



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR ONE-STEP MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT APPROVAL

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Project Title:	Support to Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety –ASIA-PACIFIC REGION		
Country(ies):	Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Yemen, Viet Nam Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga [39 Eligible Parties]	GEF Project ID: ¹	
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	01365
Other Executing Partner(s):	Country National Executinig Agencies	Submission Date:	29 May 2015
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	12 Months
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>		
Name of Parent Program:	Biosafety Program	Agency Fee (\$)	104,410

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND PROGRAM²:

Focal Area Objectives/programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-EA (select) (select)	Reports prepared to meet obligations of Article 33 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	GEFTF	1,099,050	995,000
Total project costs			1,099,050	995,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To Assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and make timely submission of their Third National Reports on measures that each party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33

Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
Development of the 3rd National Reports	TA	Enhanced Understanding by key stakeholders of their obligations under the Protocol and the	43 eligible Parties have received funds and developed a 3rd National Report on the	GEFTF	995,000	995,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC and to be entered by Agency in subsequent document submissions.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#).

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		implications for government and other stakeholders	measures that each Party has taken to implement the CPB			
Technical Advisory support, review of reports and assistance to countries in the management of the reports	TA	Technical Advice provided at all stages of report development as per country requests, adaptive feedback and review comments to countries and relevant stakeholder queries responded to	An inventory of the support to countries developed Lessons learnt & snapshot analysis of national reports.	GEFTF	68,500	
Subtotal					1,063,500	995,000
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴				GEFTF	35,550	
Total GEF Project Financing					1,099,050	995,000

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust funds here: ()

C. SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include confirmed co-financing letters for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	National Executing Agencies	In-kind	995,000
Total Co-financing			995,000

D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), TRUST FUND, COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/Regional/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee ^{a)} (b)	Total (c)=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	Regional	Biodiversity	(select as applicable)	1,099,050	104,410	1,203,460
Total Grant Resources					1,099,050	104,410	1,203,460

a) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](#).

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	<i>hectares</i>
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	<i>hectares</i>
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	<i>Number of freshwater basins</i>
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	<i>Percent of fisheries, by volume</i>
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO _{2e} mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	<i>metric tons</i>
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	<i>metric tons</i>
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	<i>metric tons</i>
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	<i>ODP tons</i>
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i>
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries: 60+</i>

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

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

G. PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)⁶

Is Project Preparation Grant requested? Yes No If no, skip item G.

PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), TRUST FUND, COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS*

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					PPG (a)	Agency Fee ⁷ (b)	Total c = a + b
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
Total PPG Amount					0	0	0

⁵ Provide those indicator values in this table to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and/or SCCF.

⁶ PPG of up to \$50,000 is reimbursable to the country upon approval of the MSP.

⁷ PPG fee percentage follows the percentage of the Agency fee over the GEF Project Financing amount requested.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

1. *Project Description.* Briefly describe: a) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; b) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, c) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁸ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, d) [incremental/ additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF/SCCF and [co-financing](#); e) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF), and [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

This project is consistent with the GEF 6 Biodiversity focal area strategy under the Focal Area Set Aside support to National Reporting obligations under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The requested enabling activity support could be provided for revising National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) in line with the CBD's new strategic plan adopted at COP-10 and the BS Strategy 2011 - 2020, national reporting guidance as provided under COP/MOP 7 Decision with support from the Focal Area Set Aside funds.

In context of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the national reporting will also provide an update on the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and hence facilitate intervention measures under Strategic Objective 2 Program 5: Build capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The GEF strategy prioritizes the implementation of activities that are identified in country stock-taking analyses and in the COP/MOP guidance to the GEF, in particular the key elements in the Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB adopted at the third COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the CPB (COP-MOP-3) and Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety – 2012 – 2020 (http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/publications/bs_frameworkactionplan_en.pdf?download) which was adopted at COP/MOP 6.

The overarching goal is the improvement of decision-making for the regulation of Living Modified Organisms and CPB implementation. The main objective of this project is to assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and make timely submission of their Third National Reports on measures that each Party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33.

