



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/5

27 March 2008

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION
ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE
MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA
PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Fourth meeting

Bonn, 12-16 May 2008

Item 7 of the provisional agenda*

MATTERS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM AND RESOURCES

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its third meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) adopted decision BS-III/5 on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources. This decision included recommendations to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity regarding further guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety. The COP conveyed the recommendations to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in paragraphs 9 to 13 of decision VIII/18 on guidance to the financial mechanism. Earlier guidance to the GEF was provided in paragraphs 20-26 of decision VII/20 of the Conference of the Parties and decision BS-II/5 of the Parties to the Protocol.

2. The present note provides an update on the status of implementation of the above-mentioned decision and guidance to the financial mechanism. Section II presents a status report on the GEF funding portfolio for biodiversity, including biosafety and an update on the implementation of guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety, including the progress with the Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities and the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF). It also provides an update on the recent GEF support for biosafety activities. Section III discusses the need for, and a possible process to facilitate, input by the Parties to the Protocol into the strategic programming for fifth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (2010-2014). Section IV of the note presents a report on actions taken by non-Parties that received funding from the GEF towards becoming Parties to the Protocol, in accordance with paragraph 21 (b) of COP decision VII/20 and paragraph 4 of COP-MOP decision BS-II/5. Section V discusses possible measures to foster the identification and mobilization of additional financial resources to assist developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to implement the Protocol. The last section provides general conclusions and recommendations including elements of a possible decision on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources.

* UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/1.

/...

3. The report of the GEF regarding the implementation of the guidance of the Conference of the Parties is contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/9/9.

4. Parties to the Protocol are invited to consider the information provided in the present note and the report of the GEF in taking, as appropriate, its decision on matters relating to the financial mechanism and resources and in making recommendations to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention regarding further guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety in the context of the suggested multi-year guidance to the GEF coinciding with the Fifth GEF replenishment.

II. STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDANCE OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY WITH RESPECT TO BIOSAFETY

5. At their third meeting, the Parties to the Protocol adopted decision BS-III/5 on matters relating to the financial mechanism and resources. Among other things, the Parties to the Protocol urged the GEF to expeditiously finalize, approve and implement the biosafety strategy. It also requested the Conference of the Parties to seek an assurance from the GEF that the introduction of the RAF would in no way jeopardize eligible Parties' access to funding for biosafety-related activities including regional activities where appropriate. Furthermore, the Parties to the Protocol urged donor Parties and Governments to substantially replenish the GEF Trust Fund, taking account of the need for adequate and predictable funding for supporting Parties to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The Parties to the Protocol also requested the Conference of the Parties to transmit additional guidance to the financial mechanism, including provision of support for specific priority areas.

A. GEF funding portfolio for biodiversity, including biosafety

6. In 2006, thirty-two donor countries pledged a total of \$3.13 billion for the fourth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund for the next four years (2006-2010), making it the largest replenishment.^{2/} According to the Resource Programming Targets for FY08-10 under the RAF, contained in document GEF/C.31/9, the total targeted allocation for biodiversity, including biosafety, is \$ 950 million (or 31.6 per cent). Five percent of the total allocation for biodiversity (\$ 50 million) was made available to support regional and global projects. The remaining \$ 900 million was allocated to countries with individual allocations (\$ 753.2 million) and to countries that can collectively access a group allocation (\$ 146.8 million).

7. According to the GEF Business Plan FY07-10 (GEF/C.30/6), approximately \$100 million (10 per cent of the biodiversity allocation) was earmarked for capacity-building for the implementation of the Protocol.^{3/} However, under the RAF the actual amount spent on biosafety will depend on the level of priority given to biosafety by countries at the national level in apportioning their biodiversity allocation.

