



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening human resources, legal frameworks and institutional capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol			
Country(ies):	Global. Participating countries: Albania, Belarus, Botswana, Colombia, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, India, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan and Uruguay	GEF Project ID: ¹	5731
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5381
Other Executing Partner(s):	UNDP, National Competent Authorities, ABS focal points	Submission Date:	16 March 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	1,080,000
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 		

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-4	Outcome 4.1: Legal and regulatory frameworks, and administrative procedures established that enable access to genetic resources and benefit sharing in accordance with the CBD provisions	Output 4.1. Access and benefit-sharing (ABS) agreements (up to 24) that recognize the core ABS principles of Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits.	GEFTF	12,000,000	16,972,123
Total project costs				12,000,000	16,972,123

B. 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	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Strengthening the legal, policy and institutional capacity to develop national ABS frameworks	TA	National ABS legal/policy frameworks developed and/or strengthened with the participation of all stakeholders including indigenous peoples and local communities (ILCs)	-National ABS law/regulation/policy proposals drafted and submitted for approval to competent authorities. -Improved capacities of National Competent	GEFTF	4,663,409	6,743,272

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

	<p>- 21 participating countries strengthen, amend, and/or adopt ABS-related policy and legislation (specific targets for all 21 countries included in the Project Results Framework, Annex A).</p> <p><u>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 (CHM) – capacities improved as measured by the UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard</u> (scores for all 24 participating countries included in the Project Results Framework, Annex A).</p> <p><u>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</u></p> <p>- 19 participating countries adopt national policy measures for protecting traditional knowledge (TK), innovations and practices, and customary uses of biological and genetic resources (specific targets for all 19 countries included in the Project Results Framework, Annex A).</p> <p>- 22 countries with a national ABS CHM, an improved web page with relevant ABS information, or a national biodiversity CHM with ABS-related</p>	<p>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 biodiscovery 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:</p> <p>a) a Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) for countries that have a national ABS framework and are willing to advertise such 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>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>information (specific targets for all 22 countries included in the Project Results Framework, Annex A).</p> <p>- 840 key stakeholders in 24 countries trained through the project regarding ABS rules and procedures (granting of permits, assessment of access applications, core principles of PIC and MAT and their application, and rights and roles of ILCs, among others); and negotiate ABS agreements (specific targets for all 24 countries included in the Project Results Framework, Annex A).</p>				
2. Building trust between users and providers of genetic resources to facilitate the identification of bio-discovery efforts	TA	<p><u>Existing and emerging initiatives and opportunities for bio-discovery projects identified and strengthened with improved research capabilities to add value to their own genetic resources and TK associated with genetic resources</u></p> <p>- 23 participating countries with commercial agreements between users and providers of genetic resources in progress or concluded as a result of the project (specific targets for all 23 countries included in the Project Results Framework, Annex A).</p> <p>- 17 participating countries with ethical codes of conduct or guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources (specific targets for all 17 countries included in the Project Results Framework, Annex A).</p> <p><u>Stakeholders (government officials, population of researchers, local</u></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 ILCs.</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</p>	GEFTF	4,046,343	5,463,890

		<p><u>communities, and relevant industry) targeted by the campaign are aware of the National law, CBD and Nagoya Protocol provisions related to ABS and TK (percentage of stakeholders for all 24 participating countries included in the Project Results Framework, Annex A).</u></p> <p>- Change in knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) of specific groups (e.g., researchers, local communities, and relevant industry) that may use or benefit from ABS with respect to national ABS frameworks, the CBD, and Nagoya Protocol in 16 countries (baseline and targets will be determined during project inception phase)</p>	<p>and Nagoya Protocol targeting policy-makers, researchers, ILCs, 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>			
3. Strengthening the capacity of indigenous and local communities to contribute to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol	TA	<p><u>ABS bio-cultural community protocols (BCPs) and TK registers adopted by local communities in 19 participating countries (specific targets for all 19 countries included in the Project Results Framework, Annex A).</u></p> <p><u>Capacities of local ILCs to negotiate ABS agreements improved by X% as measured by the ABS tracking tool (baselines and targets for countries that have chosen to work on this outcome will be established during project implementation)</u></p>	<p>-Bio-cultural community protocols, model contractual clauses constitute the basis for clarifying PIC and MAT requirements between users and providers of traditional knowledge and biological resources.</p> <p>- 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.</p>	GEFTF	2,571,820	3,810,961
4. Implementing a community of practices on ABS and South-South Cooperation mechanisms	TA	<p><u>Community of practice on ABS serves as a knowledge-sharing platform for operationalizing a South-South cooperation framework for bilateral and multilateral collaboration between countries at regional and global levels</u></p>	<p>- Community of practice on ABS at the regional and global levels serves as a collaboration and information tool to support the implementation of ABS mechanisms under the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>- ABS experts' roster provides technical assistance and advisory services to</p>	GEFTF	147,000	147,000

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CoP on ABS implemented and operating at regional and global level by project mid-point - Fifty (50) experts on ABS mapped and incorporated into a regional and global database by project mid-point - Fifteen (15) technical assistance requirements on ABS fulfilled at regional and global level by project end - Twenty (20) knowledge products on specific ABS topics developed at the regional and global levels by project end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> governments and other stakeholders on environmental law, biotechnology, economics, sharing of benefits, among other ABS-related topics. - Systematized experiences, best practices, lessons learned, and knowledge products on ABS support countries' ABS-related activities. - Website serves as a virtual knowledge platform for the ABS community of practice and for the dissemination of information about the project. 				
Subtotal					11,428,572	16,165,123
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEFTF	571,428	807,000
Total project costs					12,000,000	16,972,123

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of the Environment (Albania)	Cash	50,000
National Government	Ministry of the Environment (Albania)	In-kind	650,000
National Government	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (Belarus)	In-kind	700,000
National Government	Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism (Botswana)	In-kind	462,941
National Government	Environmental and Sustainable Development Ministry of Colombia	In-kind	261,040
Other	Amazon Institute of Scientific Research – SINCHI (Colombia)	In-kind	211,105
GEF Agency	UNDP (Comoros)	Cash	50,000
National Government	Direction Générale de l'Environnement et des Forêts (Comoros)	Cash	2,196,000*
National Government	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (Dominican Republic)	Cash	118,200
National Government	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (Dominican Republic)	In-kind	235,000
National Government	Ministry of the Environment (Ecuador)	Cash	398,340
Bilateral Aid Agency	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH (Ecuador)	In-kind	165,000

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

National Government	Ministry of State and Environmental Affairs (Egypt)	In-kind	700,000
Bilateral Aid Agency	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH (Ethiopia)	Cash	500,000
Bilateral Aid Agency	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH (Ethiopia)	In-kind	200,000
National Government	Secretariat of Energy, Natural Resources, Environment, and Mines (Honduras)	In-kind	664,497
National Government	National Biodiversity Authority (India)	Cash	450,000
National Government	National Biodiversity Authority (India)	In-kind	250,000
National Government	Ministry of Environment (Jordan)	In-kind	1,130,000
GEF Agency	UNDP (Kazakhstan)	In-kind	50,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture (Kazakhstan)	In-kind	1,000,000
National Government	National Environment Management Authority (Kenya)	Cash	50,000
National Government	National Environment Management Authority (Kenya)	In-kind	50,000
National Government	Minister for the Environment, Green Development and Tourism (Mongolia)	Cash	175,000
National Government	Ministry for the Environment, Green Development and Tourism (Mongolia)	In-kind	175,000
National Government	Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry (Myanmar)	In-kind	365,000
National Government	Ministry of Environment (Panama)	Cash	180,000
National Government	Ministry of Environment (Panama)	In-kind	60,000
National Government	Rwanda Environment Management Authority (Rwanda)	In-kind	350,000
National Government	Ministry of Finance (Samoa)	In-kind	250,000
National Government	Ministry of Finance (Samoa)	Cash	200,000
National Government	Ministry of Environment, Energy, and Climate Change (Seychelles)	In-kind	1,995,000
National Government	Seychelles Bureau of Standards	In-kind	105,000
GEF Agency	UNDP (South Africa)	Cash	50,000
National Government	Department of Environmental Affairs (South Africa)	In-kind	700,000
National Government	Higher Council for Environment & Natural Resources (Sudan)	Cash	370,000
National Government	Higher Council for Environment & Natural Resources (Sudan)	In-kind	330,000
GEF Agency	UNDP (Tajikistan)	Cash	10,000
National Government	National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center (Tajikistan)	In-kind	340,000
National Government	National Directorate of Environment (Uruguay)	In-kind	350,000
Other	United Nations Volunteers Programme	Cash	425,000
Total Co-financing			16,972,123

* 2,000,000 EURO (1 EURO = 1.098 USD)

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Global: Albania,	12,000,000	1,080,000	13,080,000

GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

			Belarus, Botswana, Colombia, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, India, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Uruguay			
Total Grant Resources				12,000,000	1,080,000	13,080,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	297,650	20,000	317,650
National/Local Consultants	150,000	13,000	163,000

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.: NA

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. NA

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: NA

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

1. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address remains the same as it was stated in the PIF. However, PPG activities allowed to quantify the baseline investments for all the 24 participating countries as follows:

	Country	Baseline Investments
1	Albania	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2015-2018 period in Albania are estimated to be \$13,426,000 USD. There are different projects focusing on biodiversity conservation in the country that are related to sharing the benefits arising from the use of genetic resources. These include projects such as the German Development Corporation (GIZ)–Ministry of Environment’s Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity at Lakes Prespa, Ohrid and Shkodra (Skadar), with a total budget of \$2,160,000 USD (2 million Euros). Also, during recent years, work on protected areas (PAs) has focused on transboundary areas, in particular with regard to the development of the Prespa Transboundary Biosphere Reserve. This project is funded by the German Development Bank (KfW) in the amount of \$3,840,480 USD (3,556,000 Euros) and \$298,080 USD (276,000 Euros) from national funds. The Italian Cooperation and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) also have a project related to PAs that promotes innovative approaches to PA management, with a total budget of \$2,376,000 (2.2 million Euros). These PA-related projects will make an important contribution to the conservation of the country’s genetic resources, building national capacities related to ABS and promoting the protection of TK. Albania is a candidate country to join the European Union, and as a part of that work there

