



# REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL<sup>1</sup>

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: NPIF

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Global support for the ratification and entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing			
Country(ies):	Global	GEF Project ID: <sup>2</sup>	5172
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	0935
Other Executing Partner(s):	The 30 countries' Ministries in charge of CBD policy and implementation in collaboration with UNEP Division of Environmental Convention and Law (UNEP DELC)	Submission Date:	2012-09-27
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	24
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>	NPIF	Agency Fee (\$):	100,000

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>3</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
(select) BD-4	Legal and regulatory frameworks, and administrative procedures established that enable access to genetic resources and benefit sharing in accordance with the CBD's third objective on access and benefit-sharing.	Facilitate 30 countries to accede to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing	NPIF	945,000	600,000
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)	Others		(select)		
Subtotal				945,000	600,000
Project management cost <sup>4</sup>			NPIF	55,000	27,500
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>627,500</b>

<sup>1</sup> It is important to consult the GEF Preparation Guidelines when completing this template

<sup>2</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when filling up the table in item A.

<sup>4</sup> GEF will finance management cost that is solely linked to GEF financing of the project. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount.

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<b>Project Objective: To assist 30 countries ratify the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing</b>						
<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Grant Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)</b>
1. Rapid Capacity Needs Assessment	TA	1.1. Institutional, policy, legal and regulatory frameworks properly evaluated to allow decision-makers to take informed decisions on the implication of acceding and implementing the Nagoya Protocol .	<p>Scoping study and timeline for policy makers to evaluate implications of ratification of Nagoya Protocol completed in 25 of the 30 participating countries.</p> <p>1.1.1 Identification of institutions, policies, laws and regulations relevant to ratification to the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>1.1.2. Analysis of institutional and legal frameworks in light of the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol to identify gaps and opportunities if becoming parties of the protocol.</p> <p>1.1.3 Timeline and Strategic plan for the development, amendment or harmonization of the existing legal framework to comply with the Nagoya Protocol</p>	NPIF	750,000	375,000
2. Stakeholder Engagement	TA	<p>2.1 Key stakeholder groups (particularly policy makers) are fully aware of the implications and opportunities that result from acceding to the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>2.2 Countries accede to the Nagoya</p>	<p>Draft ratification document for submission to the appropriate legislative body in 25 of the 30 participating countries.</p> <p>2.1.1. Map of key stakeholder groups and strategy for ABS outreach and information sharing.</p>	NPIF	155,000	175,000

		Protocol	<p>2.1.2. Policy makers and key stakeholders briefed on the results of the rapid needs assessment.</p> <p>2.2.1. National ratification procedures and timeline established allowing for stakeholder input.</p> <p>2.2.2. Drafting of legal documents acceding to the Nagoya Protocol and submission to appropriate legislature body for approval .</p>			
3. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	TA	Project implementation facilitated with regard to results-based management	<p>3.1.1 Project monitoring system operating, providing systematic information on progress in achieving project outcome and output targets.</p> <p>3.1.2 Indicator framework developed for identified key challenge areas of Nagoya Protocol implementation.</p> <p>3.1.3 Final evaluation conducted.</p>	NPIF	40,000	50,000
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal					945,000	600,000
Project management Cost <sup>5</sup>				NPIF	55,000	27,500
<b>Total project costs</b>					1000000	627500

**C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)**

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
-------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------

<sup>5</sup> Same as footnote #4.

National Government	Per country \$ 10,000	In-kind	300,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	In-Kind	50,000
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	To be confirmed	In-Kind	277,500
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			627,500

#### D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNEP	NPIF	Biodiversity	Global	1,000,000	100,000	1,100,000
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				1,000,000	100,000	1,100,000

#### E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Estimated Person Weeks	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants*			50,000	50,000
International consultants*	40.00	40,000	0	40,000
<b>Total</b>		40,000	50,000	90,000

\* Details to be provided in Annex C.

#### F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT COST

Cost Items	Total Estimated Person Weeks/Months	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants*				0
International consultants*	40.00	31,500	10,000	41,500
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*				0
Travel*		23,500	17,500	41,000
Others**	Specify "Others" (1)			0
	Specify "Others" (2)			0
<b>Total</b>		55,000	27,500	82,500

\* Details to be provided in Annex C.