B. Implementation of the Resource Allocation Framework

8. In September 2005, the GEF Council adopted a new system, known as the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF), to guide the allocation of GEF resources to countries in the focal areas of biodiversity

^{2/} The 32 donors are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

^{3/} See, GEF Business Plan FY07-10 (GEF/C.30/6, Table 3, p11) available at: <http://www.gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=17168>

and climate change based on global environmental priorities and country-level performance. Its implementation commenced in July 2006 and the initial indicative allocations under the RAF were publicly disclosed in September 2006. In November 2007, the GEF Council approved terms of reference for an independent mid-term review of the RAF to be undertaken by the GEF Evaluation Office. The GEF Council is expected to consider the results of the review at its meeting in November 2008.

9. Under the RAF, countries are assigned a country-specific allocation or are part of a group of countries, which have collective access to a group allocation. ^{4/} Countries are expected to commit part of their country or group allocation for biodiversity to support activities for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. They have to decide the amount they wish to allocate to biosafety, depending on their prioritization of biosafety over the other issues within the biodiversity focal area.

10. At their third meeting, the Parties to the Protocol expressed concern about the possible implications of the RAF on the availability of GEF support for the development of national biosafety frameworks and the building of biosafety capacity for implementation. In paragraph 4 of decision BS-III/5, the Parties to the Protocol requested the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to seek an assurance from the Global Environment Facility that the introduction of the Resource Allocation Framework would not in any way jeopardize eligible Parties' access to funding for biosafety-related activities, including regional activities where appropriate.

11. The GEF Secretariat has made effort to sensitize countries about the RAF and to provide guidance regarding its implementation. In June 2006, the GEF Secretariat published an indicative allocation of funds for each country during the GEF-4 replenishment period (2006 – 2010). ^{5/} Earlier in March 2006, the GEF Secretariat developed and disseminated to countries "Guidelines for Country Operational Focal Points on how to manage GEF resources under the RAF during GEF-4". These guidelines were revised in November 2007 based on the experience gained during the initial implementation of the RAF. In 2006, the GEF also organized a number of subregional consultations for GEF operational and political focal points to introduce and provide guidance on the RAF and to obtain feedback from them.

12. Furthermore, pursuant to the decision taken by the GEF Council in December 2006, the GEF Secretariat prepares periodic progress reports on the implementation of the RAF. The report highlights key emerging issues and lessons learned. It also provides a summary of the resources allocated for each focal area to each country and each group, the amount that has been utilized, the amount that is in the GEF pipeline, and the amount that is available to finance additional programming in the focal area. In its November 2007 report (GEF/C.32/Inf.6/Rev.1), the GEF Secretariat reported that as of October 2007 countries had utilized a total of \$ 81.296 million in biodiversity allocations and an additional \$ 147.123 million would be utilized by projects currently in the pipeline. ^{6/} A total of \$ 18.778 million was allocated to biosafety projects.

^{4/} During the fourth GEF replenishment period (GEF-4) there are 88 countries that can collectively access a group allocation of \$146.8 million for biodiversity. A total of \$753.2 million has been earmarked for countries with individual allocations.

^{5/} The indicative allocations are available at:
http://www.gefweb.org/interior_right.aspx?id=18784&menu_id=120

^{6/} The report is available at: http://www.gefweb.org/interior_right.aspx?id=18818

13. Under the RAF, eligible countries are required to provide information on their prioritization of projects identified for implementation in consultation with the GEF Secretariat. At the beginning of GEF-4, the GEF Secretariat discussed with each country how it might utilize its allocations for financing projects in the context of each country's commitments to the relevant global environmental conventions. According to the Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety in GEF-4 (submitted for consideration by the GEF Council at its April 2008 meeting), at least 56 countries have prioritized or have expressed intentions to prioritize biosafety as part of their biodiversity portfolio for GEF-4. ^{7/}

14. In order to facilitate effective implementation of the RAF, the GEF Council at its June 2007 meeting adopted a more streamlined project cycle. Under the new cycle, projects are approved right after their identification at a much earlier stage of the project cycle than before. It is expected that the total project preparation time will be significantly reduced to 22 months under the new project cycle. Projects have to be submitted to the GEF Secretariat in the form of a Project Identification Form (PIF). The new form summarizes the project concept in 4-8 pages and allows examination of the goals, costs and components of the project. The PIF for a project has to be prepared and submitted on behalf of the country by one of the GEF Agencies. It must be accompanied with a letter of endorsement of the project from the country's operational focal point, indicating the amount that can be utilized out of the country's allocations under the RAF. A GEF Implementing Agency has up to 22 months to present fully prepared projects associated with an approved PIF for CEO endorsement. The CEO will endorse the project if it meets the technical criteria. Allocations that have been utilized are subtracted from the available country or group allocation.

