



**PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)**

**PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT**

**TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

|  |   |                              |                |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Project Title:   | Strengthening human resources, legal frameworks and institutional capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol |                              |                |
| Country(ies):  |   | GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup> | 5731           |
| GEF Agency(ies):   | UNDP  | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 5381           |
| Other Executing Partner(s):  | National Competent Authorities, ABS focal points  | Submission Date:             | March 20, 2014 |
| GEF Focal Area (s):  | Biodiversity  | Project Duration (Months)    | 60             |
| Name of parent program (if applicable):  | N/A   | Agency Fee (\$):             | 1,080,000      |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul> |   |                              |                |

**A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:**

| Focal Area Objectives   | Trust Fund | Indicative Grant Amount (\$)* | Indicative Co-financing (\$) |
|---|------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| BD-4: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing | GEFTF      | 12,000,000                    | 12,000,000                   |
| Total Project Cost  |            | 12,000,000                    | 12,000,000                   |

**B. INDICATIVE PROJECT FRAMEWORK**

**Project Objective:** To assist countries in the development and strengthening of their national ABS frameworks, human resources and administrative capabilities to implement the Nagoya Protocol.

| Project component   | Grant Type | Expected Outcomes   | Expected Outputs   | Trust Fund | Indicative Grant Amount (\$) | Indicative Co-financing (\$) |
|---|------------|---|--|------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Strengthening the legal, political and institutional capacity to develop national ABS frameworks | TA         | <p>-National ABS legal/political frameworks developed and/or strengthened with the participation of all stakeholders including indigenous peoples and local communities (ILCs).</p> <p>-Capacities of national and state competent authorities and related agencies to develop, implement and enforce national ABS domestic legislation, administrative or policy measures for ABS - including a Clearing House Mechanism - improved by at least XX% as measured by the ABS Tracking Tool.</p> <p>-ABS political profile increased at a sectoral level within government by linking the national ABS framework with national policies on scientific and technological innovation, research and development.</p> | <p>-National ABS law/regulation/policy proposals drafted and submitted for approval to competent authorities</p> <p>-Improved capacities of National Competent Authorities and related agencies on processing access applications, developing model contractual clauses under mutually agreed terms, including the negotiation and tracking of ABS agreements and biodiversity projects to ensure compliance.</p> <p>-Supportive institutional framework for sui generis systems for protecting traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and customary uses of biological and genetic resources</p> <p>-Mechanisms institutionalized to facilitate: a) a Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) for countries that have a national ABS framework and are willing to advertise such</p> | GEFTF      | 4,000,000                    | 3,714,286                    |

<sup>1</sup>Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

|  |    |   |  |       |           |           |
|--|----|---|--|-------|-----------|-----------|
|  |    |   | <p>framework and other ABS information in the CHM; b) Understanding at the ministerial level of the importance of genetic resources as a source of innovation in the national economy and the need to support research and development for the valuation of biodiversity; c) Dialogue and collaboration between policy makers and stakeholders (including research institutions, private sector, and ILCs) to ensure certainty and clarity for users and providers of genetic resources; and d) access to information and support compliance under the national law and the Nagoya Protocol.</p>   |       |           |           |
| 2. Building trust between users and providers of genetic resources to facilitate the identification of bio-discovery efforts | TA | <p>-Existing and emerging initiatives and opportunities for biodiscovery projects identified and strengthened with improved research capabilities to add value to their own genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources</p> <p>-XX% of stakeholders (government officials, population of researchers, local communities, and relevant industry) targeted by the campaign is aware of the National law and CBD and NP provisions related to ABS and traditional knowledge (TK). Target will be estimated during the PPG phase.</p> | <p>- Existing and emerging partnerships for bio-discovery between users and providers of genetic resources to generate ‘success stories’ and practical lessons, as well as reinforce trust.</p> <p>-Information and experience exchange on the interaction between ABS rules and biodiversity-based research and development activities in various sectors, including best practices, training programmes and modules on bio-discovery, research procedures, intellectual property and business models of key industries (pharmaceutical, botanical, biotechnological, agricultural, the food/beverage biotechnology, and cosmetics sector) developed and made available to relevant stakeholders including ILOs.</p> <p>-Ethical codes of conduct or guidelines for research on traditional knowledge and genetic resources</p> <p>-Campaign to raise awareness on the ABS national frameworks, CBD and Nagoya Protocol targeting policy-makers, researchers, ILOs, and relevant industry.</p> <p>-Knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) assessment surveys targeting specific groups (e.g., researchers, local communities, and relevant industry) that may use or benefit from ABS transactions are carried out to assess enhanced awareness about national ABS frameworks, the CBD and Nagoya Protocol.</p> | GEFTF | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| 3. Strengthening the   | TA | Indigenous peoples and local  | Bio-cultural community protocols,  | GEFTF | 3,428,572 | 3,714,286 |

|   |  |  |       |            |            |
|---|--|--|-------|------------|------------|
| capacity of indigenous and local communities to contribute to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol | communities engaged in the legal, policy and decision-making processes.<br><br>-ABS bio-cultural community protocols and traditional knowledge registers adopted by local communities<br><br>-Capacities of local ILCs to negotiate ABS agreements improved by at least XX% as measured by the ABS tracking tool | model contractual clauses constitute the basis for clarifying PIC and MAT requirements between users and providers of traditional knowledge and biological resources.<br><br>- Campaign increases ILCs awareness on the importance of genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources, and related access and benefit-sharing issues, including the need to participate in the national ABS policy-making process. |       |            |            |
| Sub-total   |  |  |       | 11,428,572 | 11,428,572 |
| Project Management Cost (PMC)   |  |  | GEFTF | 571,428    | 571,428    |
| Total Project Cost  |  |  |       | 12,000,000 | 12,000,000 |

