

Support to Preparation of the First National Report on Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization?

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11908

Countries

Global (Albania, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo DR, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao PDR, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Micronesia, Moldova,

Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, St. Lucia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zimbabwe, Peru, Tuvalu, Gambia, India, Malawi)

Project Name

Support to Preparation of the First National Report on Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization?

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/6/2025

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

Section I - Enabling Activity Summary

Funding elements.

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF funding elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF-8 Programming Directions? Is the General Enabling Activity Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

JS 3/17/2025 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 3/7/2025 - Thank you for this submission. This project corresponds to the resubmission as a one-step MSP of GEF ID 11860, which had erroneously been submitted as a two-step MSP. For completeness and easier follow-up, comments that were made on 11860, if any, are pasted (highlighted in grey) in the relevant comment boxes of this review sheet.

2- Missing fields have been completed. However, please

A -correct the type of report, which should show Nagoya Protocol and not Cartagena Protocol.

B- Correct the expected report submission date, which should be 2/28/2026 as per COP-MOP decision.

Type of Report(s): ⓘ	Cartagena Protocol National Report	Expected Report Submission to Convention: ⓘ	3/31/2
----------------------	------------------------------------	---	--------

C- Please correct text formatting throughout the submission. It currently contains several bolded paragraphs that should not be bolded in the "enabling activity summary" section, and mix of different line spacing in section 2.

JS 2/17/2025 - Thank you for the submission of this project.

1- This project is intended as a 1-step MSP but was submitted as a PIF instead of a CEO approval request in the portal. Please submit as a CEO approval request.

2- Please fill in the missing fields, and, among others, include UNEP and National Executing Entities in the Project Executing Entities section.

Agency's Comments

03/13/2025

1. Request to drop the PIF and resubmit the project as a 1-step MSP project has been prepared and submitted by UNEP to GEF Secretariat for approval. In addition, the project has now been re-submitted in the portal as a 1-step MSP for CEO approval request.
2. This missing information has been provided.

Cost Ranges.

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

Secretariat's Comments

JS 2/17/2025 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Enabling activity summary.

Is the enabling activity summary clear? Are the components in Table B and as described in the enabling activity request sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

JS 3/31/2025 - Cleared.

JS 3/26/2025

Please ensure consistency throughout the document in the number of eligible Parties included in this submission, which is 80.

Outputs: 80 GEF Eligible Parties received GEF funds and prepared their First National Report on measures taken to implement the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing in line with Article 29 and relevant COP/MOP Decision NP-4/3 on Monitoring and Reporting, at the same time as the seventh national reports under the Convention due on 28 February 2026

Enabling Activity Component	Enabling Activity Outcomes	Enabling Activity Outputs	GEF Enabling Activity Financing (\$)
1.0 Support for the Preparation of the First National Reports to the Nagoya Protocol on access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their utilization	1.1 First National Reports submitted in line with obligations of Article 29 of the Nagoya Protocol on access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their utilization.	1.1.1 79 GEF Eligible countries receive support (technical and financial) and prepare their First National Report on the measures taken to implement the Nagoya Protocol on access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their utilization.	2,895
Meetings			
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	5-Regional Workshops (Africa, Asia Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, West Asia) to provide technical support to parties in the preparation of draft national reports, build capacity on stakeholder engagement as well as promote knowledge exchange through peer-to-peer learning. The workshops will be led by the regional advisors with support from UNEP's global technical teams and relevant teams from CBD Secretariat. Cost: (\$3500 per country nominee to attend capacity development workshop *80 estimated nominees on average)-\$280,000		
Sub-contract to executing partner/ entity	Cost of direct execution of activities by the national executing agencies to support the delivery of the first National Report to the Nagoya Protocol (@\$30,000 per Party for 80 Countries). To be disbursed through small scale funding agreements with the respective countries		

JS 3/17/2025 - Elaborations to respond to comments made in the first review on stakeholder engagement and gender have been deleted in this resubmission. Please address the followings that were already made on the first submission:

A- The project references ?relevant stakeholders? and its intention to consult and engage relevant stakeholders. Please elaborate on who these relevant stakeholders are, and plans to engage them during project implementation.

B- Please elaborate on plans to ensure gender dimensions are covered in the production of the national reports.

In addition, the number of countries supported is not consistent throughout the document. PLease revise to ensure consistency:

Outputs: 76 GEF Eligible Parties received GEF funds and prepared their First National Report on measures taken to implement the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing in line with Article 29 and relevant COP/MOP Decision NP-4/3 on Monitoring and Reporting, at the same time as the seventh national reports under the Convention due on 28 February 2026

Enabling Activity Component	Enabling Activity Outcomes	Enabling Activity Outputs	GEF Enabling Activity Financing (\$)
1.0 Support for the Preparation of the First National Reports to the Nagoya Protocol on access	1.1 First National Reports submitted in line with obligations of Article 29 of the Nagoya	1.1.1 75 GEF Eligible countries receive support (technical and financial) and prepare their First National Report on the	2,840,000.00

JS 3/7/2025 -

A- Previous comment 1 has not been addressed. The table with the logframe is still duplicated. Please correct.