Parties are required under Article 33 of the CPB, to submit National Reports on the status of their compliance, every four years. In its decision BS-I/9, the COP-MOP adopted a reporting format and requested Parties to submit reports every four years. The decision also called for an interim report to be submitted to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) two years after entry into force of the Protocol on the 11 September 2005. The interim reports can be found at http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_natreports.shtml. The major conclusion of the analysis of the interim report was that *[Assessment of the practical elements of implementation of some of the operational provisions of the Protocol is difficult in many cases, since no concrete experience is available on how the frameworks will be operationalized; for example, no countries have reported on*

⁸ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving.

decisions taken under the advance informed agreement procedure for importing living modified organisms for intentional introduction into the environment]

At its third meeting, the COP-MOP after consideration of the analysis of the interim reports as submitted by the Executive Secretary, adopted BS-III/14 with a reporting format for the first regular national report on implementation of the Protocol. The reporting format outlined a schedule and the process for the preparation and synthesis of the reports for consideration at the fourth COP-MOP meeting (see http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_natreports.shtml#natrep1).

At its fourth meeting, the COP-MOP considered the analysis of first national reports prepared by the SCBD. In its decision BS-IV/14, COP/MOP 4 requested the Secretariat to repeat the analysis of the first national reports submitted after the deadline and make the analysis available through the BCH. It also requested the Secretariat to propose improvements to the reporting format from experiences of the first national reports, the recommendations of the Compliance Committee and suggestions made by Parties, for consideration at COP-MOP 5. In addition, the COP-MOP through decision BS IV/14 para 6 urged the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to make financial resources available with a view to enable eligible Parties to prepare their national reports. A first analysis of the information contained in the first national reports and a summary of the responses were made available to Parties in documents [UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/13](#) and [UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/INF/11](#). A revised analysis (requested by decision [BS-IV/14](#)) is available in document [UNEP/CBD/BS/CC/5/2](#) and refers to information contained in the first national reports received by the Secretariat prior to 18 August 2008. Aside of the low compliance and the need to address gaps in the implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks, strengthened national capacity in thematic issues such as the Advance Informed Agreement procedures, Socio economic considerations, Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification and Risk Assessment/Risk Management were identified as key issues for redress to facilitate implementation of the Protocol. Appendix 11 to this project document shows a listing of parties who met the obligation and prepared their national reports and Appendix 12 shows a summary of analysis of parties that met their obligations and the indicative numbers of envisaged parties that would require GEF support.

At its fifth meeting, the COP-MOP in decision BS-V/14 welcomed the reporting format for the national report on the implementation of the Protocol proposed by the Secretariat and requested Parties to use it for the preparation of their second national reports, through a consultative process involving all relevant stakeholders. It also encouraged Parties to respond to all questions in the reporting format in order to facilitate the establishment of baselines for subsequent assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and also for the work of the Compliance Committee. Parties that encounter difficulty in completing and submitting their national report on time were encouraged to seek assistance from the Secretariat or the Compliance Committee, and/or make use of the roster of biosafety experts. The GEF was also requested to make financial resources available to eligible Parties for the preparation of their second national reports as per BS V/5 para 4c. Furthermore, COP-MOP requested the Secretariat to organize an online forum and/or regional or sub-regional workshops on national reporting to assist Parties in the preparation of their national reports and exchange best practices and experience on the fulfillment of the monitoring and reporting obligations under the Protocol.

At its sixth meeting, COP-MOP, welcomed, in its [decision BS-VI/14](#), the high rate of submission of second national reports. The analysis of the reports attributed the high submission rate to the GEF support and technical assistance provided by UNEP. The detailed analysis and report was presented to COP/MOP 6 as [UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/16](#). Parties that have not submitted their national report were encouraged to do so at the earliest opportunity. It encouraged Parties to facilitate the preparation and submission of their national reports by using, as appropriate technical and other resources available in existing bilateral, sub-regional and regional arrangements, and the roster of biosafety experts. COP-MOP also reminded Parties of paragraph 2 of [decision BS-V/14](#), which requests Parties submitting their national report for the first time to use the reporting format for the second national report.

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

At its seventh meeting, the COP/MOP in decision [BS VII/14](#) reviewed and updated the reporting format for the third national report. [BS VII/14](#) reviewed and updated the reporting format for the third national report. Parties also requested in decision [BS VII/5](#) (para 14ai) for GEF support to the third national reporting.

The third regular national report is to be submitted to the Secretariat, no later than 1st November 2015, in an official language of the United Nations through the BCH (see https://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_natreports.shtml). Parties are encouraged to respond to all questions in the reporting form. Complete information is required for the establishment of baseline data for the subsequent assessment and review processes of the Protocol as required for article 35 with guidance in BS V/ as well as the mid-term review of the progress in the implementation of the [Biosafety Strategic Plan 2011 – 2020](#) .

