But for its practical application there is needed a number of legislative documents. The present project will directly promote implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of the Republic of Tajikistan and application of the Biosafety Law. The biosafety issue has been considered at the sub-regional workshop on biosafety that took place on October 19-21, 2004, in Dushanbe (Tajikistan) with participation of the Central Asia countries and Mongolia. Upon the results of the workshop there has been adopted the Resolution on “Development of the regional cooperation on ensuring biosafety in the Central Asia countries” which was submitted to the International Commission on Sustainable Development for consideration at the regular meeting. Project implementation will allow to build the capacity, particularly needed for strengthening regional cooperation, and thereby implement recommendations of the workshop Resolution.

**C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:**

The project belongs to the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area. Biosafety is one of the priority area of GEF-4 Strategic Programme under SO3: To safeguard biodiversity stating that “In order to safeguard biodiversity, countries require management systems and frameworks that have the capacity to detect, exclude, eradicate, control and effectively manage introduced organisms that pose a risk to biodiversity. Through this strategic objective, GEF will help build country capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.” Therefore, “Building Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol” is included as SP6 of GEF-4 Strategic Programme. Furthermore, GEF Council adopted the GEF Strategy for Financing Biosafety (GEF C.30/8/Rev.1) to help build the capacity of eligible countries to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through activities at the national, sub-regional and regional levels. Capacity building is a key prerequisite for the effective implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB). In order to be able to implement their obligations, Parties to the CPB need appropriate institutional mechanisms and infrastructure, well-trained human resources, adequate funding as well as easy access to relevant information. At its first meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on Biosafety, adopted in annex 1 of decision BS-I/5, an Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. At its second meeting, COP-MOP in decision BS-II/3 adopted terms of reference for a comprehensive review of the Action Plan and invited Governments and relevant organizations to submit information regarding the progress and effectiveness in their implementation of the Action Plan as well as suggestions on the desired revisions. The Secretariat prepared, on the basis of the submissions received, a synthesis paper including strategic recommendations for a possible revision of the Action Plan. At its third meeting, COP-MOP in decision BS-III/3 adopted an updated version of the Action Plan. Therefore the project is in line with GEF strategies and CPB priorities.

**D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES. N/A**

**E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:** Tajikistan executed the UNEP/GEF Project on Development of Biosafety Frameworks between 2002-2004. National Biosafety Framework was prepared at the end of the development project including draft law on biosafety. In 2005 Tajikistan also completed was a UNEP/GEF project for Establishment of a national Biosafety Clearing House.

**F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH [incremental reasoning](#) :** Tajikistan is a poor country with limited initial capacity to fulfill its international obligations. Implementation of this project on capacity building will not only allow Tajikistan to meet its obligations under the Cartagena Protocol but will create the needed base for further sustainable long-term development of the national biosafety system. The National Biosafety Framework was completed in 2004. The administrative, legislative and institutional status and capacity needs of Tajikistan with regard to biosafety was determined at that time. Since then, there are some developments and changes in the administrative and institutional status. Therefore, component 1 (stocktaking exercise) is required to update information on stakeholders and gaps on

biosafety for effective planning and implementation of the other components of the project. Within the context of the project, the baseline includes the activities carried out at domestic level; the increment includes the activities proposed under this project proposal for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the Cartagena Protocol, to be financed through the GEF contribution and national co-financing. These activities will be based on the following: The draft National Biosafety Framework was completed in 2004, when the national administrative, legislative and institutional status and capacity needs with regard to biosafety were determined at that time. Since then, there are some developments and changes in the administrative and institutional status. Therefore, component 1 (stocktaking exercise) is required to update information on stakeholders and gaps on biosafety for effective planning and implementation of the other components of the project. The Biosafety Law (2005) forms the basis for biosafety regulatory regime. However, the law needs updating and secondary legislations needs to be drafted together with manuals and guidelines. Without the project and activities under component 2, this process may be delayed. The institutional baseline for handling of requests, risk assessment, risk management, monitoring and inspections constitutes laboratories with the potential to be included in the biosafety network and these laboratories also present research institutes. Administrative and technical staff of the competent authorities constitutes a basis to some extent for human resources for handling of requests, risk assessment, decision-making and risk management. Without adequate human resources (both in quality and in quantity), notifications cannot be evaluated in an appropriate manner and the system cannot function well enough to respond to notifications within the appropriate time periods. Without the 3rd component of the project, determination and handling of illegal movements and release of LMOs would not be possible and may result with damage on biodiversity. Monitoring and inspection system is the priority issue for Tajikistan as being so rich of genetic origins and diversity for crops in the region. Mandating of particular laboratories for LMO detection and training of technical staff on LMO detection and identification is a key capacity need in order to allow an effective monitoring and inspection system to regulate transboundary movements and environmental release of LMOs. In 2005 the BCH project was completed, but the BCH has been dormant since then due to lack of resources. The project would serve sustainable and effective system for public awareness, education and participation on biosafety. Consequently, baseline for biosafety would lead to illegal introduction of LMOs in Tajikistan, weak implementation of CPB and possible environmental damages due to weak monitoring and inspection.