\*\* For others, to be clearly specified by overwriting fields \*(1) and \*(2).

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**H. 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 and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument that will be signed by the executing agency and UNEP. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process will include an end of project assessment undertaken by independent review teams. The final reports will be submitted to the GEF M&E Unit as well as other stakeholders and/or donors involved in the implementation of this project. 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 bi-annual progress reports, annual summary progress reports and the final evaluation

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:**

A.1.1. The [GEF focal area/LDCF/SCCF strategies/NPIF Initiative](#):

This project is in line with Objective 4 of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy for GEF-5: “Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing (ABS)”. This project is in also in line with the objective of the NPIF, as stated in the GEF Council Document “Outstanding issues related to the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund” (GEF/C.40/11/Rev.1 of May 26, 2011). According to this document, “the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund has been established to facilitate and support effective and efficient implementation of the decisions made at the 10th CoP of the CBD related to the Protocol. The primary objective of the NPIF is to facilitate the early entry into force and create enabling conditions at national and regional levels for implementation of the Protocol”.

The creation of the NPIF was approved by the GEF Council on February 18, 2011. Further to the creation of the fund, the GEF Council approved the arrangements proposed for the operation of this new multi-donor trust fund in the spring meeting of 2011. The terms of the NPIF are in the document GEF/C.40/11/Rev.1, *Outstanding Issues Related to the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund*. Key activity areas to be funded through the NPIF include:

- a. Support Parties in reviewing their own capacities and needs on ABS and to strengthen the enabling environment with a focus on the provisions of existing national policies, laws, and regulations;
- b. Support Parties to implement national and regional projects to promote technology transfer on mutually agreed terms, private sector engagement, and projects targeting investments in the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources;
- c. Support Parties to build capacity as appropriate with the aim of ensuring that traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources held by indigenous and local communities is accessed

- d. Support Parties to undertake activities to increase public awareness on needs and opportunities of the Nagoya Protocol
- e. Support Parties to further the knowledge and scientific-base for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

Through two project components on a) capacity assessment and awareness-raising; and b) stakeholder engagement, the proposed project addresses four out of the five priority areas of the NPIF with the aim of an accelerated ratification and early entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol and as well as the preparation of broad stakeholder involvement in its implementation in 30 countries.

A.1.2. For projects funded from LDCF/SCCF: the LDCF/SCCF eligibility criteria and priorities:

NA

A.1.3 For projects funded from NPIF, relevant eligibility criteria and priorities of the Fund:

According to the GEF Council Document “Outstanding issues related to the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund” (GEF/C.40/11/Rev.1 of May 26, 2011), “the Fund will initially focus its support on assisting signatory Parties and those in the process of signing the Nagoya Protocol, and that intend to ratify the Protocol in order to accelerate the ratification and implementation of the Protocol.” Furthermore, the NPIF calls for “supporting Parties in reviewing their own capacities and needs on ABS with a focus on the provisions of existing national policies, laws, and regulations and to strengthen the enabling environment at national level through the development of appropriate policy and institutional measures to promote the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources”.

All countries participating in the proposed project are Parties to the CBD and have expressed strong intent of ratifying the Nagoya Protocol. To this end, most have already begun to develop policies and regulatory measures for a national ABS regime, and seek assistance in tackling the many technical and legal complexities related to access and benefit sharing. The objectives of the proposed project are fully congruent with the NPIF priorities and will lead to improved enabling conditions at national and regional levels for an accelerated entry into force, as well as the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the participating countries. UNEP will select the 30 participating countries based on submission of the formal letter of endorsement after project approval, and capacity to ratify the Nagoya Protocol after completion of the scoping study and awareness raising activities.

The interest and intent of countries to accede to the Nagoya Protocol after carrying the proposed activities (capacity needs assessment and stakeholder engagement) is a prerequisite to participate in this project. These activities are in place to enable these countries to facilitate and expedite the approval process inside the legislature bodies charged with ratifying this international legally binding agreement.