### C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, (\$)

| Sources of Cofinancing | Name of Cofinancier                                      | Type of Cofinancing | Amount (\$)         |
|------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| National Governments   | Ministry of Environment or appropriate Government Agency | Cash                | \$11,400,000        |
| GEF Agency             | UNDP   | Cash                | \$600,000           |
| <b>Total</b>           |  |                     | <b>\$12,000,000</b> |

### D. INDICATIVE TRUST FUND RESOURCES (\$) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY:

| GEF Agency                   | Type of Trust Fund | Focal Area   | Country Name/Global | Grant Amount (\$ (a) | Agency Fee (\$) (b) <sup>2</sup> | Total (\$) c=a+b  |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| UNDP                         | GEF                | Biodiversity | Global              | 12,000,000           | 1,080,000                        | 13,080,000        |
| <b>Total Grant Resources</b> |                    |              |                     | <b>12,000,000</b>    | <b>1,080,000</b>                 | <b>13,080,000</b> |

### E. PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

- (up to) \$300k for projects above \$10 million
- |                       |                         |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Amount Requested (\$) | Agency Fee for PPG (\$) |
| 300,000               | 27,000                  |

**PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY FOR MFA: N/A**

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

### A. Project Overview

1. The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (herein after referred to as “the Nagoya Protocol” or “the Protocol”) was adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its tenth meeting in Nagoya, Japan, 2010. Ninety-two (92) countries signed the Nagoya Protocol while the protocol was open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 2 February 2011 to 1 February 2012. The Nagoya Protocol will enter into force 90 days after the date of deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification. A total of twenty nine (29) parties have ratified the protocol as of February 27, 2014. The process of ratification has been supported by the GEF through a number of country-based and regional projects (Annex 1) as well as investments from other

donors and providers of technical assistance. While some of these projects have also been designed for implementation of the protocol, this new project will focus on implementation of basic measures.

2. This project 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.*” A synthesis of the elements for capacity building for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol can be found in the “*Overview of measures to build or develop capacity to effectively implement the Protocol based on the needs and priorities of Parties and indigenous and local communities*”. This is Annex II of the “Report of the eleventh meeting of the conference of the parties to the convention on biological diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/35). The need for capacity building was reviewed once more at ICNP-3 in the document “Measures to assist in capacity-building and development and the strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition” (UNEP/CBD/ICNP/3/CRP.2).

3. **Baseline programs:** This project is going to build on the initiatives and investments of participating countries to implement the basic measures of the Nagoya Protocol over the next 5 years. During project preparation, detailed information will be gathered for each of the participating countries, with particular emphasis on the Government’s plans and investments for the implementation of the protocol over the next five years. The baseline per country will include efforts of other financiers and providers of technical assistance (e.g. ABS Capacity Development Initiative, bilateral donors, etc). One of the eligibility criteria to participate in this project is support of the ABS agenda and the associated investments at the National, Regional and Local for the period 2014-2019. Because political buy-in plays a critical role in putting in place and operate the NP, serious considerations will be given to formal expression of political support to this protocol in the selection of participating countries.

4. The specific problem that this project will seek to address is the lack of a functioning national legal, political and institutional framework that will enable the equitable sharing of benefits from the use of genetic resources and traditional knowledge between the state (national and state governments), commercial interests, and the owners and custodians of these resources and traditional knowledge (ILCs). This issue is compounded by the lack of trust between users and providers of genetic resources that prevent unleashing the potential of genetic resources as a source of innovation, biodiversity conservation, market development and poverty alleviation.

5. The long-term solution : is the establishment of a comprehensive national legal, political, regulatory and institutional framework and capacity for ABS, to activate the potential of the diverse genetic resources and traditional knowledge for generating economic benefits to the target country and key stakeholders, including local communities where appropriate, in the form of business, employment, technology transfer and capacity development. The long-term solution will therefore involve building trust between users and providers of genetic resources in order to identify and strengthen biodiscovery efforts of biochemical products such as pharmaceuticals, nutraceuticals and agro-chemicals. These new opportunities will strengthen the economic case and political motivation as well as the financing required for the conservation and sustainable use of the biological diversity/resources containing the genetic material.