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

		is a very important initiative to help prepare the country to comply with the Natura 2000 Network designation process. This is a 4-year project (2015-2018) funded by the Italian Cooperation, with a total budget of \$4,752,000 USD (4.4 million Euros), which will have an important impact on access to information and in promoting partnerships for biodiscovery.
2	Belarus	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2015-2018 period in Belarus are estimated to be \$1,279,930 USD. Most of the planned investments are by the government and are related to the research institutions that base their work on researching genetic resources. The most evident and direct investment is the yearly budget of the National Coordination Center for ABS (NCC-ABS) at the Institute of Genetics and Cytology within the Academy of Sciences of Belarus, with an investment of \$30,000 USD per year (an estimated total of \$150,000 USD). Specific projects include: a) <i>Maintenance of the State Cadastre of Fauna in the Republic of Belarus</i> , with an estimated budget of \$31,230 USD; b) the conservation of bison, including the genotyping of European bison (<i>Bison bonasus</i>) and study of the deposited DNA bank of the Belovezha bison (<i>Bialowieza bison</i>), with an estimated total budget of \$35,000 USD; c) cataloguing the genetic resources of rare and endangered wild plant species based on DNA identification technique with a total estimated budget of \$10,000 USD; d) the establishment of the forest seed storage bank and the development of the transplant nursery in Belavezhskaya Puscha National Park (Bialowieza Forest), with an estimated total budget of \$520,000 USD; and e) the State Program for the Development of Strong Protected Natural Areas System (2015-2019) with an estimated total budget \$456,000 USD and the identification of natural sanctuaries and migration corridors with a total budget of \$32,700 USD, both of which will contribute to the protection of the countries genetic resources; and f) funding of UNDP projects, particularly the National System of Environmental Monitoring, with a total of \$45,000 USD invested for monitoring purposes.
3	Botswana	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Botswana are estimated to be \$462,941 USD. This government investment (Department of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism) will be directed to strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and specific ABS activities with the participation of multiple stakeholders (e.g., various government agencies, ILCs, researchers, and the private sector).
4	Colombia	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2015-2019 period in Colombia are estimated to be \$6,518,338 USD. These investments include a study to develop guidelines on benefit sharing (to be codified in an official resolution or decree) with a total budget of \$29,000 USD, which will be provided through the Green and Sustainable Business Office of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS). A second initiative, "Expedición Bio" (Bio Expedition), will be carried out by Colciencias and other national institutions (including the MADS). This program will include four main areas of work, one of which includes bioprospecting, aimed at the promotion of genetic resources' commercial uses. This is a comprehensive initiative from the government that will run from 2014 to 2025, and which seeks to establish the country in the area of the global bioeconomy. The total budget for the Bio Expedition initiative is estimated at \$120 million USD, \$30 million of which will be dedicated to the biodiscovery component. Fund allocated for the 2016-2019 period under the biodiscovery component are estimated to be \$3 million USD, and will be used to strengthen national capacities and establish partnerships and identify opportunities for biodiscovery. GEF-funded projects that are part of the baseline include <i>Development and production of natural dyes in the Chocó Region of Colombia for food, cosmetics and personal care industries under the provision of the Nagoya Protocol</i> (GEF ID 5160) with a total budget of \$3,017,193 USD. Finally, the MADS will invest \$261,040 USD in ABS-related activities and the Sinchi will investment \$211,105 USD in research and development activities on genetic resources that will serve as the basis for future ABS partnership for the development of natural-based products.
5	Comoros	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Comoros are estimated to be \$2,246,000 USD. This includes an investment by the Direction Generals de l' Environnement et des Forets of \$2,196,000 USD and an investment by the UNDP of \$50,000 USD for strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for implementing the Nagoya Protocol, promoting biodiscovery initiatives, and promoting the participation of ILCs in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.
6	Dominican Republic	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in the Dominican Republic are estimated to be \$353,200 USD. The baseline investment will be limited to activities funded directly by the government to strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, building national capacities, and engaging multiple stakeholders in ABS (e.g., various government agencies, researchers, and the private sector). Finally, under the GIZ-funded project <i>Promotion of economic potentials of biodiversity in an equitable and sustainable way for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in Central America</i> for member states of the Central American Integration System (SICA), the Dominican Republic will benefit from regional capacity-building activities.
7	Ecuador	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Ecuador are estimated to be \$17,767,866 USD. These include the Ecuadorian Intellectual Property Institute (IEPI) program/line of work on TK with the goal to promote and protect TK and genetic resources associated with the ILCs, including activities for capacity-building and for the development of BCPs. The estimated investment for 2015 is \$170,170 USD. Associated with these activities is the work that will be carried out by National Secretariat of Higher Education, Science, and Technology (SENESCYT) also on TK protection, including promotion of a digital database on TK, the development of a protocol to conduct research on TK, the establishment of a dialogue processes to mainstream TK into different sectors, the legal protection of TK in the CODES, the development of the anti-biopiracy committee, information-sharing and capacity-building for the ILCs, and support for the development of BCPs, jointly with MAE. Additional government investments related to ABS will amount to \$398,340 USD. GEF-funded projects that are part of the baseline include <i>Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Diversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources</i> (GEF ID 5534) with a total budget of \$17,034,356 USD. Finally, the GIZ will support raising awareness and of the development of BCPs with an investment of \$165,000 USD.
8	Egypt	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Egypt are estimated to be

		\$700,000 USD. This will be a direct government investment by the Ministry of State and Environmental Affairs to strengthen the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and specific ABS activities with the participation of multiple stakeholders (e.g., various government agencies, ILCs, researchers, and the private sector).
9	Ethiopia	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Ethiopia are estimated to be approximately \$700,000 USD. This investment from the GIZ will support the strengthening of the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, promotion of biodiversity initiatives, and promotion of the participation of ILCs in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.
10	Honduras	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Honduras are estimated to be \$814,497 USD. These include a government-funded initiative of up to \$150,000 USD to be implemented by the Intellectual Property Rights Office to promote the identification and protection of biodiversity through collective marks of biodiversity-related products, including the use of associated TK. Additional government investments related to ABS (Ministry of the Environment) will total \$664,497 USD. Within the context of the UN- Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD)+ <i>Development of a REDD+ Programme in Honduras</i> , activities will be conducive to the development of a Draft Law on Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC), which is applicable broadly to the management of natural resources and will also cover access to genetic resources and associated TK. Finally, under the GIZ-funded project <i>Promotion of economic potentials of biodiversity in an equitable and sustainable way for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in Central America</i> for member states of the SICA, Honduras will benefit from regional capacity-building activities.
11	India	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2015-2018 period in India are estimated to be \$24.8 million USD. It is important to note that ABS policy and legislation has been in place for more than 10 years and therefore the country is allocating an important amount of funds to keep its public administration and there are several projects that connect and strengthen the implementation of the ABS policies and procedures. Apart from the important national budget to support the NBA and the SBB at the state level (\$1,089,000 USD), there are other projects directly related to ABS implementation. The first project, <i>Strengthening the Implementation of the Biological Diversity Act and Rules with focus on its Access and Benefit Sharing Provisions</i> , has been in operation since 2011 and it was set to end in 2015 (although it is likely to be extended for another year). This is a GEF-funded project, co-funded by the Indian Government and with the UNEP as the implementing agency (IA), with a total budget of \$9,839,000 USD. Another important project is the <i>Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN)</i> . This is a UNDP 2- to 3-year project (2015-2017) with impact on different aspects of ABS policy with a total budget of \$10,000,000 USD. There is also long-term technical assistance from the Norwegian Government to the NBA with a total investment of \$632,000 USD; this investment aims to promote dialogue and interaction on Multilateral Environmental Agreements, including the CBD and its implication on India's domestic Policy and Law. Last, an Indo-German ABS partnership (2016-2019) will contribute to strengthening the ABS institutional capacities and structures of the country, with a specific focus on developing and documenting best practices and developing success stories with the business sector. This project will have an estimated budget of \$3,240,000 USD (3 million Euros).
12	Jordan	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2015-2018 period are estimated to be around \$1,130,000 USD. There are three basic investments that constitute the project's baseline in Jordan. The first is the project on the Sustainable Use of Ecosystem Services in Jordan funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) Energy and Climate Fund (EKF-ESS) with a total budget of \$300,000 USD and coordinated by the Ministry of Environment. This investment will allow building the institutional and technical capacities to develop and enforce national biodiversity policies and strategies and to inform and influence policy-level decision-makers regarding the investments with potential impacts on natural resources so that ecosystems and their services are adequately and continuously taken into full account. The second set of projects relates to the creation of a national platform for plant genetic resources information and knowledge sharing and exchange for research and development for target groups and stakeholders in Jordan. This project is led by the National Center for Agriculture Research and Extension Center (NCARE) with an estimated budget of \$500,000 USD from different multilateral cooperation agencies. The third set of projects is led by the Royal Botanic Garden and focuses on the collection and preservation of seeds of all the native plant species of Jordan and the development of the "Wild Socioeconomic Plant Conservation Strategy for Jordan." This set of projects is funded by the Agence Française de Développement and Multilateral Cooperation in the amount of \$330,000 USD.
13	Kazakhstan	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Kazakhstan are estimated to be \$1,050,000 USD. This will include an investment from the Ministry of Agriculture of \$1,000,000 USD and an investment from the UNDP of \$50,000 USD for strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, promotion of biodiversity initiatives, and promotion of the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol.
14	Kenya	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Kenya are estimated to be \$2,841,110 USD. These include the project <i>Developing the Microbial Biotechnology Industry from Kenya's Soda Lakes in line with the Nagoya Protocol</i> (GEF ID 5626), which will be funded through the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF) with a total budget of \$2,665,110 USD. The baseline also includes an investment of \$76,000 USD in royalties from the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)/NOVOZYME bioprospecting partnership for research and development and a share of the resultant benefits. Finally, the KWS will invest \$100,000 USD for research and development and bioprospecting regulations in compliance with the Nagoya Protocol.
15	Mongolia	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Mongolia are estimated to be \$350,000 USD. This government investment (Ministry for the Environment, Green Development, and Tourism) will be directed to strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, promotion of biodiversity initiatives, and promoting the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol.
16	Myanmar	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Myanmar are estimated

		to be \$365,000 USD. This government investment (Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry) will be directed to strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, promoting biodiversity initiatives, and promoting the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol.
17	Panama	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Panama are estimated to be \$545,000 USD. The most important nationally funded project is for the safeguard, identification, compilation, and registry of TK supported by the Intellectual Property Office of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry for a total value of 275,000 USD during 2016. Similar investments are likely to happen in the coming years. In addition, within the context of the UN-REDD+ Program for Panama, a preliminary design of a BCP for the research and collection of medicinal plant species in indigenous lands (i.e., <i>comarcas</i>) is under development with an investment of \$30,000 USD. A government investment (Ministry of Environment) of \$240,000 USD will be directed to strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for implementing the Nagoya Protocol, promoting biodiversity initiatives, and promoting the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol. Finally, under the GIZ-funded project <i>Promotion of economic potentials of biodiversity in an equitable and sustainable way for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in Central America</i> for member states of the SICA, Panama will benefit from regional capacity-building activities.
18	Rwanda	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Rwanda are estimated to be \$350,000 USD. This government investment (Rwanda Environment Management Authority) will support the strengthening of the national legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, biodiversity initiatives, and the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol.
19	Samoa	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Samoa are estimated to be \$450,000 USD. This government investment (Ministry of Finance) will support the strengthening of the national legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, biodiversity initiatives, and the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol.
20	Seychelles	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in the Seychelles are estimated to be \$2,100,000 USD. This will include an investment by the Ministry of Environment, Energy, and Climate Change of \$195,000 USD and an investment by the Seychelles Bureau of Standards of \$105,000 USD directed towards strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, promoting biodiversity initiatives, and promoting the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol. Baseline investments will also include \$1,800,000 USD for the maintenance of ex-situ gene bank of plant resources at the National Botanical Gardens and the National Biodiversity Centre.
21	South Africa	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in South Africa are estimated to be \$750,000 USD. This will include an investment by the UNDP of \$50,000 USD in support of strengthening of the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, promoting biodiversity initiatives, and promoting the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol. Baseline investments will also include \$700,000 USD from the Department of Environmental Affairs, which will provide technical support to the Bioprospecting and Biodiversity Economy initiative in the country.
22	Sudan	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2015-2018 period in the Sudan are estimated to be \$726,000 USD. Most of these investments are direct government investments with a small amount (\$26,000 USD) coming from UNESCO. The lead institution for the expenditure of these investments is the Medicinal and Aromatic Plants Research Institute with \$620,000 USD. There are also investments for a total of \$80,000 USD, which is related to the legal modification of sectoral regulations, training in legal aspects of ABS, developing legal instruments, and generating policies related to ABS practices and TK that are either underway or will be during the course of this project (plant genetic resources and wildlife conservation).
23	Tajikistan	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Tajikistan are estimated to be \$350,000 USD. This will include an investment by the National Biodiversity, and Biosafety Center (NBBC) of \$340,000 USD and an investment by the UNDP of \$10,000 USD for strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, promoting biodiversity initiatives, and promoting the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol.
24	Uruguay	Existing and planned investments for programs and baseline activities for the 2016-2019 period in Uruguay are estimated to be \$350,000 USD. This government investment (National Directorate of Environment) will be directed to strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, promoting biodiversity initiatives, and promoting the participation of ILCs in implementing the Nagoya Protocol.