In compiling the national reports, a three step approach is proposed as follows

- i. Downloading of offline reporting template in any of the six UN languages to gather data and organize information
- ii. Preparation of national reports through a consultative process involving all relevant stakeholders as appropriate.
- iii. Filling of the online form and submission by the BCH National Focal Points through the BCH (<https://bch.cbd.int/managementcentre/register#national>).

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

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

Out of that lessons learned process, an Operational Toolkit was developed to support future national biosafety reporting (still undergoing peer review). In addition, UNEP will review the third National Reports using its Regional Advisors and the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Task Team to capture and codify lessons learnt building on the experience from the 2nd National Report. In addition, UNEP will continue to use the National Project Coordinators meetings as a platform for the parties to share experiences gained in preparation of the 3rd National Reports in line with Party obligations on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. UNEP will also review and update presentations developed under the Second National Reports to support parties on data capture and processes to support preparation of national reports in the various UN languages. Based on the lessons learned, UNEP will also contribute to the analysis to be undertaken under the third Assessment and Review of the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Once the reports have been uploaded to the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH), the results will be analysed and these will provide a simultaneous and comparable snapshot of how countries in the Asia-Pacific Region are implementing CPB. It will also provide and give guidance on potential areas for capacity building interventions which can be used for an updated action plan for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This project is an intervention in alignment with the GEF's mandate to generate global benefits by paying for the incremental costs of planning and foundational enabling activities that countries implement to generate global biodiversity benefits. The contents of the 3rd National Report will greatly assist the CPB and the countries plan for their biosafety related actions and could even generate future projects as a result.

In order to assist the Parties to meet their obligation under the Protocol in a timely and effective manner, the GEF funding support provided through UNEP to assist the eligible Parties by giving the Parties the necessary technical advisory support in data collection, consultations with the relevant stakeholders, interpretation of Protocol related issues and in the compilation, review and submission of the report in the required format. The UNEP-GEF support saw an increment of compliance of more than 50% compared to the first national report.

The same approach is to be utilized in preparation and submission of the third national report.

The proposed Regional Medium Sized Project will be used to group several eligible parties requesting for enabling activity support from the Focal Area Set Aside funds to assist 39 Eligible Parties in the Asia and Pacific region to meet the obligations of article 33, these parties will be grouped due to commonalities of culture and operational efficiency to enable UNEP provide rapid and efficient support through its regional advisory support in the region in Arabic, French and English. The expected results, key deliverables and bench marks are captured in Appendices 4 – 6.

The main criteria for taking part in the project are

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

A sample letter of endorsement is attached as Appendix 10.

2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

3. *Stakeholders.* Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from [civil society](#) and [indigenous people](#)? (yes /no) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:

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

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

Potential Stakeholders	Expected Roles
Government Ministries/Departments and Agencies [eg. Environment, Science and Technology, Health, Agriculture, Finance, Trade]	Development and implementation of policy and regulatory frameworks, implementation of regulatory functions including monitoring and compliance with Protocol related matters
Academia [Universities and Research Institutions]	Biosafety research and training including laboratory analytical functions to support regulatory agencies
Civil Society Groups	Consumer related issues, public engagement and socio economic others
Standards Institutions	Development of standards to facilitate work of regulatory and development agencies

4. *Gender Consideration.* Are [gender considerations](#) taken into account? (yes /no). If yes, briefly describe how gender considerations will be mainstreamed into project preparation and implementation, taken into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of men and women.

Even though the proposed project is a normative task required to be executed by all Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, efforts will be put in place to ensure representation of women and men in the consultative process and also gender specific data will be collected and disaggregated even though the reporting formats does not require as this will guide national design and implementation of gender specific tasks to support implementation of the Protocol especially in the execution of Article 23 of the Protocol on Public Awareness, Education and Participation.

5. *Benefits.* Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. Do any of these benefits support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) and/or adaptation to climate change?