6. The achievement of the long-term solution faces the following barriers:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Limited legal, political and institutional capacity to develop national ABS frameworks</p> | <p>At present, there are insufficient levels of awareness regarding the value of genetic resources as a source of innovation and scientific/technological development among decision- and policy-makers, and the constituents to whom they respond, to ensure political support for assigning the levels of resources that are required for its conservation and sustained use. Lack of capacity has been identified as a key constraint for the introduction of national ABS regimes across a wide range of stakeholders and at all levels – national, state, local / community and sectoral. At the national level, there is little understanding of ABS issues and the protection of traditional knowledge among sectors other than those directly involved in the conservation and development of biological resources, and even</p> |
|---|--|

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | then there is a need to ensure consistency in the vision and rationale behind ABS, given the emergence of relevant initiatives on Intellectual Property Rights (WIPO) and agricultural / plant genetic resources linked to other global instruments (ITPGRFA). Government institutions also require training inputs to ensure that they have the capacity to perform the roles of “checkpoints” as provided for in the Nagoya Protocol.   |
| Limited trust between users and providers of genetic resources | Within the biotechnology, agriculture, pharmaceutical, botanical and food industries, scientific researchers are among the key stakeholders that will be directly affected by national ABS frameworks when it comes into force. This issue is compounded by the limited trust between users of genetic resources of these industries and providers of these resources and traditional knowledge that will prevent implementation of any national ABS framework. Government representatives, indigenous and local communities are not aware of best practices, business models and the intricacies of research and development processes of key industries (pharmaceutical, botanical, biotechnological, agricultural, the food/beverage biotechnology, and cosmetics sector).   |
| Limited capacity of indigenous and local communities           | At community level, there is lack of awareness among indigenous and local communities about the potential and availability of biological/genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge. The absence of such understanding contributes towards the loss and degradation of bio-resources through unsustainable patterns of land use, which also leads to the loss of associated traditional knowledge. Indigenous groups and local communities have limited understanding on how to respond to requests for access to their genetic resources and traditional knowledge including their rights and responsibilities within national ABS frameworks. The absence of useful and user friendly approaches such as community protocols for clarifying PIC and MAT, including promotional materials, guidelines and manuals on the value of bio-resources and associated traditional knowledge and the ABS principles enshrined in the CBD in local language is a barrier in this case. Translation of such materials into local languages is, therefore, important for the wide use of these tools by the stakeholders, plus support from appropriate training programmes is needed for the holistic success of this project. |

7. **The GEF Alternative Scenario:** This Project aims to remove the barriers mentioned above through in-country activities implemented under the following three inter-related components. These activities will be facilitated by Global Technical Support provided by UNDP and other key players:

8. *i. Strengthening the legal, political and institutional capacity to develop national ABS frameworks:* National ABS frameworks for genetic resources and its associated traditional knowledge will be developed or strengthened under this component. The development/strengthening of the national law and regulations will be conducted through a transparent and consultative process ensuring full participation of all relevant stakeholders including the indigenous and local communities and NGOs. The development of the national ABS law or policy and implementing regulations, together with institutional framework and other supporting measures will lead towards accession to the Nagoya Protocol, if needed.

9. The operationalization of this framework will be supported by measures to improve capacities of National Competent Authorities and related agencies on processing access applications, developing model contractual clauses under mutually agreed terms, including the negotiation and tracking of ABS agreements and biodiversity projects to ensure compliance. Specifically, government agencies need to be trained, among others, to understand the ABS rules and procedures, including granting of permits, assessment of access applications, core principles of PIC and MAT and their application, and rights and roles of ILCs; interpret ABS provisions of national law, the Nagoya Protocol, the CBD and other related international agreements such as the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA); understand and keep abreast of negotiations at WIPO and FAO to ensure that all authorities dealing with ABS will have a common and coordinated national approach;

and negotiate ABS agreements. These will ensure better understanding of national and international provisions of ABS, and enhance the implementation of the proposed national ABS law at all levels.

10. The project will also focus on the development of approaches to unleash the scientific and technological potential of ABS. Specifically, the project will institutionalize mechanisms to establish a CHM in countries that already have a national ABS framework and are willing to advertise ABS information in it. The project will also institutionalize mechanisms to facilitate not only the understanding at the ministerial level of the importance of genetic resources as a source of innovation in the national economy but also the long-term dialogue and collaboration between policy-makers and sectors that use genetic resources. These mechanisms will also facilitate access to information for national and international users of genetic resources and support compliance under national law and the Nagoya Protocol. Development of a “Users’ Guide” of rules and procedures for users and providers will further clarify the access requirements. With these developments, decision making on ABS issues at national and state levels and within relevant agencies and stakeholders will be informed and strengthened through the use of appropriate tools, guidelines, frameworks and guides. As a consequence, access to biological resources will be informed and enhanced under the provisions of the proposed national ABS law, including equitable benefit sharing provisions.