B- The summary refers to an annex C as containing additional information on project activities but annex C is the ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS. Please correct in the summary:

The final updated report will be uploaded online using the online format on the Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) Clearing-House by ABS Clearing-House National Focal Points. The key envisaged activities are highlighted in ANNEX C.

Other comments are cleared, thank you.

JS 2/17/2025

1- Please remove the duplicate table A from the summary.

2 - Please reformulate the output related to workshops in table B to be explicit that, as mentioned in the budget, the regional workshops will be drafting workshop designed to support participants

through a drafting sprint to elaborate/consolidate first version of their national reports, and will not be limited to peer-to-peer exchange.

3- Please add in the EA summary a short elaboration on the technical assistance that will be provided by the project on top of the national grants, including the regional workshops' objectives.

4- The project references 'relevant stakeholders' and its intention to consult and engage relevant stakeholders. Please elaborate on who these relevant stakeholders are, and plans to engage them during project implementation.

5- Please elaborate on plans to ensure gender dimensions are covered in the production of the national reports.

Agency's Comments

03/13/2025

1. The duplicate table has been removed.
2. Output 1.1.2 related to regional workshops has been reformulated as drafting workshops designed to support participants through a drafting sprint to elaborate/consolidate first version of their national reports.
3. A short summary on the technical assistance has been added.
4. Section on 'Stakeholder Identification' lists and describes roles of potential stakeholders.
5. Section on 'gender equality and women empowerment' illustrates activities to be carried out to ensure gender dimensions are covered in the production of the national report.

24/03/2025

- A. Reference to 'relevant stakeholders' has been elaborated and their potential roles elaborated on the project.
- B. Plans to ensure gender dimensions are covered has been elaborated too.
- C. The number of countries has now corrected and streamlined throughout the project document.

28/03/2025

The number of countries has been edited accordingly.

Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information

Eligibility Criteria.

Is this enabling activity eligible for GEF funding?

Secretariat's Comments

JS 3/17/2025 - Cleared.

JS 3/7/2025 -

1- This has not been addressed. Please correct the line spacing in this section, so that it is consistent with the formatting of the other sections.

Rest is cleared, thank you.

JS 2/17/2025

1- Please correct the line spacing of this section, so that it is consistent with the formatting of the other sections.

2- This section refers to an annex J that is not provided. Please remove the reference as there is no need to provide a LoE template with this submission.

3- Please remove the sentence "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.", since incremental cost reasoning and the direct generation of GEBs do not apply to enabling activities.

Agency's Comments

03/13/2025

1. Formatting done
2. Reference to sample letter of the LOE and Annex J in the CEO Approval request has been removed. LOE template removed in the annexes. Annex J is now Acronyms and Abbreviations.
3. The sentence has been removed.

Institutional framework.

Are the institutional arrangements for implementation adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

JS 3/26/2025 - Cleared.

JS 3/17/2025 -

- This section mentions participation of the CBD biosafety unit in the steering committee when this project is to support the Nagoya Protocol, not the Cartagena Protocol. Please revise to ensure appropriate CBDSEC representatives are invited:

(d) A Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established to provide overall guidance and technical advice on Project implementation, institutional coordination and achievement of the Project objectives. The Programme Steering Committee will comprise representatives from UNEP/GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit representing the GEF Implementing Agency, the Nature Frameworks Support Unit as representing the Executing Agency, **the CBD Biosafety Unit**, relevant branches and units in the Ecosystems Division, the Law Division, and UNEP-WCMC including representatives f

JS 3/7/2025

1-This section refers to an Annex F, which is not provided. If the content is already included in section "D: Institutional Framework" of the portal entry, please just remove the reference to Annex F or include its content in this part of the portal entry:

The envisaged institutional arrangement is captured schematically in **ANNEX F**.

Rest is cleared.

JS 2/17/2025

1- This section refers to an Annex F, which is not provided. Please include the content of the annex in the portal entry.

2- Please plan for a steering committee and clarify its composition and role in this part of the portal entry.

Agency's Comments

03/13/2025

1. Annex F has been provided and also included in the portal entry.
2. A project steering committee has been added and details on the composition and role provided.

24/03/2025

- Reference to the correct CBD Secretariat team responsible for Access and Benefit Sharing Clearing-House has been addressed.

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat's Comments

JS 3/7/2025 - Cleared.

JS 2/12/2025 - Please see comment on budget and charge/role of consultants on monitoring.

Agency's Comments

03/13/2025

1. The comment has been addressed and budget amended accordingly

Section 3. Information Tables

GEF resource availability.