A.2. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, etc.:

According to the Second National Reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity, 81 countries, out of 93, attached high level or medium level priorities to access and benefit-sharing. Based on the analysis of the Third National Reports, high or medium level priorities have been awarded by 98 countries, out of 129, to access and benefit sharing. Furthermore, at least 58 countries are in the process of developing or have adopted access and benefit-sharing measures, and measures from 39 countries are included in the database of the CBD. The study on 109 National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) showed that more than 50 percent of them included access and benefit sharing measures and/or objectives.

All countries collaborating under the proposed framework are Parties to the CBD and all indicated a strong

dedication to ratify or accede to and to implement the Nagoya Protocol as soon as possible. At the same time, the countries are stating that various institutional arrangements, policy and legal inconsistencies or overlaps as well as lacking capacities of various stakeholder groups may become a barrier to this expressed intent, if not addressed in a comprehensive approach.

The attached table summarizes all countries' growing commitment to ABS issues, both in their reporting to the SCBD, as well as in national plans (e.g. NBSAPs and national reports) and national planning tools and policy frameworks. Up to date, 21 countries have expressed interest in participate in this project, 10 have submitted letter of endorsement and 3 are seriously considering the case. In view of the interest of Parties in Ratifying the Nagoya Protocol expressed at ICNP-2, it is estimated that the 30 Letters of Endorsement will be obtained within 60 days after the approval of the project.

## **B. PROJECT OVERVIEW:**

B.1. Describe the baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) requests that its Parties create conditions to facilitate appropriate access to genetic resources for environmentally sound uses. It also requires them to develop and implement legislative, administrative or policy measures with the aim of sharing, in a fair and equitable way, the benefits arising from the use of genetic resources, and associated indigenous and local community knowledge, with the providers of such resources and knowledge. This should be based on mutually agreed terms and subject to prior informed consent. To this end, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (the 'Nagoya Protocol') is a legally binding instrument, adopted at the Tenth Meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in October 2010.

The Nagoya Protocol will enter into force 90 days after the date of deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification. Up to date, 92 countries have signed the protocol but only 6 have ratified it (Ethiopia, Gabon, Jordan, Mexico, Rwanda and Seychelles). For the Nagoya Protocol to be meaningful, the additional 44 to ratify, would need to be a mix of developed-and developing-countries. This grant will support 30 GEF eligible countries to carrying out activities leading to ratification. This grant is in direct response to the decision at the Second meeting of the *Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (ICNP-2)* held in Delhi, July 2012, where the Conference of the Parties "Reiterates its invitation to the Global Environment Facility to provide financial support to Parties to assist with the early ratification of the Nagoya Protocol and its implementation."

This statement is echoed by national submissions to the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on ABS and the Open-ended Expert Workshops on Capacity Building for ABS, which the CBD Secretariat organized. At the first Capacity building Workshop on ABS (Montreal, 4-5 June 2011), two main areas were discussed: i) Needs and priorities to meet the obligations under the Nagoya Protocol, i.e. among others preparations for ratification; and ii) Needs and priorities for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. Among the priority needs the workshop identified, were: i) Policy, institutional and legal frameworks, ii) Awareness-raising, and iii) Scientific and technological knowledge. These priority needs were consistently echoed at the respective 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> ABS capacity development workshops in Montreal (October 2011) and New Delhi (July 2012). All three workshops, as well as the second meeting of the Open-ended Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol (ICNP 2, New Delhi, 2-6 July 2012) also referred to mechanisms and actions to address above identified capacity gaps.

Realizing their challenges and needs, all participating countries under this proposal decided to utilize the momentum for ABS. By building on respective national opportunities and existing measures, albeit often disjointed, the project aims at fostering awareness of both the public and the private sector, aligning national policy and legal frameworks with NP provisions and enhancing national knowledge for ABS. Recognizing their similar needs, the countries agreed to address their challenges under a joint framework, opening opportunities for collaboration and

sharing of knowledge and expertise. By applying a multi-country approach, the project seeks to explore commonalities between countries, promote regional cooperation, learning and exchange and apply cost-saving measures.

This MSP aims at providing the legislative bodies of the 30 participating countries key pieces of information to take informed decision on ratification. The project is lifting a key barrier (ratification) that would then allow countries later on (i.e. not through this project but other projects) to establish the policy and legal frameworks necessary to regulate this issue, and incentives for private sector agreements.