11. *ii. Building trust between users and providers of genetic resources to facilitate the identification of biodiscovery efforts:* This component seeks to identify and strengthen existing and emerging initiatives and opportunities for biodiscovery projects with improved research capabilities to add value to their own genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources. Key outputs will also increase the knowledge and awareness of stakeholders (government, ILOs and private users) on the business models, biodiscovery procedures, best practices challenges and opportunities of industries and users of genetic resources. Conversely, to ensure full participation and compliance of the law by these genetic resource users, awareness raising activities must be conducted, targeting universities, research institutions and biotechnology companies. They must be made aware of the national ABS framework, including their obligation to obtain permits from competent authorities whenever there is research or bio-prospecting and to obtain PIC from resource providers. Bio-prospectors in particular must be informed of their obligation to share benefits equitably with the resource providers, including possible technology transfer (non-monetary benefits).

12. Important stakeholders like the ILCs, researchers and relevant industries will be specifically targeted by an awareness raising campaign, on the proposed national ABS law and the application procedures and ABS issues. Tools, methods, and outreach materials will be developed to raise awareness and knowledge of national law and CBD and Nagoya Protocol provisions related to ABS and traditional knowledge among stakeholders, to prepare the way for implementation. As part of the project’s monitoring and evaluation system, knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) assessment surveys will be conducted targeting specific groups (ILCs, researchers and relevant industries) that may use or benefit from ABS transactions to determine the project’s impact on awareness levels. These would include baseline surveys at the startup of the awareness raising activities for specific target groups, and repeat surveys following the same methodologies at project completion. Knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) assessment surveys targeting specific groups (e.g., researchers, local communities, and relevant industry) that may use or benefit from ABS transactions will be carried out to assess enhanced awareness about national ABS frameworks, the CBD and Nagoya Protocol.

13. *iii. Strengthening the capacity of indigenous and local communities to contribute to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol:* This component will assist with the development of ABS community protocols and confidential/non-confidential traditional knowledge registries in line with provisions of the emerging national ABS framework and the Nagoya Protocol. The emphasis on community-based development of community protocols and traditional knowledge registries is fully in line with Article 12 of the Nagoya Protocol which requires Parties to the Protocol, among others, to support the development by ILCs, community protocols in relation to access to traditional knowledge and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. The development of a sui generis framework (Component 1) may focus on the use of community protocols as the basis for clarifying PIC and MAT requirements between users and providers of traditional knowledge and genetic resources. This

component will demonstrate the use of community protocols to develop sui generis approaches to ABS for protection of traditional knowledge.

14. ILCs will also be trained on strategies to facilitate the protection of traditional knowledge in the context of the national ABS policy-making process. A series of training, communication education and public awareness activities and products will increase the capacity and confidence among communities to provide greater clarity to external stakeholders about their core values, challenges, priorities, and plans relating to the conservation and customary sustainable uses of biodiversity and the protection and promotion of their traditional knowledge, greater awareness of how traditional knowledge can be accessed and used, how they can retain control over the process and considerations such as ownership of knowledge and sharing of benefits arising from its utilization. Special focus will be given to women, considering their essential role in developing and using community protocols. The experiences and lessons learned and the output of the project will be disseminated to other communities, other target countries, and internationally including through providing relevant input to meetings involving Parties to the CBD.

15. **Global environmental benefits:** The implementation of the basic measures of the Nagoya Protocol in the participating countries will unleash a wide range of monetary and non-monetary benefits for providers of genetic resources. Some of these benefits should be reinvested in the conservation and sustainable use the biological resources from where the genetic resources were obtain. This will fulfil the three objectives if the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD). The tangible and measurable global environmental benefits associated with this project, can only be identified with the full implementation of the capacity building activates described in the results framework.

16. **Innovation, sustainability and scale-up potential:** Innovation: This is the largest individual project made by the GEF in support of the NP and it nicely complements past and existing efforts to build capacity to implement the Nagoya Protocol. Although most of the activities have been tested before, some elements should be considered “innovative”, including the clustering of activities to “build trust” among stakeholders and to bring the views of the private sector during early stages of development of the legal and administrative framework. This should certainly enhance the “legal certainty and clarity” for those interested in investing. The development of “ABS incubators” to promote ABS agreements (to be developed during project preparation) should be considered innovative in the context of GEF funded projects.

17. Sustainability: The outcomes will be sustainable insofar as the participating countries maintain the momentum generated by the increased institutional capacity generated by this project. Because “political will” has been identified as a key element for the successful development and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, it is of the outmost importance that the governments commit themselves to this project in full. To this effect, the project will assist the governments with a number of activities that should facilitate political by-in and the engagement of the appropriate ministries, legislators and representatives of different sectors.

18. Scale-up potential: The lessons learned during the preparation and implementation of this project will be instrumental in structuring and deliver country- and region-based ABS projects during GEF-6. Because the sum of the investments, including this project, are not be sufficient to cover the demand for technical and financial assistance to all GEF eligible countries, this project will need to be scaled-up.