A. 5. 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:

2. The project final design is aligned with the original PIF. The project's strategy, including the structure of the project components, closely resembles the PIF that was approved by the GEF. However, a fourth project component was included in response to requests made by the participating countries during two regional project validation workshops held during the PPG phase in Panama City, Panama, and Istanbul, Turkey (the workshop reports are included in Annex 8.3 of the GEF Agency Project Document) to establish a Community of Practice (CoP) on ABS and the South-South Cooperation Framework. Accordingly, the new project component is: "Component 4– Implementing a

Community of Practice and South-South Cooperation Framework on ABS.” This new project component has been allocated \$147,000 USD from the GEF and \$147,000 USD in cofinancing from the United Nations Volunteers (UNV), who will operate as a Project Responsible Party and will be responsible for implementing this component. In addition, the project cofinancing increased from \$12,000,000 USD (cofinancing ratio: 1:1) as originally indicated in the PIF to \$16,972,923.17 USD (cofinancing ratio: 1:1.4) at the time of the CEO Endorsement.

3. The allocation of financial resources among the project components was revised based on a gap analysis and the specific needs of the participating countries to fulfill their obligations with the Nagoya Protocol. In addition, the project duration was reduced from 60 months to 36 months as part of a strategy to optimize the financial and technical assistance provided through the GEF grant to the project participating countries and to reduce operation costs that will be incurred if the project has a longer life. Accordingly, the new allocation of GEF funds and cofinancing is as follows:

Project Component	Grant Amount (USD)	Cofinancing (USD)
Component 1	4,663,409	6,743,272
Component 2	4,046,343	5,463,890
Component 3	2,571,820	3,810,961
Component 4	147,000	147,000
Subtotal	11,428,572	16,165,123
Project Management	571,428	807,000
Total Project Cost	12,000,000	16,972,123

4. In addition, the following changes were made to the project outputs, which do not represent a departure from the project’s strategy as defined originally in the PIF.

PIF Outputs (Component 1)	Project Document Outputs (Component 1)
<i>Outcome 1.2. 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 (CHM) - improved as measured by the ABS Tracking Tool</i>	<p><i>Outcome 1.2. 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 (CHM) - improved as measured by the UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard</i></p> <p>It was clarified that the baseline capacities of national and state competent authorities and related agencies were assessed using the UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard rather than the ABS Tracking Tool. Scores for all 24 participating countries are included in the Project Results Framework, Section 3. In addition, the GEF ABS Tracking Tool was completed for all 24 countries.</p>

5. A description of the four inter-related project components is included in *Section 2.5: Project objective, components, outcomes, and outputs* of the GEF Agency Project Document. Specific country-level activities related to project components 1, 2, and 3 for the 24 participating countries are included in Annex 8.2 of the same document.

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Risk	Level*	Risk Mitigation Strategy
Lack of political support	M	Political willingness was used as a selection criterion for the participating countries during the project design. In addition, country visits and regional validation workshops conducted during the PPG served to build commitment among decision-makers to the project. During project implementation, there will be awareness-raising campaigns to sustain the efforts and to elicit continued support from the project team through country visits and visits from the UNDP country offices; this will help to maintain the political support needed for the successful implementation of the project.
Lengthy	M	Drafting and passing legislation tends to take significant time. The project will ensure that all

legislative process		proposed legislation is at least submitted for approval during the 3 years that it will remain active. The project will implement capacity-building and awareness-raising activities for decision-makers and other key stakeholders at the beginning of the project so that the skills and knowledge are in place early to facilitate the drafting of all related legislation.
Turnover at the Ministerial level and changes in priorities	M	In addition, multiple activities to raise awareness among ministerial staff and decision-makers about ABS and the Nagoya Protocol will be implemented and will serve to highlight the importance of the project in fulfilling the commitments of the participating countries within the framework of the Nagoya Protocol. When changes occur at the ministerial level, the project, with support from the UNDP country offices, will inform the new environmental officials about the project, its objective, progress, and achievements, as well as the project's benefits regarding ABS and contributions to achieve national and global environmental goals. Different platforms will be used for this, such as the project's steering committee, learning and knowledge-sharing processes that will be part of the project's activities at the country level and the project's monitoring and evaluation plan, country visits by the project staff, as well as the project's website to be developed as part of the CoP on ABS. Finally, increasing the capacity of government officials has been shown to increase professional retention. Being better prepared on matters relating to ABS becomes a bonus for officials who rarely have the opportunity for training.
Failure to bring together the private sector, ILCs, and government	M	The GEF Agency, through its offices in the participating countries and technical support from the project team bases in the UNDP's regional hubs (Turkey, Panama, and Thailand), 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 and beverages industries).
Gender equality concerns	M	Gender concerns have been integrated in the project design. At the national level (24 participating countries), the project will ensure that the ABS regime helps to improve gender equality and women's empowerment. Project activities will integrate a gender focus and data in their design and monitoring processes to ensure that women are empowered to participate fully and also benefit from the use of genetic resources. Specific attention will be focused on ensuring the active participation of women, particularly in drafting the ABS framework, providing PIC and MAT and ensuring the benefit sharing terms of equitable. At the local level, the project will strengthen women's capacity, as they are the gatekeepers of TK and the primary providers/collectors/managers of natural and genetic resources. Through the development of BCPs as well and the implementation of social and economic development activities, the project will ensure that women have an equal participation in the project as men. The strong participatory role envisaged for the ethnic minority women in the project will also contribute to ensuring social security.
Activities proposed may affect environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas	M	Environmental sustainability and sustainable use of biodiversity measures have been incorporated in the project design. The introduction of an effective national ABS regime will contribute towards biodiversity conservation and encourage sustainable use of biological resources. The project will ensure that environmental sustainability principles are integrated into implementation to avoid harmful environmental impacts and reduce its environmental footprint. In particular, Component 2 focused on biodiscovery and product development and commercialization from genetic resources materials will include provisions for sustainable harvest, cultivation and use of natural resources. The project will also recommend set up of a benefit sharing mechanism to channel and reinvest proceeds from ABS agreements towards the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of its components. Capacity development and awareness-raising activities will also mitigate the potential negative impacts from users and providers of biological and genetic resources.
Illegal utilization and/or commercialization of biological and genetic resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous people	M	Indigenous people are key stakeholders in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. The project will be implemented considering national policies and rights of indigenous peoples regarding their traditional lands and use of natural resources. In addition, indigenous people will be consulted and will actively participate in project implementation to ensure that their rights and concerns are registered. Project activities will include the development of intellectual property rights (IPR) and licensing strategies to be used by multiple stakeholders, including indigenous peoples, and the develop of ethical codes of conduct and guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources, will provide additional assurance to indigenous peoples that their beliefs and values are taking into account when identifying and implementing biodiscovery projects. Also, drafts of

	sectoral guidelines (ABS rules and biodiversity-based research and development activities in indigenous lands) and information regarding ABS rules that apply to biodiversity-based research and development activities for various sectors will be made available to indigenous peoples to ensure that these consider community laws and procedures as well as customary use and exchange.
--	---

* L = Low; M = Moderate; H = High.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

6. As stated in the PIF, this project will coordinate activities with the on-going GEF projects funded using STAR and NPIF financial resources in GEF-4 and GEF-5, as well as with projects funded by the ABS Capacity Development Initiative in the Pacific, Africa, Asia, and LAC and other non-GEF funded initiatives. During the PPG, complementarity and coordination mechanisms between past and current ABS initiatives were outlined based on country visits and regional project validation workshops (Istanbul, Turkey; and Panama City, Panama); complementarity and coordination mechanisms with other relevant GEF financed initiatives and non-GEF ABS initiatives are summarized in *Section 2.4: Design principles and strategic considerations (Table 2)* of the GEF Agency Project Document. In addition, contact was established with the ABS Capacity Development Initiative to discuss opportunities for cooperation; a representative of the initiative (i.e., Hartmut Meyer, GIZ) participated in the regional validation workshop held in Istanbul, Turkey. Furthermore, a fourth project component was included in response to the request made by the participating countries during two regional validation workshops to establish a CoP on ABS and the South-South Cooperation Framework. Through this new project component, cooperation between existing and future ABS related initiatives will be enhanced and interaction with the broad network of experts involved with the initiative will be sought as part of the activities for the mapping of ABS experts to provide support for participating countries within the framework of the ABS CoP and South-South Cooperation mechanisms.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

7. The successful implementation of the project will largely depend on effective communication with the multiple project stakeholders and the implementation of mechanisms to ensure these stakeholders' participation. During the PPG, a stakeholder analysis was completed for all the 24 project participating countries. A description of the principal stakeholders involved in the country-level project activities and how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation is presented in *Section 2.11: Stakeholder involvement plan* and *Annex 4: Stakeholder Involvement Plan per Country* of the GEF Agency Project Document.

8. UNDP Country Offices will provide programmatic and administrative support to aid in the execution of the project's activities and the timely and efficient delivery of the desired outcomes at the country level. Also, the UNV will play a key role in the development of a CoP on ABS and promoting South-South cooperation between the project participating countries (Component 4). The UNV will also participate as a project co-financier.

B.2 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 (LDCE/SCCF):

9. The project will provide monetary and non-monetary benefits for stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of ABS law and/or policy; these include ILCs, which are key stakeholders in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. ILCs will benefit from capacity-building regarding ABS and the Nagoya Protocol, including the negotiation of ABS agreements, obtaining PIC, establishing MAT, and the sharing of benefits. Through the implementation of pilot initiatives on ABS and the use of case studies for BCP development, the ILCs in selected countries will have direct experience in implementation of ABS and will be aware about the multiple derived benefits. BCPs will enable ILCs to affirm their role as drivers of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within their territories where they will be implemented in ways that support their livelihoods and traditional ways of life. Codes of conduct and guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources tailored to the needs of the research community and ILCs will provide useful models to follow for access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing during and after project completion.

10. Gender considerations were properly included in the final project design, including the participation of women in activities of the 24 project participating countries. The stakeholder analysis conducted for the participating countries allowed identifying women groups involved in the use of biological and genetic resources and defining the role of women in the project. In the identification of communities involved in the management of genetic/natural resources to serve as a case study for the development of the BCP priority will be given to a community with a high number of women participating. In addition, women will be beneficiaries of training and awareness activities at the national and local levels, and will be consulted for the development of national ABS law/regulation/policy proposals. Information related to women's customary uses of biological and genetic resources and associated TK would be documented and use as a basis for promoting biodiscovery initiatives between users and providers of genetic resources.

