



● GEF Portal

● Eric Mugo

1. [Home](#)

0. [RoadMap](#)

0. CEO Endorsement Form

Support to Preparation of the Fourth National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - ASIA-PACIFIC, GRULAC, CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE REGIONS



- CEO Approval Request
 - GEF Review
 - CEO Approved

Enabling Activity (CEO) – GEF - 7



Part I: Project Information

GEF ID
10639

Project Type
EA

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT

CBIT

Project Title

Support to Preparation of the Fourth National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety - ASIA-PACIFIC, GRULAC, CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE REGIONS

Countries

Regional, Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kiribati, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, St. Lucia, Suriname, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkey, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen

Agency(ies)

UNEP

Other Executing Partner(s):

Competent National Authorities

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Biodiversity

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Biodiversity, Supplementary Protocol to the CBD, Biosafety

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 0

Type of Reports	Submission Date	Expected Implementation Start	Expected Completion Date	Expected Report Submission to Convention
Cartagena Protocol National Report	9/17/2020	9/17/2020	8/31/2021	12/31/2020

Duration

12

In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

135,327.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-EA	GET	1,424,500.00	1,050,890.00
		Total Project Cost(\$)	1,050,890.00



B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and submit their Fourth National Reports on measures that each Party has taken to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Project Component	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Preparation of the Fourth National Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	Fourth National Reports submitted in line with obligations of Article 33 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	51 GEF Eligible countries have received funds and prepared the Fourth National Report on the measures taken to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	1,295,000.00	1,050,890.00
Sub Total (\$)			1,295,000.00	1,050,890.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) □				
			129,500.00	
Sub Total(\$)			129,500.00	0.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			1,424,500.00	1,050,890.00

C. Source of Co-Financing for the Project by Name and by Type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Afghanistan	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	
Recipient Country Government	Albania	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Antigua and Barbuda	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Armenia	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Bahamas	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Bahrain	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Bangladesh	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	20,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Barbados	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	2,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Barbados	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	23,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Belarus	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Bhutan	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Bolivia	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Bosnia and Herzegovina	In-kind	Investment mobilized	10,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Cambodia	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	20,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Colombia	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	17,828.00
Recipient Country Government	Cuba	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	40,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Dominica	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Dominican Republic	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ecuador	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	53,205.00
Recipient Country Government	Grenada	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Guatemala	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Guyana	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	20,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Honduras	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	12,000.00
Recipient Country Government	India	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	70,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Iraq	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Jamaica	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	34,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Kiribati	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Kyrgyz Republic	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Lao PDR	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Lebanon	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Maldives	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Marshall Islands	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Mexico	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Mongolia	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	75,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Montenegro	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Nicaragua	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Pakistan	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Palau	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Jordan	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Panama	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	20,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Moldova	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,000.00
Recipient Country Government	St. Lucia	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Samoa	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	
Recipient Country Government	Solomon Islands	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Sri Lanka	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	12,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Suriname	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	8,857.00
Recipient Country Government	Tajikistan	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Tonga	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Turkey	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Venezuela	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	40,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Vietnam	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	25,000.00

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Yemen	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	
			Total Co-Financing(\$)	1,050,890.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

N/A

D. GEF Financing Resources Requested by Agency, Country and Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNEP	GET	Regional	Biodiversity	BD Set-Aside	1,424,500	135,327
Total Gef Resources(\$)					1,424,500.00	135,327.00

Part II. Enabling Activity Justification

A. ENABLING ACTIVITY BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT □

Provide brief information about projects implemented since a country became party to the convention and results achieved

In the context of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the national reporting provides an update on the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and hence facilitate intervention measures under Strategic Objective “BD-3-8 -Further development of biodiversity policy and institutional frameworks through the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety” under the GEF 7 Biodiversity Strategy. The GEF strategy prioritizes the implementation of activities that are identified in-country stock-taking analyses and in the COP/MOP guidance to the GEF, in particular, the key elements in the Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB adopted at the Fourth COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the CPB (COP-MOP-3) and Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety – 2012 – 2020 (http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/publications/bs_frameworkactionplan_en.pdf?download) which was adopted at COP/MOP 6.

This project is consistent with the GEF 7 Biodiversity focal area strategy under BD-EA “Further development of biodiversity policy and institutional frameworks through Enabling activities (national biodiversity strategy, national reports for CBD, CP, and NP)”. The requested enabling activity support will provide data to support the revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) in line with the CBD’s new strategic plan adopted at COP-10 and the BS Strategy 2011 - 2020, national reporting guidance as provided under COP/MOP 9 Decisions CP 9/4b and CP 9/5 with support from the Focal Area Set Aside funds. It will also provide data to support the final review of the Biosafety Strategy 2011 – 2020 and provide lessons and best practices for the Post 2020 Biodiversity Framework.