**G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES:** One risk is mandating of trained technical staff in different positions other than biosafety facilities. Training of trainers and preparation of guidelines and manuals will provide sustainability of human resources in biosafety laboratories and institutes. Close collaboration and cooperation between institutions is important factor in the successful implementation of the project. In addition to Project Coordination Committee, the establishment and mandating of National Biosafety Committee, competent authorities and Scientific Advisory Committee as defined in the Law, training of Customs personnel on biosafety will serve sustainability of institutional collaboration and cooperation both during and after the project. The stability of the governmental support during and after the project to implement NBF is one of the key assumptions of the project. Therefore, political instability would pose important risk for success of the project as well. The activities under the fifth component of the project that will be executed starting from early stages of the project will contribute growing interest of the public to the biosafety issues. The public interest will be driving force for the governments and politicians to support implementation of NBF.

**H. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:** Cost-effectiveness will arise from being able to build on capacity already put in place by previous GEF support for NBF development and establishment of the national BCH, by ensuring continuation of the objectives. Tajikistan has a population of 6.4 million, among them more than 66% are living in rural areas. The main economic contributions to GDP are from agriculture – about 26%. The basic directions of agriculture are cotton and wheat production, viniculture, gardening, vegetable growing and cattle breeding. The agricultural production has a very important role in economic development in Tajikistan and the country is likely to turn to increasing use of biotechnology in order to improve yields and production of important crops. Therefore, food and environment security, export orientation and rural development are assigned highest priorities in agriculture policies of Tajikistan. The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2002) sets out a series of specific national, sectoral and crosscutting objectives. The emphasis is on maintaining high levels of GDP growth, and on overcoming poverty in rural and urban areas. Thus biosafety and the safe use of biotechnology are likely being important considerations in the drive towards economic development. As environmental protection cuts across all sectors, it is a responsibility of the society as a whole. During the

UNEP/GEF project on development of NBF supported by internal resources, technical and human resource capacity of competent authorities were supported. Training of trainers is a key activity in the project for cost effectiveness in terms of technical capacity and will provide sustainability of the biosafety system. The ability of safe use of modern biotechnology will contribute conservation of biological diversity, particularly genetic resources important for food and feed, meeting obligations of Tajikistan under other multilateral environmental conventions.

### **PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT**

**A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:** The National Executing Agency for the project (NEA) will be National Center on Implementation of National Environmental Action Plan, which is the focal point for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The NEA will be responsible for the completion of project objectives, and for closely monitoring how the activities are implemented. The NEA will contribute financially (in-kind) to the project, covering partially cost of experts, maintenance of the BCH web site, project management and administration budget.

**B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:** National Coordinating Committee (NCC): A National Coordinating Committee (NCC) will be established by the NEA to advise and guide the implementation of this project. This committee will include representatives from all government agencies with mandates relevant to the CPB and will include representations from the private and public sectors. National Project Coordinator (NPC): The National Project Coordinator will be appointed by the NEA, after consultation with UNEP, for the duration of this project. The NPC shall be responsible for the overall co-ordination, management and supervision of all aspects of this project. He/she will report to the National Coordinating Committee and UNEP, and liaise closely with the chair and members of the NCC and NEA in order to ensure that progress is made according to the work plan for the project. He/she shall be responsible for all substantive, managerial and financial reports from the project, provides overall supervision for any staff in the National Project Implementation team as well as guide and supervise all other staff appointed for the execution of the various components of the project.

### **PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:**

Project activities have been planned in line with the components included in the original PIF. However, some changes have been made if compared with PIF due to the long project preparation period, namely:

First two components have been merged: "stocktaking" and "integration of biosafety issues" as they belong together and there is no need to separate them.

Under those components, three outcomes were merged as they all belong together:

- 1.1 national consensus on strengths and weaknesses in national capacity,
- 1.2. ownership of project design by all stakeholders
- 2.1 Biosafety recognized as priority for sustainable development and integrated into national plans and strategies

Two outputs under 2nd component have been merged as the content of them is overlapping:

- 2.1. A functional and strengthened regulatory regime in order to implement the NBF and
- 2.2. Implementing regulations developed

3 outcomes under 3rd component were merged together as first and the last is the description of the process and only the second is a real outcome:

- 3.1. NSBAP becomes a component of strengthening of regulatory regime in order to implement the NBF
- 3.2. An efficient and operational regulatory framework with full public participation
- 3.3. Public participation in development of regulatory regime and public access to the relevant legislation

2 outcomes under 4th component were merged together as they are repetitive and together consist of administrative system.