11. Other stakeholders such as private businesses and key industries and researchers will also benefit from capacity development to raise their awareness of the benefits associated with biodiscovery and ABS agreements, and their role in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The projects will also create awareness about the importance genetic resources for food security by promoting research and partnerships for biodiscovery in the agricultural and other sectors.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

12. The GEF strategy (i.e., GEF alternative scenario) for assisting countries in the development and strengthening of their national ABS frameworks, human resources and administrative capabilities to implement the Nagoya Protocol will be more cost-effective in the short and long terms than the alternative approach (i.e., business-as-usual scenario). Under the business-as-usual scenario limited legal, policy and institutional capacity to develop national ABS frameworks will prevail, together with limited trust between users and providers of genetic resources and inadequate participation of indigenous and local communities to implement the Protocol, thereby preventing the delivery of global environmental benefits. In line with the GEF Council's guidance on assessing the cost-effectiveness of projects (Cost-Effectiveness Analysis in GEF Projects, GEF/C.25/11, April 29, 2005), a qualitative approach to identifying the alternative with the best value and feasibility for achieving the project objective was used.

13. Under the GEF scenario, the project considers cost-effective elements to achieve the objective proposed. First, it builds on previous ABS projects that led to the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol in some of the participating countries and on the progress that has been made towards their implementation. To this end, for the final project design a gap analysis was completed through country visits and subsequent consultations with the focal points and other stakeholders to identify the specific needs of each country for implementation and to establish complementarities with other ongoing or planned ABS initiatives. This included a baseline assessment of the institutional capacity of key government agencies related to ABS within each country using the UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard to help identify the capacity-building needs within the agencies.

14. Second, the project will promote partnerships for biodiscovery between users and providers of genetic resources building on existing experiences in some participating countries that are already fulfilling some of the obligations under the Nagoya Protocol (e.g., India, Kenya, Panama, and South Africa) and by implementing pilot initiatives that will generate knowledge and lessons learned to use for establishing future partnerships for biodiscovery and for developing guidelines for research and TK, business models, IPR, and other ABS issues. The project will build capacities at the national and local levels including those of ILCs, which would have not happened in the short term without this GEF investment. Through the establishment of clear commercial agreements between users and providers of genetic resources and the development of criteria for the distribution of benefits, together with creating greater awareness about ABS and the Nagoya Protocol at the local, and national levels, the project will encourage further private investment in biodiscovery and will generate future benefits for ILCs and biodiversity.

15. Third, PIC and MAT requirements between users and providers of TK and biological resources will be clarified through the development of BCPs in close consultation with ILCs and through case studies in selected countries where local communities are using genetic resources. These experiences will also provide lessons learned for BCP development and for promoting the participation of ILCs in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, which will be used in-country to promote similar initiatives and in other countries where it proves to be a cost-effective approach in both the medium and long term.

16. In the "business as usual" scenario, the prevailing environment will be characterized by: a) slow progress for the implementation of obligations under the Nagoya Protocol in the participating countries and for achieving the

international technical standards for best practices required by the ABS objectives of the CBD; b) the fact that implementation readiness of national ABS authorities and other related stakeholders will not be achieved in the short term and local experience and information-sharing on the development of PIC, MAT, and benefit-sharing will remain inadequate; c) institutional efforts to build trust between users and providers of genetic resources, including the identification and promotion of ABS partnerships and the documentation of lessons learned and of best practices will remain limited; d) a lack of available information to stakeholders (e.g., researcher, ILCs, and the private sector) related to genetic resources research development, IPR, and to related-business models; e) limited involvement of ILCs in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and the fact that a lack of experiences and lessons learned related to the development of BCPs will provide limited opportunities for obtaining PIC and negotiating MAT between users and providers of TK and genetic resources; and f) limited participation of ILCs in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol due to few opportunities for awareness-raising and capacity-building for ILCs regarding ABS.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

17. Project execution performance will be monitored through the following standard UNDP/GEF M&E activities.

Project start:

18. A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 3 months of project start, with participation of those with assigned roles in the project organization structure listed under Section 5.1 of the GEF Agency Project Document. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the first project year. It is anticipated that the Inception Workshop will also be the de facto first meeting of the Project Steering Committee (PSC).

19. The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues, including the following:

- a) Assisting all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services, and complementary responsibilities of UNDP and Project Coordination Unit (PCU) staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The ToRs, including those for project staff may be discussed again, if needed.
- b) Based on the Project Results Framework and the ABS Tracking Tool, the AWP for the first year will be finalized. Indicators, targets and their means of verification will be reviewed, revised (as needed) and agreed, and assumptions and risks will be re-checked.
- c) A detailed overview of reporting, M&E requirements will be provided. The M&E work plan budget will be agreed and scheduled.
- d) Financial reporting procedures and obligations will be discussed.

20. Together with the UNDP/GEF-approved Project Document, the Inception Workshop Report will constitute a key reference document for the project and will be prepared and shared with participants to clarify and formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

21. Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results-Based Management Platform.

22. Based on the initial risk analysis submitted (Annex 1 of the GEF Agency Project Document), the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Based on the information recorded in ATLAS, a Project Progress Report (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.

23. Where appropriate and pertinent, other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

24. Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Report (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (1 July to 30 June). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

25. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:
- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes—each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
 - Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual)
 - Lesson learned/good practice
 - AWP and other expenditure reports
 - Risk and adaptive management
 - ATLAS Quarterly Performance Review (QPR)

Periodic Monitoring:

26. Periodic monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (the PCU will be hosted by UNDP in Istanbul, Turkey) through quarterly meetings with the project implementation team, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock of and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure the timely implementation of project activities. Staff from the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub and the UNDP ABS Senior Technical Assistant, as appropriate, may conduct yearly visits to the project’s field sites (i.e., countries), or more often based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project’s Inception Report and AWPs to assess first-hand project progress. Any other member of the PSC can also take part in these trips, as decided by the PSC. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub and circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team, all PSC members, and UNDP-GEF.

Project Mid-Term:

27. Since the project will end in three years and would not benefit from doing a Mid-term Review (MTR), a MTR will not be conducted.

End of Project:

28. An independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) will take place three months prior to the final PSC meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. This final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project’s results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The TE will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The ToRs for this evaluation will be prepared by UNDP based on guidance from the UNDP Headquarters and UNDP-GEF M&E.

29. The TE will also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response, which is to be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The GEF ABS Tracking Tool will also be completed during the TE.

30. During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met, and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project’s results.

Learning and knowledge-sharing:

31. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information-sharing networks and forums.

32. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based, and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

33. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and visibility requirements:

34. The project will fully comply with UNDP and GEF Branding Guidelines, Communication and Visibility Guidelines, as required and/or appropriate:

- UNDP branding guidelines can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>
- Specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>

35. Among other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo must be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects must be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be obtained from: http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP logo can be obtained from: <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

36. Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf.

37. Among other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo must be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies, and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by government officials, productions, and other promotional items.

38. Where other agencies and partners provide co-financing support, their guidelines will also be taken into account in the design of appropriate communications products.

Audit:

39. Audit on project will follow UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable Audit policies (e.g., as a part of the Istanbul Regional Hub [IRH] audit as a Direct Implementation Modality [DIM] project).

M&E work plan and budget

<i>Type of M&E activity</i>	<i>Responsible Parties</i>	<i>Budget USD Excluding project team staff time</i>	<i>Time frame</i>
<i>Inception Workshop and Report</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Project Coordinator (PC) and Team (PCU),</i> ▪ <i>UNDP STA, UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub Staff</i> 	<i>55,000</i>	<i>Within first three months of project startup</i>
<i>Measurement of Means of Verification of project results</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>UNDP IRH Staff will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.</i> 	<i>To be finalized during Inception Phase and Workshop</i>	<i>Start, mid, and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required</i>
<i>Measurement of Means of Verification for project progress on output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Oversight by PC</i> ▪ <i>Project Team</i> 	<i>None</i>	<i>Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of AWP's</i>
<i>APR/PIR</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>PC and Team</i> ▪ <i>UNDP STA</i> ▪ <i>UNDP IRH Staff</i> 	<i>None</i>	<i>Annually</i>
<i>Periodic status/ progress reports</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>PC and Team</i> 	<i>None</i>	<i>Quarterly</i>
<i>Project Steering Committee meetings</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>UNDP IRH Manager</i> ▪ <i>UNV</i> ▪ <i>Country Representatives</i> 	<i>37,500</i>	<i>Yearly</i>
<i>Terminal Evaluation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>PC and Team</i> ▪ <i>UNDP IRH Staff</i> ▪ <i>UNDP STA</i> ▪ <i>External Consultants (i.e., evaluation team)</i> 	<i>53,430</i>	<i>At least three months before the end of project implementation</i>
<i>Project Terminal Report</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>PC and Team</i> ▪ <i>UNDP STA</i> ▪ <i>UNDP IRH Staff</i> ▪ <i>Project partners</i> 	<i>None</i>	<i>At least three months before the end of the project</i>
<i>Visits to field sites</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>UNDP STA and UNDP IRH Staff (as appropriate)</i> ▪ <i>Government representatives</i> 	<i>For GEF-supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget</i>	<i>Yearly</i>

Audits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP IRM ▪ GPC and Team 	9,000	Yearly
TOTAL COST <i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>		\$154,930 USD (1.3% of total GEF budget)	


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

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

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
NA			

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
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator, UNDP-GEF		16 March 2016	Santiago Carrizosa, Senior Technical Adviser, EBD	+507 302-4510	santiago.carrizosa@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>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.</p>	<p>Number of national ABS law/regulation/policy proposals developed and/or strengthened with the participation of key stakeholders including indigenous peoples and ILCs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: some legal ABS measures in place - Belarus: some legal acts to regulate the access to genetic resources in place, but they do not include all the issues relevant to the Nagoya Protocol - Egypt: draft ABS legislation pre-dating the Nagoya Protocol - India: legal framework in place - Jordan: amendment of the Environment Protection Law in process - Sudan: legal amendment to introduce ABS in progress; some draft sectoral rules in process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: ABS policy and legislation adopted - Belarus: improved ABS rules adopted to fully implement the Nagoya Protocol - Egypt: ABS legislation and ABS bylaw adopted - India: strengthened participation of research community in the ABS regulatory system - Jordan: amendment of Environmental Protection Act and ABS bylaws approved - Sudan: ABS policy/legislation adopted and sectoral laws reviewed to properly reflect ABS provisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Official Gazette and bulletins per country - National ABS law/regulation/policy draft proposals - Project reports - Reports submitted to ABS CHM; - National reports on implementation of the Nagoya 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is political will to develop/update ABS-related legislation at the national level - One or more institution is officially designated and capacitated to fulfil the functions and responsibility of a national competent authority - Speedy processes for adoption and promulgation of texts
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dominican Republic: some ABS provisions are included in the existing regulation for biodiversity research - Ecuador: ABS comprehensive legal framework in place - Honduras: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place - Panama: specific ABS legal framework in place - Uruguay: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dominican Republic: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations - Ecuador: guidelines for the implementation of the existing ABS legal framework integrating the different relevant legal provisions in force in the country - Honduras: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations - Panama: draft of revised ABS legal framework - Uruguay: draft of a national ABS law and 		

			corresponding regulations		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place - Comoros: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place - Ethiopia: Pre- Nagoya protocol measures on ABS in place - Kenya: Pre- Nagoya protocol measures on ABS in place - Seychelles: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place - South Africa: Pre- Nagoya protocol measures on ABS in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations - Comoros: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations - Ethiopia: updated/ harmonized ABS legislation submitted for approval - Kenya: effective ABS laws updated through consultative process and submitted for approval - Seychelles: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations - South Africa: draft amendment to the ABS Provisions in the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (No. 10 of 2004) 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place - Mongolia: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place - Myanmar: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place - Samoa: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place - Tajikistan: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption - Mongolia: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption - Myanmar: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption - Samoa: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption - Tajikistan: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption 		