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table F (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 2/17/2025 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Cleared.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments JS 2/17/2025 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments
Rio Markers.
Are the Rio Markers for CCM ,CCA, BD and LD presented?

Secretariat's Comments JS 2/17/2025 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments
Country endorsement.

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point at the time of the EA submission and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database? Are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in Portal

Secretariat's Comments
JS 3/31/2025 - Cleared.

JS 3/26/2025 - We note the additions of Gambia, India, Marshall Islands, Montenegro and Sierra Leone compared to previous submission.

1- Marshall Islands, Montenegro, Sierra Leone: The LoEs do not identify the executing entity. Two of them only refers to "implementation" by UNEP, the third by the "Nagoya Protocol". Please provide LoEs that follow the template: <https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-8-operational-focal-point-endorsement-letter>

JS 3/17/2025 - Cleared. We note Peru and Tuvalu have been added compared to previous submission.

JS 3/10/2025

We note Angola, Argentina, Chad, Eritrea, and Sudan have been removed from the project. Please add them at the next occasion, once a valid LoE is provided.

JS 2/26/2025 -

1. Angola: The LOE is not signed by the current OFP at the time of submission. Additionally, ?2025? is not a valid executing partner. The letter should indicate the executing partner instead of a tentative timeline. Please provide a revised letter.
2. Argentina: The LOE is not signed by the Operational Focal Point at the time of submission. Currently Argentina does not have an OFP. We can only accept a LOE signed by the current OFP at the time of submission.
3. Chad: (i) The information indicated in the Sources of Funds column in the table is not accurate. GEF Set Aside is not a valid source of funds, and this option is not available in the provided template. (ii) Additionally, ?december 2024? is not a valid executing partner. The letter should indicate the executing partner instead of a tentative timeline. Please provide a new letter with correct source of funds and executing partner.
4. Eritrea: There is no LOE for this country. The only available document is a Letter of commitment. Please provide a valid LOE.
5. Sudan: The LoE provided is for support to the report under the Cartagena protocol, when this project is for the Nagoya Protocol. Please provide a LoE that is related to this project.

Agency's Comments

03/13/2025

1. Angola: The OFP has been requested to amend LOE and share duly signed version for resubmission in the amendment. For now, the country has been removed from the current list
2. Argentina: The OFP has been requested to submit a duly signed LOE for resubmission in the amendment. For now, the country has been removed from the current list.
3. Chad: The OFP has been requested to amend LOE and share duly signed version for resubmission in the amendment. For now, the country has been removed from the current list.
4. Eritrea: The OFP requested to share signed LOE for inclusion in the amendment. For now, the country has been removed from the current list.
5. Sudan: The OFP requested to share signed LOE for inclusion in the amendment. For now, the country has been removed from the current list

03/24/2025

The Gambia, India, Marshall Islands, Montenegro and Sierra Leone have been added to the list making a total of 80 Parties.

03/28/2025

Marshall Islands, Montenegro, Sierra Leone have been removed from the list for now as we work on revising the LOEs with the OFPs.

Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)

Gef Secretariat comments

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Council comments

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

STAP comments

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

CSOs comments

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Project Budget Table.

Is the project budget table attached? Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

Secretariat's Comments

JS 3/26/2025 - Cleared. Please make sure to align the budget with any changes to the number of countries in the next submission.

JS 3/17/2025 -

A- The budget for workshops has been increased from \$287,000 to \$374,500 with no justification when only two countries have been added compared to previous submission. It seems the budget had now been calibrated for 107 countries when 75 are included in this submission. Please revise or justify.

JS 3/10/2025 - Cleared.

JS 2/17/2025

1- Please justify the need for consultants for project monitoring and safeguards for this type of EA projects, which generally do not require such support for monitoring and safeguards. We rather understand that the main role of these \$48,000 of consultants will be to provide global technical assistance and support the workshops. If so, please charge them on component 1, and not on M&E.

Agency's Comments

03/13/2025

1. One of the international consultants will provide continuous advisory support to the project and guidance to national project executing entities, including through in-person technical advice offered during the drafting workshops to ensure compliance with the reporting requirement of the protocol and adherence to UNEP safeguards issues.

The cost of this consultancy (USD 48,000) is now charged to Component 1. The same is reflected in the CEO Approval request.

24/03/2025

The budget for workshops has been adjusted to correspond with the number of countries included in the project proposal so far.

Environmental and Social Safeguards.

If there are screening documents or other ESS documents available, have these been attached? (only as applicable)

Secretariat's Comments

JS 2/17/2025 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?

Secretariat's Comments

JS 3/31/2025 - The project is recommended for technical clearance.

JS 3/26/2025 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

JS 3/17/2025 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

JS 3/10/2025- Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

JS 2/17/2025- Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

REVIEW DATE(S)

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/26/2025	3/14/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/10/2025	3/24/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/17/2025	3/28/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/26/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/31/2025	