- 4.1. An operational institutional structure for effective decision making
- 4.2. A fully functional decision making system and an efficient system for administrative processing of requests

2 outcomes under component 5 were merged together:

- 5.1. NBSAP integrated in the development of enforcement and monitoring system for post-releases of LMOs
- 5.2. An operational and integrated system for post-release monitoring, enforcement and emergency response

Output 6. 3 Feedback from public during the decision-making process is changed to: 6.3. Organizing public opinion poll as feedback as such cannot be the output, but feedback and opinion from public could be gained through poll.

Consequently, costs of components 1 and 2 in the PIF have been merged into component 1 in budget. Budgets of Components 7 and 8 in PIF have been merged into component 6 in budget (M&E and project management); however,

those are separate activities in the 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 Director UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility (GEF) Coordination		15 December 2010	Alex Owusu- Biney Task Manager, UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility (GEF) Coordination PO Box 30552 Nairobi, Kenya Fax:(254 20) 762-4041	+254-20- 7624066	Alex.Owusu- Biney@unep.org

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Indicators (beginning of year 2014)	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
Objective: To assist the Republic of Tajikistan to implement its National Biosafety Framework (NBF) in order to comply with Cartagena Protocol	By the end of the project the base for functional biosafety system that includes: Regulatory system Administrative system Enforcement and monitoring system System for public awareness and participation will be created and put into place.	Draft NBF was prepared during 2002 - 2004, but it needs updating	By the end of 2013, updated NBF is adopted and being implemented effectively	Project evaluation conducted after its completion Government Decree on National Strategy and Action Plan on Biosafety approval. Draft regulations developed in a course of project implementation Draft guidelines developed in a course of project implementation Comparative analysis of polls on public awareness Reports of national competent authorities Project progress reports Reviews of international consultants	No political activities (election of President, Parliament) will cause delays in the implementation of the project Sufficient financial and human resources for carrying out the project
<b>Component 1: Stocktaking and integration of biosafety issues</b>					
<b>Outcome 1: National consensus on strengths and weaknesses in national capacity and integrated into national plans and strategies</b>					
<b>Outputs:</b>					
1.1. Existing strengths and weaknesses identified	Gap analysis of national strengths and weaknesses in regard of biosafety composed	Basic information was collected during NBF development project, but it is outdated and needs to be updated as biosafety is a rapidly developing area	By the end of first half of 2011, gap analysis performed	Gap analysis available from project website	Information is available and stakeholders willing to give their views and cooperating with reviewers
1.2 Strategy to process developed	Recommendations based on gap analysis how to proceed with biosafety in Tajikistan submitted	There is neither biosafety policy in Tajikistan nor any clear vision about possible future developments	By third quarter of 2011, recommendations made by experts about short and long term strategy for biosafety	Recommendations available from project website	General recognition of biosafety as an important issue
1.3. An approved National Strategy and Action Plan on Biosafety (NSAPB)	NSAPB drafted, discussed and approved	There is neither biosafety policy in Tajikistan nor any clear vision about possible future developments	By the end of 2012, NSAPB developed, discussed with major stakeholders and approved by relevant authority	Draft available from project website, final NSAPB published in official website of the government	Government fully committed Strategy is not isolated from other relevant issues National Strategy takes into account needs and priorities

					No delay in NSAPB approval
<b>Component 2 Regulatory system</b>					
<b>Outcome 2: An efficient and operational regulatory framework with full public participation</b>					
<b>Outputs:</b>					
2.1. Implementing regulations developed	Biosafety law and regulations drafted, discussed and submitted for approval	Biosafety law was adopted in 2005, but it needs updating and drafting of secondary legislation	By the end of 2012 biosafety law amended and secondary legislation developed	Drafts of law and regulations available from project website and once approved published in the official website of the government	Good lawyers available to develop regulatory regime Public is actively involved into development of regulatory system
2.2. Technical documents and tools developed	Technical documents and tools about biosafety legislation drafted and discussed	No technical documents and tools available	Technical documents and tools developed by 2013,	Documents and tools available from project website	Experts available to perform the work
<b>Component 3: Administrative framework</b>					
<b>Outcome 3: An operational institutional structure for effective decision making and an efficient system for administrative processing of requests</b>					
<b>Outputs:</b>					
3.1. Administrative body to handle requests established	Competent authorities nominated and relevant administrative system for handling requests established, including National Biosafety Commission	There is no administrative body for handling requests established	By 2012 administrative body for handling requests established	Contacts of administrative body published in BCH central portal and other details available from project website	Support from the government to setting up the administrative system Competent authorities cooperating and responsibilities clearly divided and mutually understood
3.2. Guidelines and procedures for administrative handling of requests developed	Guidelines drafted and procedures set for handling requests on administrative level	No guidelines nor procedures set for handling requests on administrative level	Guidelines drafted and procedures set by second half of 2012.	Guidelines available from project website and copies sent together with regular reporting	Technical expertise available for drafting or adapting guidelines. Help from academia and scientists
3.3. Staff trained to handle confidential information in requests	Training organized for handling confidential information	No trainings organized for handling confidential information	Trainings organized by 2012	Training lists and programmes submitted with regular reporting	Provisions of handling confidential information drafted together with amended or new pieces of legislation, i.e. the topic is regulated by the time of training
3.4. Technical experts trained in RARM	Trainings for RA and RM organized for technical and scientific staff	No trainings on RARM organized for scientific staff	RARM trainings organized by the end of 2012.	Training lists and programmes submitted with regular reporting	Technical expertise available (including international expertise) for trainings. Help from academia and scientists
3.5. Checklist and technical	Guidelines, checklists and	No guidelines, checklists	Guidelines and checklists	Guidelines available	Technical expertise