Increase by X% in the 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 CHM, as measured by the UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: 42.42% - Belarus: 30.30% - Egypt: 16.67 % - India: 53.05 % - Jordan: 22.73 % - Sudan: 24.24 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: 52.42% - Belarus: 50.30% - Egypt: 36.67 % - India: 58.05 % - Jordan: 42.73% - Sudan: 44.24 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard - Government records / official bulletins - ABS and CHM related reports - National reports on implementation of the Nagoya Protocol 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff apply their new knowledge and abilities in a satisfactory manner - There is stability in the human resources within the institution that benefits from the capacity development activities - Willingness from staff to participate in the training activities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: 74.24% - Dominican Republic: 28.79% - Ecuador: 45.45% - Honduras: 28.79% - Panama: 40.91% - Uruguay: 12.12% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: 94.24% - Dominican Republic: 58.79% - Ecuador: 65.45% - Honduras: 58.79% - Panama: 70.91% - Uruguay: 12.12% 		
Number of ABS partnerships established with project support for the development of products for commercial purposes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: 18.67% - Comoros: 13.64% - Ethiopia: 65.15% - Kenya: 49.97% - Rwanda: 68.18% - Seychelles: 45.45% - South Africa: 75.76% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: 50% - Comoros: 50% - Ethiopia: 90% - Kenya: 70% - Rwanda: 50% - Seychelles: 80% - South Africa: 85% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scientific publications - Research reports - Patents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effective cooperation between users and providers of genetic resources - Commercial feasibility of the products selected
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: 35.0% - Mongolia: 30.0% - Myanmar: 20.0% - Samoa: 35.0% - Tajikistan: 15.0 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: 50 to 75% - Mongolia: 45 to 65% - Myanmar: 35 to 55% - Samoa: 50 to 75% - Tajikistan: 30 to 50% 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: zero (0) - Belarus: zero (0) - Egypt: zero (0) - India: zero (0) - Jordan: zero (0) - Sudan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: at least one partnership established - Belarus: at least one partnership established - Egypt: at least one partnership established - India: at least one partnership established - Jordan: at least one partnership established - Sudan: at least one partnership established 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: zero (0) - Dominican Republic: zero (0) - Honduras: zero (0) - Panama: zero (0) - Uruguay: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: at least one partnership established - Dominican Republic: at least one partnerships established - Honduras: at least one partnership established 		

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panama: at least one partnership established - Uruguay: at least two partnerships established 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: zero (0) - Comoros: zero (0) - Ethiopia: zero (0) - Kenya: zero (0) - Rwanda: zero (0) - Seychelles: zero (0) - South Africa: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: negotiations for one partnership in progress - Comoros: negotiations for one partnership in progress - Ethiopia: one partnerships established - Kenya: one partnership established - Rwanda: negotiations for one partnership in progress - Seychelles: negotiation in progress - South Africa: one partnership established 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: zero (0) - Mongolia: zero (0) - Myanmar: zero (0) - Samoa: zero (0) - Tajikistan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: at least one biodiscovery partnership established - Mongolia: at least two partnership established - Myanmar: at least one partnership established - Samoa: at least one partnership established - Tajikistan: at least one partnership established 		
<p>Component 1: Strengthening the legal, policy and institutional capacity to develop national ABS frameworks</p>	<p>Number of national policy measures adopted for protecting TK, innovations and practices, and customary uses of biological and genetic resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: zero (0) - Belarus: zero (0) - Egypt: zero (0) - Jordan: zero (0) - Sudan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: draft assessment of TK associated with genetic resources with options on how to protect TK* - Belarus: draft assessment of TK associated with genetic resources with options on how to protect TK* - Egypt: draft of an institutional framework for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Official Gazette per country - National draft proposals for protecting TK/ABS - National CHM web portals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is political will for the protection of TK within the national ABS framework and from the ILCs to participate

			<p>protecting TK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jordan: draft of an institutional framework for protecting TK - Sudan: draft assessment of genetic resources including needs and options for protecting TK* (*Targets to be confirmed during project inception phase) 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dominican Republic: zero (0) - Ecuador: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dominican Republic: proposal for the legal protection of TK within the ABS framework - Ecuador: Draft of regulations for the Code of Social Knowledge Economy and Innovation (COES) TK component 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: zero (0) - Comoros: zero (0) - Ethiopia: TK well captured in the existing legal framework - Kenya: zero (0) - Rwanda: zero (0) - Seychelles: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: national TK policy instrument submitted for approval or adoption - Comoros: national TK policy instrument submitted for approval or adoption - Ethiopia: national TK policy instrument submitted for approval or adoption - Kenya: revised national TK policy instruments submitted for approval or adoption - Rwanda: revised national TK policy instruments submitted for approval or adoption - Seychelles: national TK policy instrument submitted for approval or adoption 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: zero (0) - Mongolia: zero (0) - Myanmar: zero (0) - Samoa: zero (0) - Tajikistan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: National TK guidelines developed - Mongolia: National TK guidelines developed - Myanmar: National TK guidelines developed - Samoa: National TK guidelines developed - Tajikistan: National TK guidelines developed 		
Number of countries with a <u>national</u> ABS CHM, an improved web page with relevant ABS information, or a <u>national</u> biodiversity CHM with ABS-related information.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: national biodiversity CHM in place - Belarus: national biodiversity CHM in place - Egypt: national biodiversity CHM in place - Jordan: national biodiversity CHM in place - Sudan: national biodiversity CHM in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM - Belarus: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM - Egypt: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM - Jordan: ABS procedures and information and procedures uploaded into the existing CHM - Sudan: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dominican Republic: 0 - Ecuador: national biodiversity CHM in place - Honduras: national biodiversity CHM in place - Panama: 0 - Uruguay: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dominican Republic: fully functional ABS-related web page - Ecuador: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM - Honduras: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM - Panama: fully functional ABS-related web page - Uruguay: fully functional ABS-related 		

			web page		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: 0 - Comoros: 0 - Ethiopia: ABS CHM in place but needs strengthening - Kenya: ABS CHM in place but needs strengthening - Rwanda: national biodiversity CHM in place - Seychelles: national biodiversity CHM in place - South Africa: DEA website with no ABS-related information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: ABS CHM established - Comoros: ABS CHM established - Ethiopia: existing ABS CHM strengthened - Kenya: existing ABS CHM strengthened - Rwanda: ABS CHM established and linked to the biodiversity CHM - Seychelles: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM - South Africa: fully functional ABS-related web page (DEA) 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: zero (0) - Mongolia: zero (0) - Myanmar: zero (0) - Samoa: zero (0) - Tajikistan: national biodiversity CHM in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: National ABS CHM established - Mongolia: National ABS CHM established - Myanmar: ABS CHM established - Samoa: ABS CHM established - Tajikistan: ABS CHM established and linked to the biodiversity CHM 		
	Number of key stakeholders per country trained through the project regarding ABS rules and procedures (granting of permits, assessment of access applications, core principles of PIC and MAT and their application, and rights and roles of ILCs, among others); and negotiate ABS agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: zero (0) - Belarus: zero (0) - Egypt: zero (0) - India: zero (0) - Jordan: zero (0) - Sudan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: twenty (20) - Belarus: twenty (20) - Egypt: twenty (20) - India: fifty (50) - Jordan: twenty (20) - Sudan: twenty (20) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data bases & documents with records of the training events - Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff apply their new knowledge and abilities in a satisfactory manner - There is stability in the human resources within the institution that benefits from the capacity development activities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: zero (0) - Dominican Republic: zero (0) - Ecuador: zero (0) - Honduras: zero (0) - Panama: zero (0) - Uruguay: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: twenty-five (25) - Dominican Republic: sixty (60) - Ecuador: sixty (60) - Honduras: eighty-five (85) 		

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panama: seventy-five (75) - Uruguay: eighty-five (85) 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: zero (0) - Comoros: zero (0) - Ethiopia: zero (0) - Kenya: zero (0) - Rwanda: zero (0) - Seychelles: zero (0) - South Africa: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: forty (40) - Comoros: forty (40) - Ethiopia: sixty (60) - Kenya: sixty (60) - Rwanda: forty (40) - Seychelles: forty (40) - South Africa: sixty (60) 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: zero (0) - Mongolia: zero (0) - Myanmar: zero (0) - Samoa: zero (0) - Tajikistan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: one hundred (100) - Mongolia: one hundred (100) - Myanmar: one hundred (100) - Samoa: one hundred (100) - Tajikistan: one hundred (100) 		
Outputs:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National ABS law/regulation/policy proposals drafted and submitted for approval to competent authorities • 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 biodiscovery projects to ensure compliance. • Supportive institutional framework for sui generis systems for protecting TK, innovations and practices and customary uses of biological and genetic resources • Mechanisms institutionalized to facilitate: a) a CHM for countries that have a national ABS framework and are willing to advertise such 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 					
Component 2: Building trust between users and providers of genetic resources to facilitate the identification of bio-discovery efforts	Number of commercial agreements between users and providers of genetic resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: zero (0) - Belarus: zero (0) - Egypt: zero (0) - India: TBD* - Jordan: zero (0) - Sudan: zero (0) <p>(*Baseline to be confirmed during project inception phase)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: at least one (1) agreement in progress* - Belarus: at least one (1) agreement in progress - Egypt: at least one (1) agreement concluded - India: at least one (1) agreement in progress* - Jordan: at least one (1) agreement concluded - Sudan: at least one (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signed agreements <p>Official reports and web pages of the National Competent Authorities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will among between users and providers of genetic resources to pursue bio-discovery projects

			agreement concluded (*Target to be confirmed during project inception phase)		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: three (3) - Dominican Republic: two (2) - Honduras: zero (0) - Panama: one (1) - Uruguay: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: one (1) more agreement concluded - Dominican Republic: one (1) more agreement concluded - Honduras: one (1) agreement concluded - Panama: one (1) more agreement in progress - Uruguay: at least two (2) agreements concluded 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: zero (0) - Comoros: zero (0) - Ethiopia: one (1) - Kenya: two (2) - Rwanda: zero (0) - Seychelles: one (1) - South Africa: three (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: at least one (1) agreement in progress* - Comoros: at least one (1) agreement in progress* - Ethiopia: at least one (1) additional agreement concluded - Kenya: at least one (1) additional agreement concluded - Rwanda: at least one (1) agreement in progress* - Seychelles: at least one (1) agreement in progress - South Africa: at least one (1) additional agreement concluded <p>(*Target to be confirmed during project inception phase)</p>		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: zero (0) - Mongolia: zero (0) - Myanmar: zero (0) - Samoa: zero (0) - Tajikistan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: one (1) agreement in progress - Mongolia: one (1) agreement in progress - Myanmar: one (1) agreement in progress - Samoa: one (1) agreement in progress - Tajikistan: at least two (2) agreements negotiated 		
Ethical codes of conduct or guidelines per country for research on TK and genetic resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Egypt: zero (0) - India: zero (0) - Jordan: zero (0) - Sudan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Egypt: guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources - India: guidelines to access genetic resources and TK for researchers - Jordan: guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources - Sudan: guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signed code of conduct declarations - Published guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is political will for the protection of TK within the national ABS framework 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Honduras: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Honduras: code of conduct/good practices guidelines for the academic research sector 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: zero (0) - Comoros: zero (0) - Ethiopia: some codes or guidelines in place - Kenya: some codes or guidelines in place - Rwanda: zero (0) - Seychelles: zero (0) - South Africa: some codes or guidelines in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: at least one (1) code or guideline developed - Comoros: at least one (1) code or guideline developed - Ethiopia: at least one (1) code or guideline developed - Kenya: standards for code of best practices on TK developed - Rwanda: at least one (1) code or guideline developed - Seychelles: best practices/code of conduct for research on TK and 			