Parties are required under Article 33 of the CPB, to submit National Reports on the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety every four years. The national reporting is an obligation under Article 33 as highlighted

“Monitoring and Reporting”

[Each Party shall monitor the implementation of its obligations under this Protocol, and shall, at intervals to be determined by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Protocol, report to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Protocol on measures that it has taken to implement the Protocol.]

In its decision BS-I/9, the COP-MOP adopted a reporting format and requested Parties to submit reports every four years. The decision also called for an interim report to be submitted to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) two years after entry into force of the Protocol on 11 September 2005. The interim reports can be found at http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_natreports.shtml. The major conclusion of the analysis of the interim report was that [Assessment of the practical elements of implementation of some of the operational provisions of the Protocol is difficult in many cases since no concrete experience is available on how the frameworks will be operationalized; for example, no countries reported on decisions taken under the advance informed agreement procedure for importing living modified organisms for intentional introduction into the environment]

At its third meeting, the COP-MOP adopted, after considering the analysis of the interim reports that were submitted to the Parties, in decision BS-III/14, a reporting format for the first regular national report on implementation of the Protocol and outlined a schedule and the process for the preparation and synthesis of the reports for consideration at the fourth COP-MOP meeting (see <https://beta.bch.cbd.int/reports#natrep0>).

At its fourth meeting, the COP-MOP considered an analysis of first national reports prepared by the Secretariat. In its decision BS-IV/14, it requested the Secretariat to repeat the analysis of the first national reports submitted after the deadline and make the analysis available through the BCH. It also requested the Secretariat to propose improvements to the reporting format from experiences of the first national reports, the recommendations of the Compliance Committee and suggestions made by Parties, for consideration at COP-MOP 5. In addition, COP-MOP urged the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to make financial resources available to improve capacity-building in preparing their national report.

The Secretariat of the CBD carried out an analysis of the First National reports and it was apparent that the information submitted did not effectively reflect or establish baselines for subsequent assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol. In decision BS-IV/14, the COP-MOP requested the Secretariat to propose improvements to the reporting format. At its fifth meeting, the COP-MOP in decision BS-V/14 welcomed the reporting format proposed by the secretariat and requested parties to use the new format in the preparation of their second national reports, through a consultative process, involving all relevant stakeholders.

The analysis of the information contained in the first national reports and a summary of the responses were made available to Parties in documents UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/13 and UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/INF/11. A revised analysis (requested by decision BS-IV/14) is available in document UNEP/CBD/BS/CC/5/2 and refers to information contained in the first national reports received by the Secretariat prior to 18 August 2008. Aside of the low compliance and the need to address gaps in the implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks; strengthened national capacity in thematic issues such as the Advance Informed Agreement procedures, Socio economic considerations, Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification and Risk Assessment/Risk Management were identified as key issues for redress to facilitate implementation of the Protocol. The Interim and First National Regular reports were not supported by the GEF.

At its fifth meeting, the COP-MOP in in decision BS-V/14 welcomed the reporting format for the national report on the implementation of the Protocol proposed by the Secretariat and requested Parties to use it for the preparation of their second national reports, through consultative processes involving all relevant stakeholders. It also encouraged Parties to respond to all questions in the reporting format in order to facilitate the establishment of baselines for subsequent assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol. Parties that encountered difficulty in completing and submitting their national report on time were encouraged to seek assistance from the Secretariat or the Compliance Committee, and/or make use of the roster of biosafety experts. The GEF was also requested to make financial resources available to eligible Parties for the preparation of their second national reports. Furthermore, COP-MOP requested the Secretariat to organize an online forum and/or regional or sub-regional workshops on national reporting to assist Parties in the preparation of their national reports and exchange best practices and experience on the fulfilment of the monitoring and reporting obligations under the Protocol.

At its sixth meeting, COP-MOP, welcomed, in its decision BS-VI/14, the high rate of submission of second national reports. It urged those Parties that have not submitted their national report, to do so at the earliest opportunity. It encouraged Parties to

facilitate the preparation and submission of their national reports by using, as appropriate technical and other resources available in existing bilateral, sub-regional and regional arrangements, and the roster of biosafety experts. COP-MOP also reminded Parties of paragraph 2 of decision BS-V/14, which requests Parties submitting their national report for the first time to use the reporting format for the second national report. The high rate of submission of the second national reports were attributed to the facilitative GEF grant.

COP-MOP 6 requested the Secretariat to assist Parties in making information that is missing from their report available through the Biosafety Clearing-House. It also requested the Secretariat to update the reporting format and submit a revised one to the seventh meeting of the Parties taking into account the experience gained in analyzing the second national reports, the recommendations of the Compliance Committee and the feedback received from Parties.