tools developed and made available	technical tools drafted and made available for handling requests on scientific and technical level	available	drafted and published by the end of 2012.	from project website and copies send with regular reporting	available for drafting guidelines. Help from academia and scientists
3.6. Equipping reference laboratory	Reference laboratory equipped	No reference laboratory, laboratories in Tajikistan are not sufficiently equipped for LMO analysis	Reference laboratory equipped and accredited by 2012.	List of inventory together with project reporting	Laboratory cooperating and cofinancing the process

#### **Component 4: Monitoring and enforcement**

**Outcome 4: An operational and integrated system for post-release monitoring, enforcement and emergency response**

##### **Outputs:**

4.1. Staff trained in post-release monitoring and enforcement	Trainings organized for post release monitoring and enforcement	No trainings organized for post release monitoring and enforcement	Trainings organized by the end of 2012.	Training lists and programmes submitted with regular reporting	Technical expertise available for trainings. Help from academia and scientists
4.2. Developing technical guidelines for monitoring	Technical guidelines for monitoring developed	No guidelines available	Guidelines developed by second half of 2012.	Guidelines available from project website, and sent with regular reporting	Technical expertise available for drafting guidelines. Help from academia and scientists
4.3. Developing emergency response plans	Emergency response plans developed	No emergency response plan	Emergency response plan developed by 2013.	Plan available from official website of the government	Technical expertise available. Help from academia and scientists

#### **Component 5: Public awareness and participation**

**Outcome 5: An effective platform for public dialogue, awareness raising and participation in the decision making process**

##### **Outputs:**

5.1. A mechanism for public access to information and information sharing set up via the national BCH	National BCH updated and made available for public access	BCH was established in 2005-2006, but it needs updating. No manuals in local language how to use BCH	By 2012, manuals for using of BCH published and workshops for members of competent authorities organized	BCH available electronically	Public is aware about BCH Sufficient equipment available for maintaining BCH
5.2. A platform for enhancing public awareness and education on biosafety issues in place	Info days and trainings organized and informative and educational materials published	Only a few info days and trainings have been organized about biosafety and some publications have been published, but this is not sufficient for public awareness	By the end of 2013, trainings organized and publications prepared	Training lists and programmes submitted with regular reporting together with published materials	High public interest in biosafety questions, no opposition from any interest group, NGOs willing to cooperate and help in setting public platform
5.3 Organizing public opinion poll	Public opinion poll organized	No public opinion poll conducted in Tajikistan	By end of 2013 poll organized	Results of poll published in project website	Public is interested in participating in the poll, providing relevant and useful information about biosafety and their

					opinions
--	--	--	--	--	----------

**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)

**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>
<b>For Project Management</b>			
<b>Local</b>			
Project coordinator	250	144 weeks	Every day project coordination work
Project assistant	104.40	144 weeks	Assisting NPC with substantive and technical project support
Administration Assistant	104.40	144 weeks	Assisting NPC with administrative and financial project support
<b>International</b>			
Justification for Travel, if any:			
<b>For Technical Assistance</b>			
<b>Local</b>			
National consultants	1000	159 weeks	Baseline analysis and making recommendations, compiling biosafety policy document, preparing legislation and procedures, technical manuals, organizing trainings on confidential information, RA and RM, border control, monitoring, emergency plan, preparing lectures and publications etc
<b>International</b>			
	1500	66 weeks	Stocktaking analysis and making recommendations,, compiling biosafety policy document, preparing legislation and procedures, technical manuals, organizing trainings on confidential information, RA and RM, border control, monitoring, emergency plan
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**

No PPG was used for this proposal

- A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.**
- B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:**
- 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>	
<b>Total</b>						

\* 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)