			<p>genetic resources developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - South Africa: guidelines and codes of conduct to promote sustainable harvesting developed 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: zero (0) - Mongolia: zero (0) - Myanmar: zero (0) - Samoa: zero (0) - Tajikistan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: three (3) codes of conduct developed: agriculture, pharmaceutical, and biotechnology sectors - Mongolia: three (3) codes of conduct developed: agriculture, pharmaceutical, and biotechnology sectors - Myanmar: three (3) codes of conduct developed: agriculture, pharmaceutical, and biotechnology sectors - Samoa: three (3) codes or guidelines developed - Tajikistan: three (3) codes or guidelines developed for different sectors 		
	<p>Proportion (%) of users and providers (government officials, population of researchers, local communities, and relevant industry) aware of the National law and CBD and NP provisions related to ABS and TK.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: 0% - Belarus: 0% - Egypt: 0% - India: 0% - Jordan: 0% - Sudan: 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Albania: 25% - Belarus: 25% - Egypt: 25% - India: 25% - Jordan: 25% - Sudan: 25% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness survey results - Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sampling effort are optimal - Willingness of stakeholders to engage in project activity
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: very low - Dominican Republic: very low - Ecuador: very low - Honduras: very low - Panama: very low - Uruguay: very low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colombia: 40 to 50% - Dominican Republic: 40 to 50% - Ecuador: 40 to 50% - Honduras: 40 to 50% - Panama: 40 to 50% - Uruguay: 40 to 50% 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: very low - Comoros: very low - Ethiopia: high - Kenya: moderate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: 40 to 50% - Comoros: 20 to 40% - Ethiopia: 40 to 60% - Kenya: 40 to 60% 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rwanda: very low - Seychelles: low - South Africa: high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rwanda: 40 to 50% - Seychelles: 40 to 50 % - South Africa: 40 to 60% 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: 10-15% - Mongolia: 10-15% - Myanmar: 10-15% - Samoa: 10-15% - Tajikistan: 10-15% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: ≥ 35% - Mongolia: ≥ 35% - Myanmar: ≥ 35% - Samoa: ≥ 35% - Tajikistan: ≥ 35% 		
	Change in knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) of specific groups (e.g., researchers, local communities, and relevant industry) that may use or benefit from ABS with respect to national ABS frameworks, the CBD, and Nagoya Protocol.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sixteen countries*: X (Baseline and targets will be determined during project inception phase) *Botswana, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sixteen countries*: Increase in KAP of specific groups related to ABS *Botswana, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge, attitudes, and practices survey results - Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	
Outputs:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 biodiscovery, 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 ILCs. • Ethical codes of conduct or guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources. • Campaign to raise awareness on the ABS national frameworks, CBD and Nagoya Protocol targeting policymakers, researchers, ILCs, and relevant industry. • 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. 					
Component 3: Strengthening the capacity of ILCs to contribute to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol	Number of ABS BCPs and/or TK registries per country adopted by local communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Egypt: zero (0) - Jordan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Egypt: one (1) BCP developed - Jordan: one (1) BCP developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Published of agreed-upon BCPs - Online TK databases - ILC-based registries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effective cooperation between interest groups (national government, relevant industry, ILC organizations, researchers, etc.) for the participation of ILCs in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dominican Republic: zero (0) - Ecuador: zero (0) (but some activities underway) - Honduras: one (1) (not officially recognized) - Panama: zero (0) (but some activities underway) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dominican Republic: one (1) BCP developed - Ecuador: at least two (2) BCPs developed - Honduras: one (1) BCP developed - Panama: one (1) BCP developed 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uruguay: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uruguay: at least one (1) BCP developed 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: 0 - Comoros: 0 - Ethiopia: 0 - Kenya: BCPs in place - Rwanda: 0 - Seychelles: 0 - South Africa: BCPs in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Botswana: process for the conclusion of at least one (1) BCP underway - Comoros: at least one (1) BCP developed - Ethiopia: at least one (1) BCP developed - Kenya: at least one (1) more BCP developed - Rwanda: process for the conclusion of at least one (1) BCP underway - Seychelles: process for the conclusion of at least one (1) BCP underway - South Africa: at least one (1) more BCP developed 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: zero (0) - Mongolia: zero (0) - Myanmar: zero (0) - Samoa: zero (0) - Tajikistan: zero (0) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: at least two (2) BCPs developed - Mongolia: at least two (2) BCPs developed - Myanmar: at least two (2) BCPs developed - Samoa: at least two (2) BCPs developed - Tajikistan: at least two (2) BCPs developed 		
	Capacities of local ILCs per country to negotiate ABS agreements as measured by the UNDP ILC/ABS Capacity Development Scorecard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Twenty-two countries*: X% (Baseline and targets will be determined during project inception phase) *Albania, Belarus, Botswana, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Uruguay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Twenty-two countries*: Baseline + X% *Albania, Belarus, Botswana, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Uruguay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated ILC/ABS Capacity Development Scorecard 	

Outputs:

- BCPs, model contractual clauses constitute the basis for clarifying PIC and MAT requirements between users and providers of TK and biological resources.
- Campaign increases ILCs' awareness on the importance of genetic resources and TK associated with genetic resources, and related access and benefit-sharing issues, including the need to participate in the national ABS policymaking process.

Component 4. Implementing a Community of Practice and South-South Cooperation Framework on ABS ⁵	CoP on ABS implemented and operating at regional and global level by project mid-point	- No	- Yes	- ABS CoP website - Project and country ABS-related reports	- Willingness of countries and other project stakeholders to be part of the CoP and share ABS information
	Number of experts on ABS mapped and incorporated into a regional and global database by project mid- point	- Zero (0)	- Fifty (50)	- Database/expert roster - Project reports	
	Number of technical assistance requirements on ABS fulfilled at regional and global level by project end	- Zero (0)	- Fifteen (15)	- Official country requirements for technical support - Mission and project reports	
	Number of knowledge products on specific ABS topics developed at the regional and global levels by project end	- Zero (0)	- Twenty (20)	- ABS CoP website - Project reports	

Outputs:

- CoP on ABS at the regional and global levels serves as a collaboration and information tool to support the implementation of ABS mechanisms under the Nagoya Protocol.
- ABS roster of experts provides technical assistance and advisory services to governments and other stakeholders on environmental law, biotechnology, economics, benefits-sharing, among other ABS-related topics.
- Systematized experiences, best practices, lessons learned, and knowledge products on ABS support countries' ABS-related activities.
- Website serves as a virtual knowledge platform for the ABS CoP and for the dissemination of information about the project.

⁵ To be accomplished by UNDP with UNV's support as a Responsible Party.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Response Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference in Endorsement Document																								
Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion: March 18, 2014; March 27, 2014																										
<p>12. Is the <i>project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</i></p> <p>Yes. This information is summarized in Annex 1. For CEO Endorsement, please provide a table identifying the specific gaps to be filled by this project in the participating countries. The information needs to be country-specific and derived from the scoping study carried out to identify the gap.</p>	<p>As requested, a table with the gaps to be filled by this project in the 24 participating countries is included as Annex 8 of the UNDP Project Document, which is part of this CEO Endorsement Request. A gap analysis was completed as part of the PPG through country visits and subsequent consultations with the GEF/ABS national focal points and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>– Project Document Annex 8 - Specific gaps to be filled by this project in the Participating Countries</p>																								
<p>16. Is the GEF funding and cofinancing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p> <p>For CEO Endorsement, please try to increase co-financing ratio to 1:2. Please also review the allocation of financial resources especially between Components 1 and 2. It is important that this grant provides significant financial and technical assistance to the participating countries to fulfill their obligations with the NP.</p>	<p>The cofinancing was increased from \$12,000,000 to \$16,972,923.17 (co-financing ratio: 1 to 1.4). All cofinancing letters are included as part of this CEO Endorsement Request.</p> <p>The allocation of financial resources among the project components was revised based on a gap analysis and the specific needs of the participating countries to fulfill their obligations with the Nagoya Protocol, and the inclusion of a fourth project component in response to the request made by the participating countries during the PPG to establish a Community of Practice (CoP) on ABS and a South-South Cooperation Framework. Accordingly, the new allocation of GEF funds and cofinancing is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="799 1339 1409 1686"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Grant Amount (USD)</th> <th>Cofinancing (USD)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Component 1</td> <td>4,663,409</td> <td>6,743,272.17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Component 1</td> <td>4,046,343</td> <td>5,463,890</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Component 1</td> <td>2,571,820</td> <td>3,810,961</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Component 1</td> <td>147,000</td> <td>147,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subtotal</td> <td>11,428,572</td> <td>16,165,123.17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Management</td> <td>571,428</td> <td>807,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>12,000,000</td> <td>16,972,123.17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Grant Amount (USD)	Cofinancing (USD)	Component 1	4,663,409	6,743,272.17	Component 1	4,046,343	5,463,890	Component 1	2,571,820	3,810,961	Component 1	147,000	147,000	Subtotal	11,428,572	16,165,123.17	Project Management	571,428	807,000	Total	12,000,000	16,972,123.17	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request. Part I, B: Project Framework</p>
	Grant Amount (USD)	Cofinancing (USD)																								
Component 1	4,663,409	6,743,272.17																								
Component 1	4,046,343	5,463,890																								
Component 1	2,571,820	3,810,961																								
Component 1	147,000	147,000																								
Subtotal	11,428,572	16,165,123.17																								
Project Management	571,428	807,000																								
Total	12,000,000	16,972,123.17																								
STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF). Date of screening: April 2014																										
<p>1. Regarding the project framework, the Objective is clearly stated and is consistent with the problem. The</p>	<p>Building trust between users and providers of genetic resources will not be limited to increasing awareness but will also promote</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request. Part I, B: Project Framework</p>																								