The aims of this MSP will be achieved through the following project components and activities:

**Component 1: Rapid capacity needs assessment** in the participating countries to identify institutions, policies, laws and regulations relevant for the countries in ratifying to the Nagoya Protocol. This scoping study will identify opportunities and gaps as well establish timelines and plans for the legislative processes in the various participating countries that would eventually lead to the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. Gaps identified in the scoping study will later be filled by investing some of the resources of country-specific projects submitted to the GEF after the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol. The needs assessment will also help to focus the design of future projects.

**Component 2: Stakeholder engagement** is aimed at raising awareness and sharing of information among key stakeholder groups (particularly policy-makers) of the opportunities and implications that will result from ratification of Nagoya Protocol. It will involve identification of key stakeholder groups and developing a strategy for outreach and information sharing. Some of the activities that will be undertaken will include awareness raising campaigns through the mass media, mobilizing of policy-makers and opinion makers in support of ratification, etc.

**Component 3: Monitoring and Evaluation** will concentrate on results based management to ensure that the project is timely and efficiently implemented and delivers the project objectives in compliance with the GEF rules and procedures

B. 2. [incremental /Additional cost reasoning](#): describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated [global environmental benefits](#) (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

This MSP would be for countries that could accede to the protocol after an initial assessment of the legal and administrative implications of ratifying the protocol, and public awareness campaigns. Participating countries in this MSP would need to certify that they can potentially accede to the Nagoya Protocol by carrying out these two types of activities and that a complete legal and regulatory framework is not needed for the legislature to ratify the NP. Countries that require a complete legal and regulatory framework need to apply for a stand-alone ABS project using BD STAR allocations.

Without a GEF-supported intervention, the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol will be significantly delayed, with global environmental benefits taking much longer to accrue. Without effective policies, legislative frameworks and demonstrated measures for ABS implementation, such as stakeholder awareness-raising and broad-based engagement agreements or partnerships, the participating countries will continue to fall short in deriving benefits from their genetic resources, allowing access for inequitable exploitation by external parties. Preparing for the entry into force and subsequent implementation of the Nagoya Protocol will allow the countries access to the full potential of ABS schemes, not only contributing to *in situ* conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, but also bearing potential to mitigating climate change and, via economic gains, to poverty alleviation.

B.3. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits



(GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF). As a background information, read [Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF.](#)":

This project will facilitate 30 countries to accede to the Nagoya Protocol, which is the third pillar of the Convention on Biodiversity: the “equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate funding”.

This project aims at assisting countries to rapid accession to the legally binding Nagoya Protocol for its early entry into force. By becoming a party of the Nagoya Protocol, a country will allow key stakeholders like local and indigenous communities, civil society, including women groups, and the private sector, to benefit from the proper use of genetic resources and the sharing of benefits. Because the Nagoya Protocol covers most of the genetic resources that biodiversity has to offer, a valuation of the economic benefits of becoming a party of the protocol are difficult to estimate at the national or global levels. Nevertheless, parties to the CBD compiled a list of monetary and non-monetary benefits arising from genetic resources (see annex II of Decision IV/24), referring to, among others, fees, royalties, licenses, intellectual property rights, or product development, access to knowledge, capacity development or benefits arising from food security or improved livelihoods.

Under well-developed ABS policy frameworks, socio-economic benefits will particularly arise at local levels, where resource users or owners as well as bearers of traditional knowledge will be able to better participate in the sustainable use of biological resources. An increased recognition and better valuation of genetic resources under such ABS policies will lead to improved and further differentiated economic opportunities at local levels, e.g. through better market access, participation in product development, or knowledge sharing. Bearing in mind that women in rural communities often play a key role in biodiversity use and conservation, community development and are equally the bearers of traditional knowledge, their active involvement in all project activities will be taken into full consideration.