The format of the third National Report prompts parties to provide information on what socio-economic considerations arise from the impact of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) based on article 26.1 of the CPB. This provides an opening for Parties to identify issues for consideration in the biosafety regulatory processes to facilitate decision making. While drafting of the second national report may not have direct benefits, it is the “off shoot” policies that are developed as a result of this report, that may be of benefit to parties e.g. drafting of regulations that ensure introduction of LMOs does not negatively impact on a countries’ population or provide data to guide national processes for enforcement of the national biosafety framework and capturing data that will allow for cost benefit analysis of introduction LMOs through dedicated ex ante and post ante socio economic studies on use of LMOs.

6. *Risks.* Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental future risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks:

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

The critical assumptions made by the proposal are that:

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

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

7. *Cost Effectiveness*. Explain how [cost-effectiveness](#) is reflected in the project design:

In the absence of GEF funds: As already emphasized, reporting is a party obligation under Article 33 of the Protocol. Guided by the “no reservation” clause in article 38, it is mandatory for the reporting to be done. From the analysis of the previous national biosafety reports, If GEF funds are not provided, countries would “self-finance” the preparation of their Third National Reports. However past experience has shown from the analysis of the first and second national reports (http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_natreports.shtml) that this method would be the least effective. The need for both financial and technical assistance is clearly highlighted in the analysis. As happened in the previous reporting cycle, some countries might not submit their reports at all, while in other cases countries may be very late in submitting their reports. Without the GEF Funding support, some of the parties may not be able to generate the required data and stakeholder inputs and the resultant baseline data might not be representative and of good quality for the required follow up analysis as per article 35. In the Asia and Pacific Region out of 43 eligible parties only 7 submitted their interim reports and subsequently only 20 submitted their 1st National Report whilst with GEF Support all eligible parties submitted their national reports and on time for the analysis and reviews required for Article 35 on Assessment and Review.

With GEF funding support: Financing this project through an expedited Medium Sized Project (MSP) is seen as the most cost effective approach as the GEF financing support coupled with UNEP’s technical advisory support to the Parties will ensure that the CPB will receive more reports of a higher quality which will provide the needed data for analysis required in meeting the requirements of articles 33, 35 and also provide a relevant data for the mid-term review of the Biosafety Strategy 2011-2020 as adopted (BS V/16). The reports will also provide a reliable data for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in particular its decision-making processes and supportive mechanisms of the COP-MOP processes. Without a significant number of national reports, the SCBD as mandated will not be able to have a good baseline for the assessment and review process under article 35 which is needed to help the COP/MOP provide adequate guidance and an updated action for implementation of the Protocol at various levels.

Fully Incremental: Enabling Activity funding is full cost funding provided by the GEF, i.e. fully incremental, and is therefore exempted from mandatory co-financing. Still, this project will demonstrate the ability to

leverage co-financing at country level through in kind contributions from the countries as reflected in Appendix 2.

8. *Coordination.* Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives [not mentioned in 1]:

The UNEP GEF Global Projects on the Development and Implementation of of National Biosafety Frameworks (NBF) were designed to assist countries to develop and implement their National Biosafety Frameworks so that they can comply with the CPB. Building on the success of these initiatives, countries that have developed and implemented their NBFs can now use these instruments as the information feedstock together with the Biosafety Tracking Tools, data on the national nodes of the BCH and the Second National Reports as a baseline to review and capture data required for the development of the Third National Report.

Another related initiative is the UNEP-GEF Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH). The overall objective of this project is to assist eligible countries in building and strengthening national capacity needed to enable access and use of the BCH in order to implement their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol, currently the 3rd Phase of this project is ready for submission and provides information to confirm that countries require capacity investments to assist them comply with the protocol. Development of the 3rd National Report project is designed along similar lines as the report will track the results of the capacity building investments in the participating countries and provide this information to the Central Portal of the BCH.

The proposed project intervention is also related to preparation of National Biodiversity Reports and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and the ongoing activities to mainstream Biosafety into the NBSAPs through the fundamental objective of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and also by the fact that the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is a subsidiary instrument to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The NBSAPs also give strategies and actions on all biodiversity related issues including biosafety. The National Biosafety Reporting therefore provides the needed data required in updating or revising the NBSAPs in areas related to the safe use and transboundary movement of Living Modified Organisms that may have adverse impacts on biodiversity or human health (see <http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/>). The reporting process will also assist parties in addressing decision BS VII/14 and BS VII/5 para 8.