At its seventh meeting, the COP-MOP in decision BS-VII/14, requested revisions to the reporting format for the third national report and to make it available through the BCH. It further requested Parties to use it to prepare, through a consultative process, their third national reports and submit their results 12 months prior to COP-MOP 8 in an official UN language.

At its eighth meeting, the COP-MOP, in decision CP-VIII/14, expressed concern about the lower rate of submission of the third national reports in comparison to the previous reporting cycle and requested the Compliance Committee to explore the reasons for the lower rate of submissions. The COP-MOP urged Parties that had not yet submitted their third national report to do so as soon as possible. The Secretariat was requested to develop a revised format for the fourth national reports with a view to ensuring complete and accurate information is captured while maintaining the applicability of baseline information by improving the formulation of questions for clarity, eliminating redundancy, and adding questions to address the mainstreaming of biosafety into national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and to submit the revised format for review by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and for consideration by the COP-MOP at its ninth meeting.

At its ninth meeting, COP-MOP, through decision CP-9/5, adopted the reporting format for the fourth national report and requested Parties and invited other Governments to submit the fourth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, setting out the modalities for doing so.

The COP-MOP also accepted the invitation of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, contained in COP decision 14/27, and decided to have a synchronized national reporting cycle commencing in 2023.

The Fourth regular national report is to be submitted to the Secretariat, no later than 1st October 2019 which was further extended to December 2019 per notification of the SCBD, in an official language of the United Nations through the BCH (see <https://beta.bch.cbd.int/reports>). The submission of the national reports was further extended to December 2020. Parties were encouraged to respond to all questions in the reporting form. Submission of high-quality information is critical for facilitating the Fourth Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol as provided in decision CP-9/6. The format of the Fourth National Report can be found on the BCH in the Six UN languages as | en | fr | es | ru | ar | zh The English version is attached as Appendix 9. The data from the Fourth National Report will serve as primary data in the Global Assessment in line with article 35 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as follows:

“Assessment and Review”

[The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Protocol shall undertake, five years after the entry into force of this Protocol and at least every five years thereafter, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Protocol, including an assessment of its procedures and annexes.]

The status of the national reports can be found at <https://beta.bch.cbd.int/reports> The CBD has also developed a report analyzer which allows for comparative analysis of the national reports.

In compiling the national reports, a stepwise approach is recommended to allow for data gathering, national consultative meetings and submission of reports as outlined under the FAQs <https://beta.bch.cbd.int/en/articles/5d2cdcd0620471000183573f>

BCH National Focal Points with limited Internet access may submit the completed offline form in MS Word format directly to the Secretariat, as an attachment to an e-mail together with a scanned copy of the first signed page.

Once the reports have been uploaded to the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH), the results will be analysed and these will provide a simultaneous and comparable snapshot of how Parties are implementing CPB. It will also provide and give guidance on potential areas for capacity building interventions which can be used for an updated action plan for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety under the Post 2020 Biodiversity Framework.

This project is an intervention in alignment with the GEF's mandate to generate global benefits by paying for the incremental costs of planning and foundational enabling activities that countries implement to generate global biodiversity benefits. The contents of the 4th National Report will greatly assist the CPB and the countries plan for their biosafety related actions under the planned Post 2020 Capacity Biosafety Building Framework and could even generate future capacity building interventions and projects as a result. The project delivery will further be guided by the obligations of Article 38 – the no reservation clause – as a basis to ensuring a high-quality reporting to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

In order to assist the Parties to meet their obligation under the Protocol in an effective manner, the GEF funding support provided through UNEP assists the eligible Parties by giving the Parties the necessary technical advisory support in data collection, consultations with the relevant stakeholders, interpretation of Protocol related issues and in the compilation, review and submission of the report in the required format.

The same approach will be utilized in preparation and submission of the Fourth national report.

The proposed Regional Medium Sized Project will be used to group several eligible parties requesting for enabling activity support from the Focal Area Set Aside funds to meet the obligations of Article 33, these parties will be grouped due to commonalities of culture and operational efficiency to enable UNEP provide rapid and efficient support in the six UN languages. The expected results, key deliverables and benchmarks are captured in ANNEXES C – E.

The main criteria for taking part in the project are

- i. Being eligible as a Party to access GEF funding support;
- ii. Submission of a letter of commitment indicating interest in the proposed project concept.

A sample letter of commitment is attached as ANNEX H. The letters of commitment are attached in a folder as Annex I.

ANNEX J to this project document shows a listing of GEF parties who provided Letters of commitment as an expression of interest in the GEF funds and commitment to prepare the national reports. ANNEX K shows a summary of the analysis of parties that met their obligations and the indicative numbers of envisaged parties that would require GEF support.