Increasing appreciation of access to and sharing the benefits arising from biodiversity and ecosystem services will in turn lead to a more sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity, creating local and global environmental benefits not only for flora and fauna but also allowing a broader impact of biodiversity on climate change mitigation

B.4 Indicate risks, including climate change risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design:

Risk	Level	Risk mitigation measures
Lack of commitment to ratify the Nagoya Protocol	Low	The project was developed based on the demand of national focal points and their respective governments. Because policy-makers will need to evaluate and decide whether or not to accede the protocol, efforts will be made to provide detailed information during the political process and illustrate the benefits the countries can derive from becoming parties of the protocol.
Lack of interest by stakeholders	Low	The project is country driven and through the growing momentum for ABS, relevant governmental stakeholders (e.g. ministries of trade, agriculture & food, rural development, planning etc.) are sought to become involved. As in the case of decision-makers, technical support and awareness-raising events should provide clarity to all involved in the ratification process as well as during implementation of the protocol one it enters

		into force.
Change in governments during project implementation	Medium	The targeted broad base of key governmental stakeholders (politicians, legislators, administrators, etc.) is mitigating national risks. In addition, the ratification to the Nagoya Protocol is expected to be fast and within the term of current governments, reducing the risk of withdrawing interest and political will.
Lack of interest of relevant stakeholder groups	Medium	Awareness-raising will provide all stakeholder groups with the necessary knowledge on issues and opportunities that lie within their participation in developing and implementing ABS regulations at the national and local levels.

B.5. Identify key stakeholders involved in the project including the private sector, civil society organizations, local and indigenous communities, and their respective roles, as applicable:

The project will collaborate with all key stakeholder groups in each of the countries that are relevant to issues of access to genetic resources and benefit sharing. These key groups constitute: 1) Decision-Makers: National politicians, legislators, as well as national focal points and national competent authorities of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. These stakeholders will have a direct role in facilitating the ratification of the Protocol by their countries and in reaching out to other stakeholder groups in both policy development and implementation, 2) Private sector: A core target group for awareness-raising, capacity development and knowledge exchange – so as to enable the public and the private sector to engage in partnerships and agreements on ABS, 3) NGOs, local and indigenous communities: Expected to be involved in the national consensus building processes for both policy processes and the development of broad-based partnerships for implementation, as well as awareness raising and training activities, 4) Academic and Research Institutions: Expected to share their know-how and capacities in networking and linking with the other stakeholders to increase collaboration and be involved in national consensus building processes on the accelerated entry into force of the Protocol on ABS as well as the preparations for its implementation.

B.6. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

This project is cost-effective because it will deliver financial support for the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol to the Ministries where the CBD focal point sits. Because CBD focal points are the engines to promote ratification and implementation of the NP, delivering the funding to their institutions should make the process efficient and expedite.

B.7. Outline the coordination with other related initiatives:

This project will coordinate with the GEF-supported project *Capacity Building for the Early Entry into Force of the Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing* (PMIS 4342), with UNEP as its implementing agency and executed by the SCBD. The objective of this project is to “assist GEF-eligible Parties to prepare for ratification and the early entry into force of the Protocol through targeted awareness raising and capacity building”. Additional coordination and information will be derived from the three ABS regional projects in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and the two country-based projects in India and Ethiopia. Enabling Activities in Morocco, Pakistan and Mozambique, will be considered too.

The proposed project will closely coordinate with the *ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa*, implemented by the GIZ and supported by various European donor agencies. It will from the beginning build on the project’s experience in developing capacitating tools and manuals as well as providing input into this broad network of experts across the African continent.

To promote transboundary and regional learning, the project will closely engage with sub-regional and regional organizations and initiatives, such as the African Union, economic community organizations (ECOWAS, SADC, etc.) or NEPAD processes. Related projects are currently carried out in other regions

and continents, such as *Building capacity for regionally harmonized national processes for implementing CBD provisions on access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits* in Asia, or the project for *Strengthening the implementation of ABS regimes in Latin America and the Caribbean*. With both, a strong information and experience exchange will be sought.

### **C. GEF AGENCY INFORMATION:**

C.1 Confirm the co-financing amount the GEF agency brings to the project:

UNEP during GEF-4 has supported countries as well as regions in accessing GEF resources for ABS, resulting in a portfolio of more than US\$ 8M. This group of projects is set to expand under GEF-5 to include several more country-level proposals and hence a pool of experience in supporting and coordinating similar projects.

In addition, UNEP through its mandate as a convener and coordinator for the environment promotes regional and multi-country cooperation to achieve global environmental benefits, focusing on diagnostic analyses and cooperative mechanisms, and associated institutional strengthening.