9. *Institutional Arrangement.* Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation:

A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:

For project execution, the following entities will be involved;

- (a) the Eligible parties
- (b) the MEA focal Points in the Regional Office for Asia and Pacific;
- (c) UNEP will make available its core of trained Regional Advisors to provide technical support function on Protocol related matters

Project Management Unit

The Project Management Unit will oversee the functioning of the MEA Focal Points. The Project Management Unit under the guidance of the UNEP Biosafety Unit will-

- Review project progress with respect to objectives, strategies and work-plans;
- Liaise with any other relevant bodies for the benefit of the project;
- Advise on how best to mobilize further resources; and
- Monitor and ensure the timely and adequate flow of funds.

THE MEA Focal Points and Regional Offices

The MEA Focal Points will provide liaison support through the regional offices for the different regions- Africa, Asia- Pacific and Latin America, the eligible parties, the regional advisors and the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit. They will carry out a coordination function to facilitate linkages with the countries.

Regional Advisors

The Regional Advisors system was set up by the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit in the year 2003. This system identified experts on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as well as on IT, trained them on the use of the BCH. The Regional Advisors, who come from the same regions and are known “champions” of biosafety issues were deployed to work with countries to assist them understand their roles and obligations under the Protocol. The countries that benefit from the services of the Regional Advisors are the developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The countries are further grouped into regions, namely the African Region, Asia and Pacific Region, the Central and Eastern Europe Region and the Latin America and the Caribbean Region. The Regional Advisors understand the politics, language as well as the culture of the regions and have successfully represented UNEP-GEF in training countries on the use of the BCH and other biosafety related capacity building issues under the Development and Implementation Projects. The proposal therefore envisages the use of the Regional Advisory service in assisting the countries during the consultation process and further compilation of the necessary information in the required format and submitting the National Reports to the BCH mainly as an online support and assisting Parties to capture lessons learnt. Travel is not envisaged and will be used as an approach to the barest minimum where there is really a felt need as UNEP envisages the national reporting as a purely nationally driven activity. The terms of reference for the Regional Advisors are captured in Appendix 9.

Eligible Parties

Eligible parties are the parties that have ratified the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and are eligible to receive GEF support. As already emphasized all parties have an obligation under Article 33 of the protocol to submit their National Reports to the BCH highlighting progress made in implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Parties are to submit the reports in the required format and by the **1st November 2015**. Parties are to hold national consultative meetings with the relevant stakeholders so as to gather the necessary information for the report.

B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:

UNEP-GEF BIOSAFETY UNIT

UNEP/GEF Biosafety Unit in the Division of Environment Policy and Implementation (DEPI) will be

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

THE ENVISAGED INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT IS CAPTURED IN APPENDIX 8.

10. Knowledge Management. Outline the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.

The national reports will be uploaded in the Biosafety Clearing House, which is a hub for knowledge management, allowing all Parties access to the final reports. In addition, the Parties will have access to the newly created tool, the report analyzer, developed during the second national report. This allows parties to review national reports and analyse trends article per article on global, regional or national levels. In addition, a composite analytical report will also be prepared by the SCBD and made available at the end of the reporting cycle citing trends and best practices to guide implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

UNEP has an existing platform through the library of its project management database ANUBIS (A New UNEP Biosafety Information System) for the Biosafety projects and related initiatives to learn from each other, share experience and expertise and also tools and methodologies to support Biosafety Decision making. ANUBIS also allows the projects to assess project outputs and reports in a user-friendly form. In addition, UNEP has created an annual forum for the projects to physically meet at regional/subregional level to learn and share experiences on project management including best practices and challenges, in addition to training on emerging issues in Biosafety. This forum will be used to share experiences on national efforts in implementing the Protocol in relation to findings from the third national reports. The parties will also have access to UNEP Biosafety's YouTube channel to access media files and also share materials for the benefit of the projects in the portfolio. Existing mechanisms and training will be offered for the project to assess and share information on the Biosafety Clearing House in line with obligations of Article 20 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

11. Consistency with National Priorities. Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes /no). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, NBSAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NCs, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.

All the 39 participating countries have ratified the CPB and are therefore obligated as per the “no reservation” provision in article 38 to implement every obligation under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The implementation of article 33 focuses on monitoring and reporting of measures put in place to facilitate the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. In addition the implementation of the obligations is

guided by Decisions of the Conference of Parties Serving as the Meeting of the Parties (COP-MOP) and in that context this particular obligation relates to [BS VII/14](#) and [BS VII/5](#) para 14ai at COP/MOP 7 and other related obligations on national reporting. The Third National Biosafety Reporting process will also provide data to facilitate the five yearly assessment and review of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as required by article 35 of the Protocol and the mid-term review of the BS Strategy 2011 – 2020.