B. ENABLING ACTIVITY GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIVITIES □

The proposal should briefly justify and describe the project framework. Identify also key stakeholders involved in the project including the private sector, civil society organizations, local and indigenous communities, and their respective roles, as applicable. Describe also how the gender equality and women's empowerment are considered in project design and implementation

Project Goal:

The overarching goal is to assist Parties to review and provide an update on the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in line with obligation of Article 33.

Project Objective:

The main objective of this project is to assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare their Fourth National Reports on measures that each Party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33.

Project Component:

The main project component focuses on supporting the GEF Eligible Parties on preparation of the Fourth National Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Project Outcomes and Outputs:

Outcomes: The Fourth National reports are submitted in line with obligations of Article 33 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Outputs: 51 GEF Eligible Parties received GEF funds and prepared the Fourth National Report on measures taken to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in line with relevant COP/MOP Decisions.

Project Activities: At the party level, the projects will collect data taking into consideration the questions in the reporting format. The collected data will be utilized to prepare a draft national report which will be subjected to a first national consultative workshop. In parallel, the draft report will also be shared with key national expert groups and relevant stakeholders for inputs. The feedback from the workshop and stakeholders will then be incorporated in the first draft report. The report will be updated and

subjected to a second national consultative workshop for review and validation. The updated report will be submitted to UNEP for technical review. The final updated report will be uploaded online using the online format on the Biosafety Clearing House by the Biosafety Clearing House National Focal Point. The key envisaged activities are highlighted in ANNEX C.

The proposed project interventions will contribute to the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as outlined under Focal Area Programming Direction BD-EA “Further development of biodiversity policy and institutional frameworks through Enabling activities (national biodiversity strategy, national reports for CBD, CP, and NP)”. The results and deliverables shall contribute to Aichi Targets 13 and 14 through the provision of data to support safeguarding biodiversity, managing genetic resources and related benefits, assessing options and planning capacity building interventions to support implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. It will also support global assessment and review of the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

B2 - STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION

The project will build on the experiences that countries have already gained through the preparation and implementation of the results of the Interim and last three national biosafety reporting. Guided by the results, the project will put in mechanisms to effectively secure the involvement of national authorities, non-governmental organizations, private sector, research institutions and local communities through the ongoing GEF projects on Development and Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks and assistance on “Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH” and other related biosafety projects. The project will be carried out through data collection, consultative workshops and interactive meetings at the national level. The various governmental departments serving as Competent National Authorities will be consulted to establish the baseline information necessary in completing the National Report.

Potential stakeholders, depending on in country dynamics may include the following:

Potential Stakeholders	Expected Roles
Government Ministries/Departments and Agencies [e.g. Environment, Science and Technology, Health, Agriculture, Finance, Trade]	Development and implementation of policy and regulatory frameworks, implementation of regulatory functions including monitoring and compliance with Protocol related matters
Academia [Universities and Research Institutions]	Biosafety research and training including laboratory analytical functions to support regulatory agencies
Civil Society Groups (CSOs)	Consumer related issues, public engagement and socio-economic others
Private Sector	Provision of Industry information on product development and related biosafety interventions

PRIVATE SECTOR ENGAGEMENT:

The Private Sector will be involved in national consultative workshops and contribute data as relevant in activities on modern biotechnology as applicable. The Private Sector working in close collaboration with the Competent National Authorities will

contribute in providing data on Party responses and experience in implementation of Article 21 on Confidential Business Information.

CIVIL SOCIETY:

The Civil society groups will provide support on consumer-related issues and interventions on data related to articles 20 (Biosafety clearinghouse and information sharing) and 21 on public education, awareness and participation. The civil society will also participate as members of national task forces or advisory groups and take part in the consultative processes and contributions of data.

B3 - Gender equality and women's empowerment

Even though the proposed project is a normative task required to be executed by all Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a party obligation, efforts will be put in place to ensure representation of women, youth, and men in the consultative process and also gender-specific data will be collected and disaggregated even though the reporting formats do not require this information especially in the execution of Article 23 of the Protocol on Public Awareness, Education, and Participation. National relevant data to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety will be documented to support future and planned capacity building interventions. The data to be captured is envisaged to identify and highlight measures that will facilitate women's participation in decision making and potential areas for generating socio-economic benefits or services for women and the youth.