C. *GEF Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities*

15. At their third meeting, the Parties to the Protocol took note of the "Elements for a Biosafety Strategy" that were developed by the GEF Secretariat and made available in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/3/INF/13. In paragraph 3 of decision BS-III/5, the Parties to the Protocol urged the GEF to expeditiously finalize, approve and implement the biosafety strategy.

16. Pursuant to the above request, the GEF Council at its meeting in December 2006, reviewed and approved the Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities (GEF/C.30/8/Rev.1), which was proposed by the GEF Secretariat as an interim basis for the development of projects for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety until the Council approved the focal area strategies. ^{8/} In September 2007, the GEF Council finally approved the strategy as part of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for the fourth GEF replenishment period (GEF-4). ^{9/} The development of the Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities took into account the guidance from the Conference of the Parties with respect to biosafety, the GEF's mandate, as well as the lessons and experiences emerging from the experience to date with the implementation of the projects funded under the GEF's Initial Strategy for Assisting Countries to Prepare for the Entry into Force of the Protocol. It also took into

^{7/} The countries that have prioritised biosafety, or have expressed intentions to prioritize biosafety are: Albania, Armenia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao (PDR), Lesotho, Liberia, Macedonia (FYR), Madagascar, Malaysia, Moldova, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, St. Kitts & Nevis, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Vietnam and Yemen.

^{8/} A copy of the GEF Strategy for Financing Biosafety is made available at the present meeting as an information document (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/INF/12). It can also be accessed at the following website: <http://www.gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=17168>.

^{9/} The purpose of the focal area strategies is: a) to focus the limited funding resources of GEF-4 on a set of priority issues of global environmental concern; and b) to link projects together to achieve stronger impacts. A copy of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy is available at: <http://www.gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=84>.

account the results of the evaluation of GEF's support to the Protocol, the inputs received from the GEF Council on the Elements for a Biosafety Strategy; and the feedback that was received at a consultative session organized at the third meeting of the COP-MOP in Curitiba.

17. The objective of the strategy is to help build the capacity of eligible countries to implement the Protocol through activities at national, subregional and regional levels. It aims at enhancing the cost-effectiveness of capacity-building efforts to implement the Protocol by, *inter alia*, requiring all new projects to perform a stocktaking assessment and determine clearly defined targets.

18. The Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities is being implemented as part of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4 (2007–2010) under Strategic Objective Three (To Safeguard Biodiversity).^{10/} The elements of the strategy are incorporated in Strategic Program 6 of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy entitled: "Building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety". Under the strategy, GEF support for biosafety will be provided to eligible countries through:

(a) Regional or subregional projects when there are opportunities for cost-effective sharing of limited resources and for coordination between biosafety frameworks and where stocktaking assessments support the potential for interchange of regional expertise and capacity-building of common priority areas;

(b) Single-country projects when the characteristics and requirements of the eligible country, as assessed in the stocktaking analysis – and the design of existing or planned future regional or subregional efforts in the area – warrant a national approach for the implementation of the Protocol in that country; and

(c) Issue-specific multi-country projects to support groups of countries lacking competence in particular fields to build their capacities in those fields, where stocktaking assessments identifies them as priority needs of the eligible countries and where this approach would foster the pooling of resources, economies of scale, and international coordination.