<p>problem is succinctly defined. A question is raised, however, concerning the lack of trust between users and providers of genetic resources mentioned as compounding the problem and as a barrier. While indeed the lack of trust is or may be a problem, the barrier may in fact lie deeper than just lack of trust since ILC's attitudes and deeply held beliefs and values will be touched upon. Lack of trust may be a manifestation of a deeper barrier. Paragraph 14 on page 7 touches upon this but it will remain to be seen whether increasing awareness will be a successful "prescription" to what is defined as a lack of trust that may in fact be seated deeper than the effort of raising awareness may overcome.</p>	<p>biodiscovery efforts between users and providers of genetic resources and piloting ABS initiatives. It will also include the development of intellectual property rights and licensing strategies to be used by multiple stakeholders, including ILCs, and the development of ethical codes of conduct and guidelines for research on traditional knowledge (TK) and genetic resources. This will provide the assurance to ILCs that their beliefs and values are taken into account during the identification and implementation of biodiscovery projects. In addition, drafts of sectoral guidelines (ABS rules and biodiversity-based research and development activities) and information on ABS rules that apply to biodiversity-based research and development activities for various sectors will be made available to ILCs to ensure that community laws and procedures are considered, as well as customary use and exchange.</p>	<p>– Project Document: Annex 2 - Outputs and Activities at the Country Level (Components 1, 2, and 3)</p>
<p>2. The Components, Outcomes, and Outputs likewise demonstrate strong coherence and links among themselves and the Objective. It is understood that baselines will be determined upon the selection of the participant countries in the project. The GEBs are clear but their presentation could be more precise or specific.</p>	<p>As mentioned at the time of the PIF, 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 of the biological resources from which the genetic resources were obtained. During the PPG specific ABS initiatives were identified that will contribute to the conservation of biological resources. These include: a) a pilot ABS initiative on the DNA identification of wild animal and plant species (Belarus); b) a pilot ABS initiative for the development of natural pigments from the microbial diversity in the Vaupes and the Amazonian regions, which will contribute to the conservation of tropical rain forests (Colombia); c) a pilot ABS initiative on medicinal plants (Egypt); d) a pilot ABS initiative to be implemented with a local community involved in the management of medicinal plants (Jordan); e) three pilot ABS initiatives related to medicinal plants and agriculture (Sudan); and d) two pilot ABS initiatives with native species (Uruguay). Other countries (e.g., Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Kenya, and Panama) will also implement pilot ABS initiatives; however, their specific nature will not be decided until project implementation. It is anticipated that these initiatives will also deliver GEBs by contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of the</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request. Part II, Section A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning.</p>

	<p>biological resources from which the genetic resources are obtained. In addition, several countries (e.g., Ecuador, Honduras, Kazakhstan, and Panama) will develop BCPs through the implementation of pilot projects with ILCs that have a high level of management of genetic/natural resources. These local-level initiatives will also contribute to the delivery of GEBs as the BCPs will enable ILCs to reaffirm their role as drivers of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within their territories. Finally, the development of codes of conduct or guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources will also contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and its sustainable use. For example, in Mongolia, activities will be directed to developing codes for the collection, exchange, and use of genetic resources with special reference to, but not limited to, accessing material from protected areas, farmers' fields, and wilderness areas. Similarly, Kenya will develop a code for best practices for in-situ and ex-situ collection of genetic resources. Finally, through the multiple project awareness-raising and capacity-building activities regarding the importance of genetic resources and TK associated with genetic resources, the project will provide multiple stakeholders (e.g., policymakers, researchers, ILCs, and relevant industry) with information and knowledge about how the benefits derived from the use of genetic resources can support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, thereby enabling them to become allies in biodiversity conservation efforts within their countries and generate environmental benefits that will extend way far beyond project completion.</p>	
<p>3. The list of primary stakeholders is understandably generic by nature at this point and will be refined as the project proposal develops further. Anticipated roles of the identified key stakeholders are defined but aside from one sentence in par. 14 concerning the recognized importance of women in community protocol development and use, no mention is made of additional gender considerations. It is assumed that this will be further developed and refined once the project countries are selected.</p>	<p>Gender considerations were properly included in the final project design, including the participation of women in activities of the 24 countries participating in the project. In addition to participating in the development of ABS community protocols, women will: a) be beneficiaries of training and awareness activities at the national and local levels, b) will participate in consultation groups to promote biodiscovery, c) will participate in exchanges with/visits to other countries to learn about specific ABS topics and the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, and d) will be consulted about the development of national ABS law/regulation/policy proposals. In addition, information related to traditional uses of</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request. Part II, Section B: Additional Information not addressed at PIF Stage. – Project Document: Annex 2 - Outputs and Activities at the Country Level (Components 1, 2, and 3)</p>

	<p>biological and genetic resources by women and the associated TK will be documented and used as the basis for promoting biodiscovery initiatives between users and providers of genetic resources.</p> <p>The stakeholder analysis conducted for the participating countries identified women's groups (e.g., Albania, Egypt, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Tajikistan, and Sudan) and defined women's roles in the project.</p>	
<p>4. The risk definition and assessment is appropriate for this stage of project development but the proposed mitigation strategy for risk 2 (turnover at Ministerial level and change in priorities) seems rather far-fetched since it is not a strategy but hoping for the best in terms of continuity at the Ministerial level.</p>	<p>The proposed mitigation strategy for Risk 2 was updated as follows: Multiple activities to raise awareness among ministerial staff and decision-makers about ABS and the Nagoya Protocol would be implemented and would serve to highlight the importance of the project to fulfill the commitments of the participating countries within the framework of the Nagoya Protocol. When changes occur at the ministerial level, the project, with the support of the UNDP country offices, will inform the new environmental officials about the project, its objective, progress, and achievements, as well as the project's benefits regarding ABS and contributions to achieve national and global environmental goals. Different platforms will be used for this, such as the project's steering committee, learning and knowledge-sharing processes that will be part of the project's activities at the country level and the project's monitoring and evaluation plan, country visits by the project staff, and the project's Website to be developed as part of the CoP on ABS.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CEO Endorsement Request. Part II, Section A.6: Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks – Project Document: Annex 1. UNDP Risk Matrix
<p>5. While coordination will be of utmost importance given the global nature of this project with the participation of 25 countries, this issue is not well addressed in the proposal. Finally, mechanisms and processes, which will be employed, will undoubtedly be stated and described more explicitly in the final project document, and STAP looks forward to seeing these components at that stage.</p>	<p>As stated in the PIF, this project will coordinate activities with the ongoing GEF projects funded using STAR and NPIF financial resources in GEF-4 and GEF-5, as well as with projects funded by the ABS Capacity Development Initiative in the Pacific, Africa, Asia, and LAC and other non-GEF funded initiatives. During the PPG, complementarity and coordination mechanisms between past and current ABS initiatives were outlined based on country visits and regional project validation workshops in Istanbul, Turkey, and Panama City, Panama. In addition, contact was established with the ABS Capacity Development Initiative to discuss opportunities for cooperation; a representative of the initiative (Hartmut Meyer, GIZ) participated in the regional validation workshop held in Istanbul, Turkey. Furthermore, a fourth project component was included in response to the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CEO Endorsement Request. Part II, Section A.6: Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives – Project Document. Section 2.4: Design principles and strategic considerations; Section 5 Management Arrangements

	<p>request made by the participating countries during two regional validation workshops to establish a CoP on ABS and the South-South Cooperation Framework. Through this new project component, cooperation between existing and future ABS-related initiatives will be enhanced, and interaction with the broad network of experts involved in the initiative will be sought as part of the activities for the mapping of ABS experts to provide support for participating countries within the framework of the ABS CoP and South-South Cooperation mechanisms.</p> <p>Project coordination will be led by the GEF Agency. The project will be executed under the Direct Implementing Modality (DIM) and according to the standards and regulations of the UNDP. The UNDP will be responsible for project planning, coordination, management, monitoring, and reporting, among other activities. During the PPG, the UNDP identified the preliminary ABS Project National Focal Point (NFP), who will be the partner responsible for carrying out project activities and ensuring effective project coordination. Working closely with the Global Project Coordinator, the NFP will supervise the implementation of in-country activities as define in the Annual Work Plan. The name and affiliation of the preliminary NFP for each participation country is provided in the UNDP Project Document, Section 5: Management Arrangements.</p> <p>To facilitate project coordination and implementation, a Project Coordination Unit (PCU) will be established by the UNDP. The PCU will be responsible for the day-to-day coordination and oversight of the Global ABS Project. The PCU will further be responsible for the project's financial and administrative management, for periodic reporting to the Project Steering Committee (PSC), and for the execution of selected project activities. The PCU will be staffed with the following core positions: a) a Global Project Coordinator (GPC); b) Regional Project Coordinators (RPCs; Latin America and the Caribbean [LAC], Asia-Pacific, Africa, and Central/Eastern Europe and Arab States); b) an Operations Analyst; d) and a Project Assistant. Draft Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the key positions at the PCU are included in Annex 7 of the UNDP Project Document. The PCU will be hosted by the UNDP in Istanbul, Turkey, with three Regional Coordinators based in Panama City, Panama; Bangkok, Thailand; and Istanbul.</p>	
--	--	--

	This distribution of the PCU and project staff was made keeping in mind the best way to facilitate effective coordination with all 24 participating countries and to provide continued technical and administrative support.	
--	--	--

Compilation of Comments Submitted by Council Members on the May 2014 Work Program

Canada's Comments

<p>1. Given that the GEF has already approved a global Nagoya Protocol capacity-building project (project 4415), we request that the rationale for this new project be clarified in the final project proposal, including by adding references to the different country coverage.</p>	<p>Project 4415 (2011-2014) focused on assisting GEF-eligible Parties to prepare for ratification and the early entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol through targeted awareness-raising and capacity-building. In addition, project 4415 builds political, legislative, and policy readiness on ABS as a means to accelerate ratification and the early entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol. It was a global project that did not have a pre-identified set of target countries; all eligible GEF CBD Parties were eligible to participate. The project's interventions covered all UN regions through national, regional, and global activities. The main activities carried out in the context of this project included: a) the development of capacity-building tools designed to assist Parties and other stakeholders in their efforts to raise awareness of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS in view of promoting its ratification and early entry into force; and b) the organization of capacity-building and awareness-raising activities for Parties at the national, regional, and international levels in order to support the ratification process and promote the early entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>On other hand, the Global ABS Project proposed herein (5731) will focus on implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and ABS. As stated in the PIF, the participating countries were selected using the following criteria: First, countries that have ratified the protocol prior to PIF Approval by the GEF Council, or will ratify the protocol during project preparation. Second, countries that have not ratified the protocol or will not ratify the protocol during project development but are actively working toward accession. Third, countries that will not accede in the near future but where the Protocol has strong political support. Twenty-two of the participating countries (Albania, Belarus, Botswana, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, India, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, and Uruguay)</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request. Part II, Section A.6: Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives</p> <p>– Project Document. Section 2.4: Design principles and strategic considerations;</p>
---	--	---