#### A.2. Stakeholders.

| Stakeholders/Interested Parties    | Role in Project Implementation   |
|------------------------------------|--|
| CBD/ABS National Focal Points      | The Focal Points will be instrumental in gathering of the information necessary during the project preparation and to identify local experts on legal and administrative matter closely related to the structure of this project.  |
| ABS National Competent Authorities | To assist in structuring the most effective and cost-benefit institutional arrangements to operate the NP.   |
| Policy makers                      | To ensure awareness and understanding of ABS and the NP for the drafting and approval of laws and regulations governing the NP. Unless policy makers are not fully aware of the scope and implications of the NP, it is going to be difficult to pass sound the laws and regulations |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | within reasonable time.   |
| ILCs   | To provide input into the legal frameworks and to prepare community protocols as part of capacity building activities.  |
| Private Sector                                   | To provide input and views into the architecture of the legal and administrative requirements for engagement of investors.  |
| National, Regional and International consultants | To assist Governments in specific preparing components in the overall architecture of the national and local laws, regulations and administrative duties necessary to install to enable ABS agreements.                           |
| Academic and research institutions               | To assist in the draft of laws and regulations, as well as administrative procedures on access to genetic resources to avoid making R&D on genetic resources a nearly impossible task due to legal and bureaucratic requirements. |

### A.3 Risk

| Risk  | Level* | Risk Mitigation Strategy   |
|---|--------|--|
| Lack of Political support   | M      | Political will, is going to be used as a selection criteria for participating countries. During project implementation, there will be awareness campaigns to sustain the efforts.  |
| Lengthy legislative process                                       | M      | Drafting and passing legislation tends to take significant time. Therefore, the project will remain active during 5 years.   |
| Turnover at the Ministerial level and changes in priorities       | M      | Increasing the capacity of Government officials has shown to increase the retention of professionals. Being better prepare on matters related to ABS, becomes a bonus for officials that rarely have the opportunity for training.   |
| Failure to bring together the private sector, ILCs and Government | M      | The GEF Agency will assist as an intermediary between private sector, ILCs and government officials. There is also a wealth of experiences and expertise that will be brought to the negotiations. While putting these two parties together may be challenging, it has shown to be an important activity to ensure that users and providers understand each other. The project will identify lawful representatives of some of the ILCs in order to gather information and build capacity among groups that are most likely to encounter a buyer of genetic resources (i.e. those working on producing materials of interest to the pharmaceutical, cosmetics, and food & drinks industries. |

### A.4. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed and other initiatives:

19. This project will coordinate activities with the ongoing GEF projects funded using STAR and NPIF financial resources in GEF-4 and GEF-5. This project will also coordinate with the projects funded by the ABS Capacity Development Initiative in the Pacific, Africa, Asia and LAC (Annex 2).

## B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

### B.1 Consistency with National strategies and plans and assessments under relevant conventions:

20. All participating countries require having explicit reference to the implementation of ABS measures and the Nagoya Protocol (to the extent possible) in their national strategies-plans and/or NBSAPs or other relevant national strategies or plans. The Government's baseline financial investments in support of these plans will be used as co-financing and a letter to that effect will be requested for CEO Endorsement.

### B.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria, and priorities:

21. This project fits with the GEF Biodiversity Strategies for GEF 5 (BD-4) and GEF-6 (Program 8) and the Aichi Target 16 (By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation). This project aims at supporting 25 countries that have completed national strategies-plans and/or NBSAPs or National Reports that include explicit references to national ABS frameworks and the Nagoya Protocol. These participating countries will also need to provide proof of a "baseline project", that is, the ABS investments over the duration of this project that will take place whether or not this GEF project is funded. The 25 countries will be selected during the PPG phase and the level of support will take into account an in-depth assessment of needs not



already covered by current ABS investments (see Annexes 1 and 2). This in-depth assessment will include a table identifying the specific gaps to be filled by this project in the participating countries. The information will be country-specific and derived from the scoping study carried out to identify the gap. This assessment will also take into account information provided by the CBD Secretariat on the countries and activities carried out with the GEF-MSP in support of the early entry into force of the NP (PMIS 4415). Participating countries must provide documentation on the Government’s interest on ABS and the Nagoya Protocol, including their plans to sustain the effort behind the time and budget of this project. This can be in the form of “mainstreaming” of ABS into Government's business (i.e. budget lines in national budget, staffing, etc.). Without this explicit commitment, institutional and financial sustainability of this GEF project would be seriously compromised.

22. In addition, since financial resources are not enough to support all of the 144+ GEF eligible countries, the following criteria will be used for the selection of the 25 countries:

23. TIER 1: Countries that have ratified the protocol prior to PIF approval by the GEF Council (29 as of February 7th), or will ratify the Protocol during the project preparation (12 months after PIF approval). Countries that have already benefited from one or more of the country-based or a regional projects funded by the GEF (Trust Fund or NPIF), or by a project from another institution (e.g., ABS Capacity Development Initiative or bilateral) could participate in this new project. During the PPG phase, the project will identify areas of support not already covered by any of the existing projects.

24. TIER 2. Countries that have not ratified or will not ratify during project development (CEO Endorsement), but are actively working toward accession. Countries that require the development of the legal and administrative measures for the relevant National Authorities to request accession to the NP, may fall into this category. Same considerations regarding participation when countries have already benefited from previous projects (see TIER 1).