The format of the Fourth National Report prompts parties to provide information on what socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) based on article 26.1 of the CPB. This provides an opening for Parties to identify issues for consideration in the biosafety regulatory processes to facilitate decision making. While the drafting of the fourth

national report may not have direct benefits to women and the youth, it is the “offshoot” policies that are developed as a result of this report, that may be of benefit to parties e.g. drafting of regulations that ensure the introduction of LMOs does not negatively impact on a countries’ population especially women and youth or provide data to guide national processes for enforcement of the national biosafety framework and capturing data that will allow for cost-benefit analysis of the introduction of LMOs through dedicated *ex ante* and *post ante* socio-economic studies.

C. DESCRIBE THE ENABLING ACTIVITY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION □

Discuss the work intended to be undertaken and the output expected from each activity as outlined in Table A

The proposed project will utilize the GEF support to assist parties in the preparation of the Fourth National Report.

C1. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK:

For project execution, the following entities will be involved;

(a) the Eligible parties

Eligible parties are the parties that have ratified the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and are eligible to receive GEF support. As already emphasized all parties have an obligation under Article 33 of the Protocol to submit their National Reports to the BCH highlighting progress made in implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Parties are to submit the reports in the required format and by the **31st December 2020**. Parties are to hold national consultative meetings with the relevant stakeholders to gather the necessary information for the report and validate the data prior to publication on the BCH.

(b) Project Management Unit

The Enabling Activities Project Management Unit in UNEP will oversee the execution of the project and will -

- Review project progress with respect to objectives, strategies, and work-plans;

- Peer review and provide technical inputs to the draft Fourth National Reports prior to submission for consistency and relevance guided by the required information
- Liaise with the SCBD, the Biosafety Compliance Committee and any other relevant bodies for the the benefit of the project;
- Advice on how best to mobilize further resources and identify follow up interventions as applicable; and
- Monitor and ensure the timely and adequate flow of funds.

(c) UNEP-GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit

The Biosafety Programme operating under the UNEP/GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit under the Ecosystems Division will be responsible for the implementation of the project and will ensure that the executing agencies implement the project in accordance with the objectives and activities outlined above. It will ensure consistency with GEF and UNEP policies and procedures and will provide guidance on linkages with other related UNEP and GEF-funded activities. UNEP has been closely involved in GEF Biosafety Programme and assisted parties in the preparation of the Second and Third National Reports. It supported the negotiation and entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. UNEP provides Secretarial support to three major biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements: the CBD, CITES and CMS. UNEP has also provided support for capacity building activities related to the Convention on Biological Diversity. It has assisted more than 35 countries to prepare Biodiversity Country Studies and National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and, through its Environmental Law Programme, UNEP continues to assist countries to adopt environmental regulations and legislations. UNEP has been recognized for its neutrality in the face of a contentious issue (biotechnology /biosafety /LMO commerce) and is regularly requested to provide direct technical assistance and facilitate multi-stakeholder involvement in biosafety. Over the past decade, UNEP has assisted more than 130 countries to develop national biosafety frameworks and to build national BCH capacity, as well as working with over 60 countries on national, regional and thematic level implementation of these NBFs.

The envisaged institutional arrangement is captured in ANNEX F.

C2 – CONSISTENCY WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES

National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) under UNCBD

The results of the fourth national report will provide data to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. It will also assist parties to generate data and identify entry points for incorporation of Biosafety elements either in new, reviewed or updated NBSAPs.

Biosafety National Reporting

All the 51 participating countries have ratified the CPB and are therefore obligated as per the “no reservation” provision in article 38 to implement every obligation under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The implementation of Article 33 focuses on monitoring and reporting of measures put in place to facilitate the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. In addition, the implementation of the obligations is guided by Decisions of the Conference of Parties Serving as the Meeting of the Parties (COP-MOP) and in that context this obligation relates to Decision BS 9/5 at COP/MOP 9 and other related obligations on national reporting. The Fourth National Biosafety Reporting process will also provide data to facilitate the five yearly assessment and review of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as required by article 35 of the Protocol and the Final Evaluation of BS Strategy 2011 – 2020 and also assist in national planning processes on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol Biosafety

These periodic assessments give data to facilitate development of action plans for implementation of the Protocol (http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_art33.shtml). The National Biosafety Reporting is of direct relevance to the development and implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs) as per the obligation of articles 2.1, 22 and related articles. In addition, the Biosafety National Reports are of direct relevance to the review and update of the NBSAPs which provides an overarching policy direction to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The Data obtained will also be useful in the ongoing efforts to review and mainstream biosafety obligations into the National Biodiversity and Action Plans as per Decisions BS VII/5 para 8 and related national biodiversity planning processes.