	<p>meet the first or second criteria, while two countries (Colombia and Ecuador) meet the third criterion.</p> <p>Project 4415 developed outreach material on ABS to raise awareness about the importance of the Nagoya Protocol and to encourage its early entry into force and effective implementation. Most of these materials are available in all six UN languages and include a systematic review of the provisions in the Nagoya Protocol and the implications for governments, as well as the development of a rationale to support ratification. The Global ABS Project proposed herein will make use of the outreach material as needed (i.e., factsheets on the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, the ABS information kit, policy briefs on the Nagoya Protocol: “Bioscience at a crossroads,” and materials developed by partners), particularly for the planned campaigns to raise awareness about the ABS frameworks at the national and regional levels.</p>	
<p>2. In addition, we request justification for the proposed \$25 million budget to cover 25 countries (average \$1 million). In particular, we note that project 4415 covered 50 countries with a total budget of just over \$2 million (average \$40,000).</p>	<p>The project proposed herein (5731) is for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, which requires significantly more resources than those provided for ratification. The GEF investment in this project is \$12 million USD, for an average of \$500,000/country. The GEF investment in project 4415 was \$1 million, for an average of \$20,000/country.</p>	
<p>Germany’s Comments: <i>Germany requests for the following projects that the Secretariat sends draft final project documents for Council review four weeks prior to CEO endorsement</i></p>		
<p>1. With regard to the broad financial, temporal, and geographical scope of the suggested project, the expected lessons learned and best practices - and the fact that it will build upon and run in parallel to other ABS capacity development activities, Germany suggests the establishment of an advisory committee for the project. Members of the advisory committee should be representatives of the relevant initiatives, e.g. the ABS Capacity Development Initiative. The committee should meet for the first time at the beginning of the PPG phase supporting UNDP in developing the activities conducted in the PPG phase. A second meeting should be conducted prior to the elaboration of the final project proposal. During the implementation</p>	<p>Component 4 of this project (Implementing a Community of Practice and South/South Cooperation Framework on ABS) includes the mapping of ABS experts during project implementation. Selected experts will be invited to participate in an advisory committee for the project. During the PPG phase, the project received expert advice on project activities through the following process: Consultation meetings were held with the GEF Secretariat, ABS Capacity Development Initiative (GIZ), UNEP and IUCN to identify projects for which complementarities and coordination will be sought to facilitate the exchange of knowledge and expected lessons learned and best practices. In addition, during the a representative of the initiative (Hartmut Meyer, GIZ) participated in the regional validation workshop held in Istanbul, Turkey (see Annex 8.3 of UNDP Project Document) to discuss proposed project activities and cooperation mechanisms between</p>	<p>– Project Document: Section 2.5. Project objective, components, outcomes and outputs</p> <p>– Project Document: Annex 3. Regional Validation Workshop Reports</p>

<p>of the project the committee should meet regularly. This could be introduced as an additional project component.</p>	<p>the ABS Capacity Development Initiative and the project proposed herein, particularly in the African region. In the Latin America and Caribbean Region, complementarities and coordination was sought with the project <i>Promotion of economic potentials of biodiversity in an equitable and sustainable way for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in Central America</i> (access and benefit-sharing, ABS). This GIZ-funded project is implemented by the General Secretariat of the Central American Integration System (SICA) with the Central American Commission for Environment and Development (CCAD). A representative of the GIZ/SIC/CCAD project participated in the regional validation workshop held in Panama City, Panama (see Annex 8.3 of the UNDP Project Document) to discuss cooperation mechanisms. Common areas for cooperation and collaboration with the Global ABS Project at the regional and country levels were identified, including training, knowledge and information-sharing, and potential funding.</p>	
<p>2. In the current form, the emphasis lies on the non-mandatory access measures (Art 6. ff. NP) whereas capacity development with respect to the mandatory compliance measures under the NP (Art 15-17) are not part of the project. Hence the PIF needs to include Expected Outcomes / Outputs covering explicitly user compliance measures as e.g. setting up checkpoints, enabling authorities/ILC to monitor the utilization and commercialization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge.</p>	<p>As suggested, the project will cover activities related to user compliance measures (e.g., setting up checkpoints, enabling authorities/ILC to monitor the utilization and commercialization of genetic resources and associated TK). Since the PIF, this need was identified as part of Barrier 1 (<i>Limited legal, policy and institutional capacity to develop national ABS frameworks</i>), which the project will be addressing for effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. It was mentioned that government institutions require training inputs to ensure that they have the capacity to perform the roles of “checkpoints” as provided for in the Nagoya Protocol. During the PPG, this need was identified during the country visits and the regional workshops held in Panama and Turkey, during which the country participants expressed to need to develop skills and experience with checkpoints and monitoring. Accordingly, activities will be carried out in some of the countries, including: a) designating competent authorities and checkpoints as part of the development and operationalization of national ABS institutional frameworks; b) conducting training workshops on checkpoints (Dominican Republic, Honduras, South Africa, and Uruguay); b) developing a draft of a legal framework (i.e., Law) for ABS, including checkpoints, user/compliance measures, and</p>	<p>– Project Document: Section 2.5. Project objective, components, outcomes and outputs / Annex 2: Outputs and Activities at the Country Level (Components 1, 2, and 3)</p>

	<p>elements for the protection of TK (Dominican Republic, Honduras, South Africa, and Uruguay); c) developing the institutional technical capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-Sharing, including the creation of an interactive database to monitor the use of genetic resources (Belarus); d) developing a platform or system for monitoring and tracking ABS commercial and non-commercial contracts as part of the activities for strengthening national capacities (Colombia); e) establishing a monitoring procedure to ensure compliance with the ABS contract terms and obligations and to ensure compliance with Material Transfer Agreements as part of the activities for strengthening national capacities (Ecuador); f) monitoring compliance with the terms of permits and contracts as part of the activities for strengthening national capacities (Dominican Republic and Kenya); g) monitoring and evaluating the implemented national framework for protecting TK as part of the activities for building a supportive institutional framework for sui generis systems to protect TK, innovations, and practices, as well as customary uses of biological and genetic resources (Egypt); h) monitoring compliance of terms of permits and contracts, and PIC and MAT for ILCs as part of the activities for strengthening national capacities (Honduras, Panama and Uruguay); i) developing a monitoring system for researchers (due diligence and guidelines issued by the government) (India, as part of activities for building national capacities); and j) building the capacity of the Seychelles Bureau of Standards/ NISTI to support the implementation of Article 17 of the Nagoya Protocol on monitoring and transparency in the use of genetic resources in the country.</p>	
<p>3. The PIF includes capacity building for developing and implementing sui generis systems on a TK. It should also include capacity building on the equally important issue of granting legal rights over genetic resources that are traditionally owned by ILCs. Without strengthening the position of ILCs in this matter, it remains unclear how the project will contribute to build trust. Germany supports the corresponding comments of the STAP.</p>	<p>As suggested, the final project design includes capacity-building on the equally important issue of granting legal rights over genetic resources that are traditionally owned by ILCs. This will be done considering national policies and rights and access separately, as each country has its own related legislation. Specific capacity-building on this issue will be implemented in Botswana, Egypt, and Ethiopia. In addition, opportunities and mechanisms for the legal protection of TK and granting legal rights over genetic resources that are traditionally owned by ILCs will be identified in the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Myanmar,</p>	<p>– Project Document: Section 2.5. Project objective, components, outcomes and outputs / Annex 2: Outputs and Activities at the Country Level (Components 1, 2, and 3)</p>

	<p>Panama, Rwanda, and Samoa.</p> <p>In selected countries, the project will provide support for clarifying and updating legislation regarding legal rights over genetic resources that are traditionally owned by ILCs. In Ethiopia, where a law that regulates access to genetic resources is already in place (Access to Genetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge, and Community Rights Proclamation No 482/2006), the project will allow harmonizing the existing legal framework with the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol, including policy instruments for the protection of TK. In Kenya, which has already adopted ABS-related provisions on rights of reasonable access to wildlife and benefit-sharing, the project will allow updating the legal framework through a consultative/participatory process.</p> <p>Finally, in Tajikistan, the development of Biocultural Community Protocols (at least two) will focus on the issue of rights-based management, PIC, and MAT.</p>	
<p>4. In accordance with the STAP comments on GEBs, Germany calls for a more realistic formulation in paragraph 15 oriented at the ABS concept provided for by the Nagoya Protocol. The project will support the establishment of sound national ABS Frameworks and support the formulation of fair contracts that capture the optional values of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge; there cannot be any guarantee that a specific act of access will result in (monetary) benefit sharing. The ABS framework and contracts need to secure the sharing of benefits arising through the value chains with the original providers. According to the objective of the Nagoya Protocol, the shared benefits should be reinvested in the conservation of biodiversity and support its sustainable use.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to STAP comment No. 2. In addition, it should be kept in mind that the delivery of GEBs will be contract-dependent; GEBs will be derived from specific negotiations regarding the access and distribution of benefits and GEBs, and the benefits may be dependent on local legislation.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request. Part II, Section A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning.</p>
Japan's Comments		
No response needed		
USA's Comments:		
<p>1. The United States requests the resubmission of this project. The United States requests that this</p>	<p>The Nagoya Protocol has already entered into force (10/2014), and most of the selected</p>	

<p>project be revised and re-submitted to the GEF Council prior to GEF CEO Endorsement to allow the UNDP to ensure that this project has been updated to reflect our technical comments below.</p> <p>The Nagoya Protocol has not yet entered into force and many countries are still deciding how to best implement it. Given this uncertainty surrounding its national implementation, we believe it is important for the GEF to fund countries working to establish regimes that track what has been already agreed in the Nagoya Protocol.</p>	<p>countries (22 out of 24) have already ratified the Protocol. Thus, this project will contribute to the development and strengthening of national frameworks for ABS for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the participating countries.</p> <p>In addition, according to Article 29 of the Nagoya Protocol, each Party shall monitor the implementation of its obligations under the Protocol and is requested to submit an interim national report on the implementation of their obligations under the Protocol. Thus, countries that have already ratified the Protocol are required to use this mechanism to track and report progress and gaps in its implementation. In addition, the project will promote the participation of countries in the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In addition the project will support national CHM for ABS in those countries that lack this tool for facilitating the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol; the ABS CHM will contribute to enhancing legal certainty and transparency on procedures for access and benefit-sharing and to monitoring the use of genetic resources along the value chain.</p>	
<p>2. In the full project proposal, we request that the UNDP discuss how specifically they will assist countries in facilitating access to genetic resources. Presently, the PIF neglects to address the linkage between access to genetic resources and ensuing benefits. Without access there can be no benefits. When implementing the Nagoya Protocol, countries need to focus as much on facilitating access to genetic resources as they do to the sharing of benefits arising from their utilization. UNDP's proposal fails to discuss how they will assist countries in facilitating access to genetic resources.</p>	<p>The role of UNDP as a GEF agency is not to facilitate access to genetic resources. UNDP's role is to provide assistance to countries to comply with the measures stated in the Nagoya Protocol. The mechanism to access genetic resources will be stated when the legal and administrative systems governing the Nagoya Protocol are put in place.</p>	
<p>3. In the full proposal, we would like to see a consistency with Article 8 of the Nagoya protocol. Article 8 of the Nagoya Protocol provides for special consideration of research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. In doing so, it instructs Parties to provide simplified measures on access for non-commercial research purposes.</p>	<p>The way in which Article 8 (Special considerations) is implemented is country-specific. UNDP can only provide guidance on the pros and cons of the modalities for implementing this article, addressing three main issues: a) research and simplified measures on access for non-commercial research purpose; b) the need of expedited access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of such resources (those related to</p>	

<p>Research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity is itself a clear and significant global benefit. UNDP's proposal neither discusses nor recognizes the need to promote this type of research and as such does not support GEF priorities.</p>	<p>present or imminent emergencies that threaten or damage human, animal or plant health); and c) consideration of important genetic resources for food and agriculture and their special role for food security.</p>	
--	---	--

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁶

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 300,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. Technical Review: Identification of specific sites for intervention; baseline studies; studies to address any opportunities/risks identified during an environmental and social screening of the project proposal	207,750	144,148	63,602
2. Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	11,083	4,433	6,650
3. Financial planning and co-financing investments	11,083	4,433	6,650
4. Validation workshop	59,000	27,869	31,131
5. Final project documentation	11,084	4,434	6,650
Total	300,000	185,317	114,683

⁶ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used) NA