25. TIER 3. Countries that will not accede in the near future but have strong political support.

**B.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage for implementing this project:**


26. The UNDP’s Biodiversity and Ecosystems Programme has a large portfolio of biodiversity projects, with 55 projects in 45 countries globally. Since 2012, UNDP has consolidated implementation of the third objective of the CBD through GEF-funded projects that facilitate not only the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol but also access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing in about 20 countries. UNDP is working with governments and stakeholders in developing countries that already have a policy framework in place for ABS in order to assist them in accessing financing and to facilitate ABS deals such as sustainable ethical biodiscovery programs or deals between corporations interested in accessing genetic resources and organizations representing the providers of these resources. In this context, UNDP is also supporting local and indigenous communities for the development of payment and benefit-sharing mechanisms and bio-cultural community protocols. UNDP is also supporting countries with the development of National ABS frameworks in a number of countries with a Senior Technical Adviser specializing in ABS and a network of regional technical advisors in the UNDP regional centers of Panama, Bangkok, Bratislava and Addis Ababa. These regional technical advisors support a network of environmental programme officers in every single country around the world. UNDP’s mandate on ABS is underscored by UNDP’s Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework (2012-2020) and the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan. Both policy documents emphasize UNDP’s role in ABS capacity building initiatives, including the development of national ABS frameworks and support for ethical biodiscovery efforts that facilitate the sharing of monetary and non-monetary benefits between users and providers of genetic resources in line with the Nagoya Protocol provisions.

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT AND GEF AGENCY**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT.**

| NAME | POSITION | MINISTRY | DATE(MM/dd/yyyy) |
|------|----------|----------|------------------|
| n/a  |          |          |                  |

**B. GEF AGENCY) CERTIFICATION**

|   |   |                         |  |                   |                             |
|---|---|-------------------------|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for project identification and preparation.</b> |   |                         |  |                   |                             |
| <b>Agency Coordinator, Agency name</b>  | <b>Signature</b>  | <b>DATE(MM/dd/yyyy)</b> | <b>Project Contact Person</b>                              | <b>Telephone</b>  | <b>Email Address</b>        |
| Adriana Dinu<br>UNDP/GEF<br>Executive<br>Coordinator and<br>Director a.i.   |  | March 20, 2014          | Santiago Carrizosa,<br>Senior<br>Technical<br>Adviser, EBD | +507 302-<br>4510 | santiago.carrizosa@undp.org |

**Annex 1: GEF projects in support of ABS.**

**GEF ABS Projects**

| <b>Project ID</b>               | <b>IA</b> | <b>Country</b>  | <b>Project Type</b> | <b>Project Title</b>  | <b>Approval Date</b> | <b>GEF Grant</b> | <b>Co-financing (\$US)</b> | <b>Project Cost (\$US)</b> |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---|---------------------|---|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>GEF-4<br/>GEF Trust Fund</b> |           |   |                     |   |                      |                  |                            |                            |
| 4091                            | UNEP      | Ethiopia  | FSP                 | Capacity Building for ABS and Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants                          | 8 June 2010          | 2,047,000        | 2,025,000                  | 4,072,000                  |
| 3801                            | UNEP      | India   | FSP                 | Strengthening the Implementation of the Biological Diversity Act and Rules with Focus on its ABS Provisions | 25 March 2011        | 3,561,000        | 6,278,000                  | 9,839,000                  |
| 2820                            | UNEP      | Regional (Cameroon, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Senegal, South Africa) | FSP                 | Supporting the Development and Implementation of ABS Policies in Africa                                     | 13 May 2010          | 1,177,300        | 1,002,049                  | 2,179,349                  |
| 3855                            | UNEP      | Regional (Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican)                          | MS P                | Strengthening the Implementation of ABS Regimes in Latin America and the Caribbean                          | 7 April 2009         | 850,000          | 952,166                    | 1,802,166                  |

|  |      |  |     |  |                  |           |             |            |
|--|------|--|-----|--|------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
|  |      | Republic, Ecuador, Guyana, Panama, Peru)   |     |  |                  |           |             |            |
| 3853   | UNEP | Regional (Brunei, Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam) | MSP | Building Capacity for Regionally Harmonized National Processes for Implementing CBD Provisions on ABS  | 11 May 2009      | 750,000   | 750,000     | 1,500,000  |
| <b>GEF-5<br/>GEF Trust Fund</b>                      |      |  |     |  |                  |           |             |            |
| 4415   | UNEP | Global   | MSP | Capacity Building for the Early Entry into Force of the Protocol on ABS  | 4 February 2011  | 944,750   | 1,159,400   | 2,104,150  |
| 4618   | UNEP | Guatemala  | MSP | ABS and Protection of Traditional Knowledge to Promote Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use   | 20 October 2011  | 874,500   | 892,500     | 1,767,000  |
| 5593   | UNDP | Malaysia   | MSP | Developing and Implementing a National Access and Benefit Sharing Framework  | 22 October 2013  | 1,970,000 | 5,833,000   | 7,803,000  |
| 5605   | UNDP | Morocco  | MSP | Developing a National Framework on Access to and Benefit-Sharing of Genetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge as a Strategy to Contribute to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of biodiversity in Morocco | 11 November 2013 | 812,786   | 1,400,000   | 2,212,786  |
| 5533   | UNDP | China  | FSP | Developing and Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge   | Pending          | 4,436,210 | 22,236,000  | 26,672,210 |
| 5653   | UNDP | Viet Nam   | MSP | Capacity Building for the Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing   | Pending          | 2,190,000 | \$7,690,000 | 9,880,000  |
| <b>GEF-5<br/>Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund</b> |      |  |     |  |                  |           |             |            |
| 4780   | UNDP | Panama   | MSP | Promoting the application of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit  | 13 December 2011 | 1,000,000 | 3,422,000   | 4,422,000  |