The Fourth national report will provide an opportunity for Parties to review and update the status of progress and records since the third national reports <https://beta.bch.cbd.int/reports>

C3 – KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

The national reports will be uploaded in the Biosafety Clearing House (<https://bch.cbd.int/>), which is a hub for knowledge management, allowing all Parties access to the final reports. In addition, the Parties will have access to the newly created tool, the report analyzer, developed during the second national report. This allows parties to review national reports and analyse trends article by article at global, regional or national levels. In addition, a composite analytical report will also be prepared by the SCBD and made available at the end of the reporting cycle citing trends and best practices to guide implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This will be a primary resource for the work under Article 35 on Review and Assessment of Global Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. UNEP shall also prepare a lessons learnt and best practices document both for information sharing and to support the work of the global assessment and review.

UNEP has an existing platform through the library of its project management database ANUBIS (A New UNEP Biosafety Information System) for the Biosafety projects and related initiatives to learn from each other, share experience and expertise and tools and methodologies to support Biosafety Decision making. ANUBIS also allows the projects to assess project outputs and reports in a user-friendly form. In addition, UNEP has created an annual forum for the projects to physically meet at regional/sub regional level to learn and share experiences on project management including best practices and challenges, in addition to training on emerging issues in Biosafety. This forum will be used to share experiences on national efforts in implementing the Protocol in relation to findings from the Fourth national reports. The parties will also have access to the CBD's YouTube channel (<https://www.youtube.com/user/bchcpb>) to access media files and share materials for the benefit and update on the implementation of Article 33 of the CPB. Existing mechanisms and training will be offered for the project to assess and share information.

C4: ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECT RISKS

Identified Risks	Rating	Mitigation Measure
Lack of political will on biosafety related issues	High	Political interest will be sustained through development of consultative meetings which emphasis the national imperatives of meeting treaty obligations and the expected outputs to drive the national biosafety agenda
Lack data and/or non -implementation of some obligations of the Protocol	Medium	Stakeholders will be carefully identified and encouraged to provide all the biosafety related data for follow up analysis to capture those of relevance to the biosafety protocol, emphasis will also be given to data generators that indicating where no data exists or exists is a compliance issue and must therefore be addressed
Inability to address all the questions in the format or limited access to the internet	Medium	Relevant parties will be provided technical advisory support in interpreting the articles of the Protocol including guidance on compliance to reporting

The critical assumptions made by the proposal are that:

- i. The necessary political will to develop the Fourth National Report exists in the countries;
- ii. Stakeholders will show interest or have vested interest in Biotechnology and Biosafety and would maintain their engagement on the issues;
- iii. Increased capacity and improved understanding of Biosafety issues will lead to (a) adoption of appropriate National Biosafety Frameworks and (b) effective engagement in the implementation of the national framework and the Protocol leading to outcomes that advance the interests of the Parties and the objectives of the Protocol.

Should these assumptions be misplaced, or their validity change over the course of the project, this could have an impact on how the objectives will be achieved. The purpose of the assistance is to help countries effectively meet the requirements of Article 33. Reporting is an obligation under the Protocol and the countries must submit the reports to ensure compliance with the Protocol.

D. DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT □

Cost effectiveness will be ensured the delivery of the project. The project will focus on interventions that avoid duplication and rather building synergy with clearly identified roles to be done through cofinancing whilst dedicated expert support and data management will benefit from the GEF resources.

Whilst the preparation of the national reports is an Enabling Activity which is obligatory for all parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, earlier experience has shown that the GEF grant compliments national efforts in the quality of the deliverables for the project. The GEF grant assists the Parties to designate national experts or consultants to collect and review data to assist in preparation of the national report. The quality of the results through this approach tends to enhance and provide high quality data to meet both the party obligation and provides data for national planning and identification of gaps for future capacity building interventions.

Without GEF support, party resources which are mostly in kind are over stretched and tends to impact on the access to quality of data from the experts. Parties in a lot of the developing countries may not have adequate technical capacity and resources to support data gathering drafting and finalisation of the Biosafety national report. Provision of high-quality data contributes to the generation of high-quality national reports which invariably provides data for the Global Assessment and Review of the Implementation of the National Report. In this cycle, the fourth National Report will also serve as the primary data for the terminal evaluation of the Strategic plan for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011 – 2020. It will also provide data to assist in planning and implementation of the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. High-quality data and effective reporting will also contribute results to support the implementation of the GEF Biodiversity Enabling Activity support to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

Therefore, without the GEF grant, the eligible Parties may not be able to access or generate good quality data required for the reporting, which would lead to a substantial decrease in the number of reports submitted by the Parties. The report submitted by the Parties will provide reliable data in response to obligations of Articles 33 and 35 and is likely to provide further data to assist parties in reviewing national implementation plans for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Without good quality reports, the assessment and monitoring under Article 35 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety may not provide the needed guidance to

assist COP-MOP in making follow up decisions on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in relation to the Post 2020 Biodiversity Framework.