19. The Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities emphasizes, as a first step in the project design, independent stocktaking assessment in the participating countries by experts/organizations that would not be directly involved in subsequent project execution. The assessment is intended to determine, *inter alia*, existing technical capacity and gaps on different biosafety issues and the possibility of common approaches and synergies at regional or subregional levels. The Strategy also emphasizes in-country coordination, broad stakeholder involvement, public awareness raising and education, access to information and long-term sustainability of the capacity-building efforts. Additionally, the strategy encourages the involvement of a broad range of the GEF's Implementing and Executing Agencies in project implementation based on their comparative advantages. It also states that GEF will only support project proposals that demonstrate ways in which participating countries will promote the continuation of activities to implement the Protocol after the end of the GEF support and in this regard include a set of indicators and conditions that reflect the sustainability of the project.

20. Furthermore, the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4 document states that GEF's strategy to build capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety will take into account the guidance from the Protocol and lessons and experiences emerging from the

^{10/} Strategic Objective Three (To Safeguard Biodiversity) seeks to strengthen the capacity of countries to detect, exclude, eradicate, control, and effectively manage introduced organisms that pose a risk to biodiversity (See <http://www.gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=84>).

GEF biosafety portfolio. It also states that priority will be given to activities for the implementation of the Protocol that are specified in the COP guidance to the GEF with respect to biosafety, in particular the key elements in the Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol and identified in a country's stocktaking analysis.

21. At its December 2006 meeting, the Council invited the GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies, under the coordination of the GEF Secretariat and based on their comparative advantages, to work with Parties to the Protocol, within the context of the Strategy and the Resource Allocation Framework, to develop projects to support the implementation of the Protocol. In March 2007, the GEF CEO invited UNEP to take "the lead role, in close collaboration with the GEF Secretariat, in the development of a strategic approach for programming resources for biosafety capacity-building for the November 2007 Council". In this regard, the GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies, under the facilitation of UNEP, have developed a Program Document for GEF Support to Biosafety in GEF-4 for consideration by the GEF Council at its April 2008 meeting. ^{11/} The Biosafety Program provides an operational framework for the GEF agencies and countries to achieve the objective of the GEF Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities. It will operationalize the biosafety aspects of Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4 specifically in relation to Strategic Program 6: Building Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.

D. Recent and Planned GEF Biosafety Projects

22. In 2006, eleven new projects to Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework through UNEP-GEF were approved by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the GEF under the "Interim Approach to the Financing of Biosafety Capacity Building", which was approved by the Council in 2005 pending the development of a strategy for biosafety. The projects are being implemented in Cambodia, Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Moldova, Slovakia, United Republic of Tanzania, Tunisia and Viet Nam. The total GEF funding for the 11 projects was US\$ 7.418 million and the total co-financing was US\$ 6.633 million. They are expected to end in 2009.

23. Two regional projects developed by the World Bank, i.e. the West African Regional Biosafety Program and the Latin America: Multi-country Capacity-Building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety were also endorsed in October 2007 and February 2008, respectively. ^{12/} The total GEF funding for the two regional projects was US\$ 9.40 million and the total co-financing was US\$ 28.90 million. The United Nations Development Programme-Global Environment Facility (UNDP-GEF) project on Capacity-Building for Implementation of Malaysia's National Biosafety Framework, which had earlier been approved as part of the 12 demonstration projects, also commenced in 2006 and will end in 2009.

24. The new Biosafety Program under GEF-4, referred to in paragraph 21 above, comprises 41 project proposals. These include 2 full-sized projects (FSPs), which have been included in the work program to be considered by the GEF Council at its April 2008 meeting, and 19 medium-sized projects (MSPs), which will be processed once the Biosafety Program is endorsed by GEF Council. (A list of the 21 projects submitted for approval is provided in annex I). The remaining 20 proposals (3 FSPs and 17 MSPs) will be submitted either as part of future work programs, or for consideration and approval by the CEO under Council-delegated authority.

^{11/} The following GEF Agencies are expected to participate in the Biosafety Program, based on their mandate and comparative advantage within the GEF: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Bank (WB), UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

^{12/} The West African project will cover eight cotton-producing countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal and Togo. The Latin American project will be implemented in Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica and Peru.