C.2 How does the project fit into the GEF agency's program (reflected in documents such as UNDAF, CAS, etc.) and staff capacity in the country to follow up project implementation:

Support to countries in assessing their opportunities and gaps in addressing issues of Access and Benefit Sharing, as well as adhering to the requirements under the Nagoya Protocol is already an integral part of UNEP's Programme of Work (PoW) 2012-2013 and will play an at least equally important role in the new PoW 2014-2015. UNEP's Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (UNEP DELC), the proposed project executing agency, already assists many national partners and governments through its expertise in environmental law and policy to develop and implement ABS policies and to harmonize national processes for the implementation of CBD provisions on ABS. The UNEP DELC deploys MEA Focal Points who are based in the UNEP Regional Offices for Africa (ROA), Asia and the Pacific (ROAP), West Asia (ROWA) and Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) to support its work.

UNEP as implementing agency is already involved in various GEF-4 funded ABS-related projects, both at national and at regional scale. The proposed executing agency, UNEP-DELC has at least three officers who specialize in ABS issues, legal and political ramifications, as well as the international processes around CBD and the Nagoya Protocol. Furthermore, UNEP has staff in the Regional Office for Africa (ROA), Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (ROAP), Regional Office for West Asia (ROWA), Regional Office for Latin America and Caribbean (ROLAC) and within its GEF Unit in DEPI who work on ABS related topics and projects.

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

### **A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:**

As the CBD is a UNEP-administered Convention, it largely draws support for ABS legal and policy issues at global and regional levels through UNEP's Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELC). While UNEP-DEPI will maintain its role as implementing agency with oversight functions, UNEP-DELC will assume the coordinating and overall executing functions in the proposed project, and can thus provide expertise needed to ensure quick implementation and the linkage to regional and international expert networks.

### **B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:**

As executing agency, UNEP-DELC will sub-contract the respective national executing partner organizations for the implementation of the respective national activities, particularly with regard to the establishment and furthering of public-private partnerships. Whereas the improvement of scientific and technical knowledge as well as the enactment and amendment of ABS-relevant policies and legislation predominantly remain activities at the national level, DELC will assume a coordinating and catalyzing responsibility through providing legal

expertise, involving relevant projects and external contributors and in convening substantive workshops and fora for exchange of experiences and lessons learned, as required.

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

NA


**PART V: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
<b>Names to be included in LoE from participating countries.</b>	GEF OFP		

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director, GEF Coordination Office UNEP		Oct, 01 2012	Mohamed Sessay	+254 20 7624294	mohamed.sessay@unep.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

<b>Project Outcome: 30 countries accede to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing</b>					
	<b>OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS</b>			<b>VERIFICATION METHODS</b>	<b>ASSUMPTIONS</b>
	<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>BASELINE</b>	<b>TARGET</b>		
	<p>Improved understanding of obligations and other provisions of the NP on ABS in 30 countries</p> <p>Countries accede and ratify Nagoya Protocol</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited understanding and capacity to comply with NP provisions</li> <li>only 6 countries have so far ratified or acceded to the NP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preparations under way to develop or amend natl. policies, legislation and regulations in line with the NP provisions</li> <li>At least 25 countries ratify or accede to the NP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natl. planning and policy-making processes. Proposals for policies, legislation and regulations in the pipeline</li> <li>CBD Secretariat records</li> </ul>	<p>National decision makers responsive to process for ratifying or acceding to the NP</p> <p>Continuous organizational support and stable mandates in the countries</p> <p>Key stakeholder groups collaborate on ABS policies, legislation and regulations</p>

OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS			VERIFICATION METHODS	ASSUMPTIONS
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET		
<p><b><u>Component 1: Rapid capacity needs assessment</u></b></p> <p><b>Outputs:</b></p> <p>1.1 Review is conducted of institutional frameworks, policies, laws and regulations with regard to needs and capacities for implementing the NP</p> <p>1.2 The awareness of key stakeholder groups on the issues and opportunities of the NP is enhanced</p> <p><i>Activities</i></p> <p>1.1.1 Identification of institutions, policies, laws and regulations relevant to the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol</p> <p>1.1.2 Review of gaps and opportunities in existing policy and regulatory frameworks to accommodate the provisions of the NP</p> <p>1.1.3 Strategic plan for development of and/or amendments to policies and legal frameworks</p> <p>1.1.4 Harmonization of already existing ABS legislation with the provisions of the NP</p> <p>1.2.1 Map of key stakeholder groups</p> <p>1.2.2 Needs assessment of stakeholder groups</p> <p>1.2.3 Strategy for ABS outreach and information</p>	<p>1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendations for legal and policy amendments</li> </ul> <p>1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of entities reached</li> <li># of entities providing input to natl. ABS policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No systematic review on NP compliance</li> <li>Few references to ABS and NP in policies and legal frameworks</li> </ul> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 25 reviews and strategic plans for development/amendments</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 4 stakeholder groups per country refer to NP/ABS (policy bodies, NGO, private sector)</li> <li>At least 4 entities/country provide input</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project reports</li> <li>Review documents</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical reports</li> <li>Workshop records</li> </ul>	<p>Decision makers continue to be interested in NP/ABS</p> <p>Mechanisms for feeding information to decision makers are conducive</p> <p>Organizational stability and mandates are maintained</p> <p>Different stakeholder groups cooperate</p>

OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS			VERIFICATION METHODS	ASSUMPTIONS
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET		
<b><u>Component 2: Stakeholder engagement</u></b>					
<b>Outputs:</b>					
2.1 Key stakeholder groups are involved in the planning for NP implementation	2.1	• 0	• At least 1 WS per country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project reports</li> <li>• Workshop records</li> <li>• Relevant official documents</li> <li>• Cooperation agreements</li> </ul>	<p>Policy bodies are willing to cooperate to address overlaps and gaps</p> <p>Institutional stability allows for continued participation of key stakeholders</p> <p>Key stakeholder groups are interested to cooperate</p>
2.2 Countries ratify or Accede to Nagoya Protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder workshops conducted</li> <li>• # of entities providing input to NP/ABS policy</li> <li>• # of cooperation agreements</li> </ul>	• 0	• At least 3 entities/country		
		• 0	• At least 2 coop agreements/country		
<i>Activities</i>					
2.1.1 National NP workshop with key stakeholder groups (govt. entities, private sector, the scientific community, CSO and IPO - where applicable)	2.2	• 3	At least 25 countries accede or ratify the NP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet submissions</li> <li>• CBD Secretariat records</li> </ul>	<p>Opportunity to engage with decision makers exist</p>
2.1.2 Engagement of key stakeholder groups (such as local and indigenous communities) in the development of NP/ABS policies and implementation measures	• NP ratification or Accession				
2.1.3 Initiation of multi-stakeholder partnerships and PPP for the NP implementation					
2.2.1 Establishment of national ratification procedures allowing stakeholder input					
2.2.2 Initiation of ratification or accession process					

OUTPUT AND ACTIVITIES	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS			VERIFICATION METHODS	ASSUMPTIONS
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET		
<b><u>Component 3: Monitoring and Evaluation</u></b>					
<p><b>Outputs:</b></p> <p>3.1 Project implementation facilitated with regard to results-based management</p> <p><i>Activities</i></p> <p>3.1.1 Project monitoring system operating, providing systematic information on progress in achieving project outcome and output targets</p> <p>3.1.2 Indicator framework developed for identified key challenge areas of NP implementation</p> <p>3.1.3 Mid-term and final evaluation conducted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M&amp;E system operational</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All countries comply with M&amp;E procedures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project reports</li> <li>• Workshop records</li> </ul>	<p>National systems conducive to proposed M&amp;E measures</p>





**ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF 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>			
Local			
International			
Project Cordinator	900	35	Supervise project implementation
Justification for travel, if any:			
<b>For Technical Assistance</b>			
Local			
Facilitator	800	30	Coordinate activities at national level
International			
Legal Expert	1,000	10	Draft legal documents
Communication Specialist	1,000	20	Prepare communication/media/outreach strategy
Institutional/Policy Expert	1,000	10	Review policy and regulatory frameworks and identify gaps
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**

A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.

N/A

B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

N/A

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/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Cofinancing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
<b>Total</b>		0	0	0	0	0

\* 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 (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)