The GEF support will also provide windows to ensure capacity building, technical support, reporting tools, and data availability to support submission of report by the Parties in response to the COP-MOP guidance.

E. DESCRIBE, DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN □

The project will follow United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) minimum requirements for project monitoring, reporting, evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument, the Small Scale Funding Agreement (SSFA), that will be signed by the National Executing Agencies and UNEP. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process will include an end of project review undertaken by independent review teams. The project will be evaluated on the basis of: execution performance, output delivery, and project impact. Evaluation of the project's success in achieving its outcomes will be monitored continuously throughout the project through the progress reports, and the final evaluation. Since the project is an Enabling Activity, a desktop review will be undertaken focusing on lessons learnt and best practices which will be feed to the global assessment and review obligation under Article 35 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

F. EXPLAIN THE DEVIATIONS FROM TYPICAL COST RANGES (WHERE APPLICABLE) □

N/A

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):

Focal Point Name	Focal Point Title	Ministry	Signed Date
Mr. Schah Zaman Maiwandi	Director General	National Environmental Protection Agency	5/8/2019
Dr. Mohammad Bin Daina	Chief Executive	Supreme Council for Environment	5/6/2019
Mr. Ziaul Hasan	Secretary	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change	8/16/2020
Mr. Rinchen Wangdi	Director	Gross National Happiness Commission	5/8/2019
Mr. Tin Ponlok	Secretary General	National Council for Sustainable Development, Ministry of Environment	5/8/2019
Ms. Richa Sharma	Joint Secretary	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change	7/30/2019
Dr. Jasim Abdulazeez Humadi ALMOHAMADI	Minister Deputy	Ministry of Environment	5/6/2019

Focal Point Name	Focal Point Title	Ministry	Signed Date
Zeina Toukan	Secretary General	Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation	5/9/2019
Mrs. Nenenteini Teariki Ruatu	Government of Kiribati, GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Environment Lands and Agricultural Development	9/17/2020
Mirslav Amankulov	Director	The State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry of the Kyrgyz Republic	8/11/2020
Phouvong Luangxaysana	Director General	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Planning and Finance	8/12/2020
Dimyanos Kattar	Minister	Ministry of Environment	8/27/2020
Miruzza Mohamed	GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Environment	5/7/2019
Clarence Samuel	Director and GEF Operational Focal Point	Climate Change Directorate, Republic of the Marshall Islands	5/29/2020
Batjargal Khandjav	Director General	Climate Change and International Cooperation Department	5/7/2019
Naheeds Durrani	Secretary	Ministry of Climate Change	1/17/2020
King M. Sam	Special Assistant to the Minister	Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism	8/20/2019
Ulu Bismarck Crawley	Chief Executive Officer and GEF	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	12/19/2019

Focal Point Name	Focal Point Title	Ministry	Signed Date
	Operational Focal Point		
Mr. Chanel Iroi	Undersecretary Technical	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meterology	8/15/2019
Dr. Anil Jasinghe	Secretary	Ministry of Environment	8/21/2020
Sheralized Bahodur	Chairman	Committee of Environmental Protection, Under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan	8/14/2020
Mr. Paula Ma'u	Chief Executive Officer	Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications	8/11/2020
Akif OZKALDI	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	5/8/2019
Nguyen Duc Thuan	GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	6/10/2019
Mr. Ammar Al-Aulaqi	Chairman	Ministry of Water and Environment, Environment Protection Authority	8/12/2020
Rrezart FSHAZI	Head of Sector	Sector of Programs for Protection of Environment and Biodiversity, Ministry of Toursim and Environment	8/26/2020
Mrs. Diann Black Layne	Chief Executive Officer	Department of Environment, Ministry of Health, Wellness and the Environment	4/29/2019

Focal Point Name	Focal Point Title	Ministry	Signed Date
Vardan Melikyan	Deputy Minister of Environment	Republic of Armenia	8/14/2020
Rochelle W. Newbold	Director	The Bahamas Environment, Science and Technology Commission, Ministry of Environment and Housing	12/5/2019
Daphne Kellman	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Environment and National Beautification	6/13/2019
Mr. Aliaksandr Korbut	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	8/17/2020
Ing. Aijredy Guillermo Aivarez Saavedra	Vice Minister	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	8/14/2020
Senad Oprasic	GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations	4/30/2020
David Felipe Olarte Amaya	Head of the International Affairs Office	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	7/2/2019
Ulises Fernandez Gomez	Head of Citma's International Relations Division	International Relations Department	8/12/2020
Patricia Abrieu Fernandez	GEF OFF and Deputy Minsiter in Charge of International Cooperation	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Dominican Republic	5/17/2019
Lloyd Pascal	National Focal Point	Ministry of Environment, Climate Resilience, Disaster Management and Urban Renewal Environmental Coordinating Unit, Dominica	5/9/2019