|      |      |                    |     |  |                   |           |           |            |
|------|------|--------------------|-----|--|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
|      |      |                    |     | Sharing in Panama  |                   |           |           |            |
| 5160 | UNDP | Colombia           | MSP | The Development and Production of Natural Dyes in the Choco Region of Colombia for the Food, Cosmetics and Personal Care Industries Under the Provisions of the Nagoya Protocol                  | 28 September 2012 | 980,000   | 1,516,500 | 2,496,500  |
| 5170 | UNDP | Fiji               | MSP | Discovering Nature-Based Products and Building Capacities for the Application of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing  | 2 October 2012    | 970,000   | 2,370,000 | 3,340,000  |
| 5172 | UNEP | Global             | MSP | Global Support for the Entry into Force of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing   | 1 October 2012    | 1,000,000 | 627,500   | 1,627,500  |
| 5264 | WB   | Gabon              | FSP | The implementation of activities related to Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) in Gabon (Component 4 under the project "Sustainable Management of Critical Wetlands Ecosystems) | 12 April 2013     | 1,000,000 | 3,594,014 | 4,594,014  |
| 5420 | UNDP | Costa Rica         | MSP | Promoting the Application of the Nagoya Protocol through the Development of Nature-based Products, Benefit-sharing and Biodiversity Conservation   | 7 May 2013        | 979,566   | 4,619,309 | 5,598,875  |
| 5448 | UNDP | Bhutan             | MSP | Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Bhutan  | 28 August 2013    | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 3,000,000  |
| 5454 | UNEP | Regional           | MSP | Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol for the Member countries of the Central African Forests Commission COMIFAC  | 20 August 2013    | 1,762,557 | 8,300,000 | 10,062,557 |
| 5613 | UNDP | Cook Islands       | MSP | Strengthening the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in the Cook Islands   | 23 December 2013  | 970,000   | 1,499,535 | 2,469,535  |
| 5634 | UNEP | Regional (Pacific) | MSP | Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the countries of the Pacific Region  | 11 December 2013  | 1,980,000 | 290,000   | 2,270,000  |
| 5626 | UNEP | Kenya              | MSP | Developing the Microbial Biotechnology Industry from Kenya's Soda Lakes in line with the Nagoya Protocol   | 5 December 2013   | 1,000,000 | 1,751,845 | 2,751,845  |

Annex 2. Countries that have received funds from the GEF and the ABS Capacity Development Initiative for development and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol

| GEF Eligible Countries           | GEF Funded Projects |                 |                  |                       |      | ABS-<br>CDI |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|------|-------------|
|                                  | S                   | R               | GEF Trust Fund   |                       | NPIF |             |
|                                  |                     |                 | GEF4             | GEF5                  |      |             |
| Country                          | Regional Caribbean  | Regional Africa | Regional Pacific | All Regional Projects |      |             |
| Afghanistan                      |                     |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Albania                          |                     | 1               |                  |                       |      |             |
| Algeria                          | 1                   |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Angola                           |                     |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Antigua and Barbuda              | 1                   |                 |                  | 1                     |      | 1           |
| Argentina                        | 1                   |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Armenia                          |                     |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Azerbaijan                       |                     |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Bahamas                          |                     |                 |                  |                       |      | 1           |
| Bangladesh                       | 1                   |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Barbados                         |                     |                 |                  | 1                     |      | 1           |
| Belarus                          |                     |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Belize                           |                     |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Benin                            | 1                   | 1               |                  |                       |      | 1           |
| Bhutan                           | 1                   | 1               |                  | 1                     |      |             |
| Bolivia (Plurinational State of) |                     |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina           |                     |                 |                  |                       |      |             |
| Botswana                         |                     | 1               |                  |                       |      |             |
| Brazil                           | 1                   |                 |                  |                       |      |             |

S = Signature; R = Ratification; GEF4 & 5 = GEF Trust Fund; NPIF = Nagoya Implementation Fund; ABS-CDI = ABS Capacity Development Initiative