These periodic assessments give data to facilitate development of action plans for implementation of the Protocol. The National Biosafety Reporting is of direct relevance to the development and implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs) as per the obligation of articles 2.1, 22 and related articles. The NBFs of the referenced countries are captured on <http://www.unep.org/biosafety/National%20Biosafety%20frameworks.aspx>. In addition, the Biosafety National Reports are of direct relevance to the review and update of the NBSAPs which provides an overarching policy direction to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The Data obtained will also be useful in the ongoing efforts to review and mainstream biosafety obligations into the National Biodiversity and Action Plans as per Decisions [BS VII/5](#) para 8.

The third national report will provide an opportunity for Parties to review and update the status of progress and records since the second national reports (<http://bch.cbd.int/managementcentre/register#national>; http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_natreports.shtml)

12. M & E Plan. Describe the budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan.


The project will follow United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) minimum requirements for project monitoring, reporting, evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument, the Small Scale Funding Agreement (SSFA) that will be signed by the National Executing Agencies and UNEP. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process will include an end of project assesment undertaken by independent review teams. The project will be evaluated on the basis of: execution performance, output delivery, and project impact. Evaluation of the project's success in achieving its outcomes will be monitored continuously throughout the project through the progress reports, and the final evaluation.

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

A. **Record of Endorsement⁹ of GEF Operational Focal Point (S) on Behalf of the Government(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [SGP OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)

B. GEF Agency(ies) Certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies ¹⁰ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for a medium-sized project approval under GEF-6.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan VanDyke Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP		May 29, 2015	Alex Owusu-Biney Portfolio Manager (Biosafety):	+254 20 7624066	Alex.Owusu-Biney@unep.org

C. ADDITIONAL GEF PROJECT AGENCY CERTIFICATION (*Applicable only to newly accredited GEF Project Agencies*)

For newly accredited GEF Project Agencies, please download and fill up the required [GEF Project Agency Certification of Ceiling Information Template](#) to be attached as an annex to this project template.

⁹ For regional and/or global projects in which participating countries are identified, OFP endorsement letters from these countries are required even though there may not be a STAR allocation associated with the project.

¹⁰ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF

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).

**Project Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators:
Project Title: Support to the Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports**

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Objective To assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and make timely submission of their Second National Reports on measures that each Party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders in each of the participating countries exhibit enhanced understanding of the protocol and its provisions. Each of the participating countries has in place a mechanism that will expedite the reporting process for the protocol. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90% of the GEF eligible Parties have by the 31st December 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders have a sustained interest in Biosafety Political will exists to effectively complete and submit the national report in a timely manner
Component 1 : Development of the Second National Reports			
<p>Outcome 1: Enhanced Understanding by key stakeholders of their obligations under the Protocol and the implications for government and other stakeholders</p>	<p>Existing Biosafety-related capacity, policy basis and main stakeholders are identified;</p>	<p>Documentation on stakeholder analysis; Workshop/seminars reports; National reporting documents</p>	<p>Stakeholders have sustained interest in issues of biosafety and related obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</p>
<p>Output: A national report from at least 90% of eligible Parties on the measures that each Party has taken to implement the CPB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main stakeholders are identified Stakeholder-specific information is produced and disseminated Increased levels of in country dialogue on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A register of Biosafety stakeholders developed for each country. Number of Second National Reports uploaded on the BCH. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders are willing to engage in discussions that will enrich the preparation and finalization of National Reports
Component 2 Technical Advisory support, review of reports and assistance to countries in the management of the reports			
<p>Outcome 1: Increased quality of national reports submitted to the SCBD Protocol by Parties</p>	<p>Increased number of reporting countries to the CPB</p> <p>Higher quality of reports received by the SCBD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A greater number of 3rd National Reports received at the SCBD compared to the 2nd National Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countries will be open to their reports being analyzed by UNEP
<p>Output:</p>	<p>As least 50% of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emails or letters 	

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
Inventory of country requests for technical assistance received at UNEP	participating countries send requests for technical support to UNEP	<p>from countries requesting for support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emails responding to countries from UNEP 	

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

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