Focal Point Name	Focal Point Title	Ministry	Signed Date
Maria Belen Duran	GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Environment, Ecuador	8/21/2020
Dr. Kelvin George	Director	Department of Economic and Technical Cooperation	8/21/2020
Lic Juan Carlos Diaz Conteras	Coordinator	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	8/10/2020
Dr.Vincent Adams	Executive Director	Environmental Protection Agency	5/7/2020
Ms. Rosibel Martinez Arriaga	GEF Operational Focal Point	Secretariat of Energy, Natural Resources, Environment and Mines	5/6/2019
Ms. Gillian Guthrie	GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation, Jamaica	12/10/2019
Fernanda Montero Lara	Director for Sustainable Finance	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	8/20/2020
Valentina TAPIS	State Secretary	Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment of the Republic of Moldova	5/2/2019
Ivana Vojinovic	General Director for Environment	Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism	8/11/2020
Mr. Javier Gutierrez Ramirez	GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales, Nicaragua	8/15/2019
Gustavo Padilla Corro	GEF Operational Focal Point and Head of International Technical	Ministerio del Ambiente	8/8/2019

Focal Point Name	Focal Point Title	Ministry	Signed Date
	Cooperation		
Ms. Samantha Justin	Chief Technical Officer	Ministry of Education, Innovation, Gender Relations and Sustainable Development	8/11/2020
Mrs. Ivette Patterzon LLM	Legal and Policy Advisor	Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment Coordination Environment	8/11/2020
Miguel Serrano	Director General	Ministry of Popular Power and Ecosocialism	8/10/2020

B. Convention Participation

Convention

Date of Ratification/Accession

National Focal Point

ANNEX A: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

See attached budget Template - Annex B1

Project Title: Support to the Preparation of the Fourth National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety											
Project Number:											
Project executing partner: Mixed Regions [Asia-Pacific, GRULAC & CEE] - National Executing Agencies											
From: October 2020 - September 2021											
				EXPENDITURE BY PROJECT COMPONENT/ACTIVITY			EXPENDITURE BY YEAR				
				Development of Report	Project Management Costs	Total	2020		Total		
UNEP BUDGET LINE/OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE				US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$		US\$		
10	PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT										
1100	Project Personnel		w/m								
	(Show title/grade)										
1101					0	0		0		0	
1102					0	0		0		0	
1199	Total			0	0	0		0		0	
1200	Consultants		w/m		0	0		0		0	
	(Give description of activity/service)										
1299	Total			0	0	0		0		0	
1600	Travel on official business (above staff)										
1601				-	0	0		0		0	
1699	Total			0	0	0		0		0	
1999	Component Total			0	0	0		0		0	
20	SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT										
2100	Sub-contracts (MoU's/LA's for UN cooperating agencies)										
2101				0	0	0		0		0	
2199	Total			0	0	0		0		0	
2200	Sub-contracts (MoU's/LA's for non-profit supporting organizations)										
2201	SSFAs for 51 Participating Countries (\$25,000 for 47 countries + 4 countries @ \$30,000)			1,295,000	0	1,295,000		1,295,000		1,295,000	
2299	Total			1,295,000	0	1,295,000		1,295,000		1,295,000	
2999	Component Total			1,295,000	0	1,295,000		1,295,000		1,295,000	

30	TRAINING COMPONENT						
	3201		0	0	0	0	0
	3299	Total	0	0	0	0	0
	3300	Meetings/conferences (give title)					
	3399	Total					
	3999	Component Total					
40	EQUIPMENT & PREMISES COMPONENT						
	4200	Non-expendable equipment (computers, office equip, etc)					
	4201		0	0	0	0	0
	4299	Total	0	0	0	0	0
	4999	Component Total	0	0	0	0	0
50	MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT						
	5100	Operation and maintenance of equip. (example shown below)					
	5101		0	0	0	0	0
	5102		0	0	0	0	0
	5199	Total	0	0	0	0	0
	5200	Reporting costs (publications, maps, newsletters, printing, etc)	0				
	5599	Component Total					
		Sub total					
	5500	Project Management Costs		129,500	129,500	129,500	129,500
	5599	Total		129,500	129,500	129,500	129,500
		Component Total	1,295,000	129,500	1,424,500	1,424,500	1,424,500

Back

[Validate](#) [Submit to HQ for Submission to GEFSEC](#) [Cancel](#)

•Contact Us

•Legal

•Council Members & Alternates

- Focal Points

- FAQ

- Help

© 2019 Global Environment Facility, All Rights Reserved.



Submitted to HQ

[Go To Home](#)