|                                       |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Burkina Faso                          | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Burundi                               |   |   |   |   |   |  | 1 |   | 1 |   |
| Cambodia                              | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Cameroon                              |   |   | 1 |   |   |  | 1 |   | 1 | 1 |
| Cape Verde                            | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Central African Republic              | 1 |   |   |   |   |  | 1 |   | 1 |   |
| Chad                                  | 1 |   |   |   |   |  | 1 |   | 1 |   |
| Chile                                 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| China                                 |   |   |   | 1 |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Colombia                              | 1 |   | 1 |   | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |
| Comoros                               |   | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Congo                                 | 1 |   |   |   |   |  | 1 |   | 1 |   |
| Cook Islands                          |   |   |   |   | 1 |  |   | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Costa Rica                            | 1 |   | 1 |   | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |
| Côte d'Ivoire                         | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |   | 1 |
| Croatia                               |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Cuba                                  |   |   | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Democratic People's Republic of Korea |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo      | 1 |   |   |   |   |  | 1 |   | 1 |   |
| Djibouti                              | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Dominica                              |   |   |   |   |   |  | 1 |   | 1 | 1 |
| Dominican Republic                    | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   | 1 |
| Ecuador                               | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Egypt                                 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| El Salvador                           | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Equatorial Guinea                     |   |   |   |   |   |  | 1 |   | 1 |   |
| Eritrea                               |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Ethiopia                              |   | 1 | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Fiji                                  |   | 1 |   | 1 |   |  |   | 1 | 1 |   |
| Gabon                                 | 1 | 1 |   | 1 |   |  | 1 |   | 1 |   |
| Gambia                                |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Georgia                               |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Ghana                                 | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Grenada                               | 1 |   |   |   |   |  | 1 |   | 1 |   |
| Guatemala                             | 1 |   |   | 1 |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Guinea                                | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Guinea-Bissau                         | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |

|                                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Guyana                           |   |   | 1 |   |   | 1 |  |   | 1 |  | 1 |
| Haiti                            |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Honduras                         | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| India                            | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Indonesia                        | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Iran (Islamic Republic of)       |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Iraq                             |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Jamaica                          |   |   |   |   |   | 1 |  |   | 1 |  |   |
| Jordan                           | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Kazakhstan                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Kenya                            | 1 |   | 1 |   | 1 |   |  |   |   |  | 1 |
| Kiribati                         |   |   |   |   |   |   |  | 1 | 1 |  |   |
| Kyrgyzstan                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic |   | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Lebanon                          | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Lesotho                          |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Liberia                          |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Libya                            |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Madagascar                       | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |  | 1 |
| Malawi                           |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  | 1 |
| Malaysia                         |   |   | 1 | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Maldives                         |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Mali                             | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Marshall Islands                 |   |   |   |   |   |   |  | 1 | 1 |  |   |
| Mauritania                       | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Mauritius                        |   | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Mexico                           | 1 | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |  | 1 |
| Micronesia (Federated States of) | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Mongolia                         | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Montenegro                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Morocco                          | 1 |   |   | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |  | 1 |
| Mozambique                       | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Myanmar                          |   | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Namibia                          |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  | 1 |
| Nauru                            |   |   |   |   |   |   |  | 1 | 1 |  |   |
| Nepal                            |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Nicaragua                        |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |

|   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Niger                                     | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Nigeria                                   | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Niue                                      |   |   |   |  |   |   | 1 | 1 |   |  |
| Pakistan                                  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Palau                                     | 1 |   |   |  |   |   | 1 | 1 |   |  |
| Panama                                    | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |   |   |   |   |  |
| Papua New Guinea                          |   |   |   |  |   |   | 1 | 1 |   |  |
| Paraguay                                  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Peru                                      | 1 |   | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Philippines                               |   |   | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Republic of Moldova                       | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Russian Federation                        |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Rwanda                                    | 1 | 1 |   |  |   |   | 1 |   | 1 |  |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis                     |   |   |   |  |   | 1 |   |   | 1 |  |
| Saint Lucia                               |   |   |   |  |   | 1 |   |   | 1 |  |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines          |   |   |   |  |   | 1 |   |   | 1 |  |
| Samoa                                     |   |   |   |  |   |   |   | 1 | 1 |  |
| Sao Tome and Principe                     |   |   |   |  |   |   | 1 |   | 1 |  |
| Senegal                                   | 1 |   | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Serbia                                    | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Seychelles                                | 1 | 1 |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Sierra Leone                              |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Solomon Islands                           |   |   |   |  |   |   |   | 1 | 1 |  |
| Somalia                                   | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| South Africa                              | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| South Sudan                               |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Sri Lanka                                 |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Sudan                                     | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Suriname                                  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Swaziland                                 |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Syrian Arab Republic                      |   |   | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Tajikistan                                | 1 | 1 |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Thailand                                  | 1 |   | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Timor-Leste                               |   |   | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Togo                                      | 1 |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Tonga                                     |   |   |   |  |   |   |   | 1 | 1 |  |



|                                    |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
|------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|--|--|----|
| Trinidad and Tobago                |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Tunisia                            | 1  |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Turkey                             |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Turkmenistan                       |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Tuvalu                             |    |    |    |   |   |   |    | 1  | 1  |  |  |    |
| Uganda                             |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| United Republic of Tanzania        |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Uruguay                            | 1  |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Uzbekistan                         |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Vanuatu                            | 1  |    |    |   |   |   |    | 1  | 1  |  |  |    |
| Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Viet Nam                           |    |    | 1  | 1 |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Yemen                              | 1  |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Zambia                             |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| Zimbabwe                           |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |  |  |    |
| TOTAL                              | 62 | 28 | 25 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 33 |  |  | 15 |