25. The above-mentioned projects address various thematic priorities specified in the COP guidance to the GEF with respect to biosafety, including the key elements in the Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol as identified by the participating countries.

26. In their first national reports, some Parties noted a lack of funding as a major limitation to the preparation of national reports and requested for support to be provided through the financial mechanism. In paragraph 12 of decision VIII/18 on guidance to the financial mechanism, the Conference of the Parties had requested the GEF to provide support for facilitation of the consultative information-gathering process leading to the preparation of national reports under the Protocol. The fifth meeting of the Parties might wish to reiterate its request made to the GEF to make available financial resources to eligible Parties facilitate the preparation of their national reports.

III. BIOSAFETY PROGRAMME PRIORITIES FOR SUPPORT BY THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY FOR THE PERIOD 2010-2014

27. Prior to the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, the GEF will embark on preparations for the fifth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund covering the period 2010-2014 (GEF-5). It would be important for the Parties to the Protocol to provide coherent and prioritized input into the strategic programming for GEF-5. This would enable the GEF to more effectively respond to the programme priorities relating to biosafety identified by the Parties to the Protocol.

28. Undoubtedly, it is difficult for Parties to accurately determine the programme priorities and to assess precisely the amount of resources that would be required by developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to implement the Protocol in the medium-term. However, it is important for the Parties to the Protocol to provide an indicative list of programme priorities and make a general projection of funding needs in the area of biosafety in order to facilitate the strategic programming for GEF-5.

29. Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity have embarked on a similar process. At its second meeting held from 9 to 13 July 2007 in Paris, the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (WGRI), in recommendation 2/3, advised the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting to adopt a four-year (2010-2014) framework for programme priorities related to utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity, coinciding with the fifth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund. ^{13/} Pursuant to paragraph 4 of that recommendation, the Executive Secretary has prepared a document (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/24) for consideration of the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting. ^{14/} The document contains elements for a four-year (2010-2014) outcome-oriented framework for programme priorities related to utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity for the period 2010 to 2014. The document takes into account the views that were submitted by Parties and Governments, relevant organizations to the Executive Secretary.

30. In this regard, the fourth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, in its decision on matters relating to financial mechanism and resource, may also wish to:

(a) Invite Parties and other Governments to submit to the Executive Secretary, within six months after the fourth meeting of the Parties, their views on possible programme priorities for GEF support for biosafety during the fifth replenishment of the GEF (2010-2014);

^{13/} See the WGRI recommendation at: <http://www.cbd.int/recommendations/wgri-recs.shtml?m=WGRI-02&id=11451&lg=0>

^{14/} The document is available at: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/cop/cop-09/official/cop-09-24-en.doc>

(b) Invite also developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to submit to the Executive Secretary, within six months after the fourth meeting of the Parties, an assessment of their projected funding needs for implementing the Protocol for the period 2010-2014;

(c) Request the Executive Secretary to develop, in collaboration with the GEF and its implementing agencies, a framework (questionnaire) to assist developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition in preparing assessments of their projected funding needs and priorities for implementing the Protocol over the period 2010-2014, referred to above;

(d) Request also the Executive Secretary to prepare a synthesis of views on programme priorities and the projected funding needs for biosafety during the period of the fifth replenishment of the GEF (2010-2014) on the basis of submissions made by Parties and other Governments and make it available to the GEF Secretariat before the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

IV. REPORT ON ACTIONS TAKEN BY NON-PARTIES WHICH RECEIVED GEF FUNDING TOWARDS BECOMING PARTIES TO THE PROTOCOL

31. In its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety (decision VII/20, paragraphs 21-26) the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity expanded the eligibility criteria to allow Parties to the Convention that are not yet Parties to the Protocol to receive GEF funding for certain capacity-building activities related to biosafety after providing a clear political commitment towards becoming Parties to the Protocol. Evidence of such political commitment would take the form of a written assurance to the Executive Secretary that the country intends to become a Party to the Protocol on completion of the activities to be funded. The eligible activities are the development of national biosafety frameworks and the development of national nodes of the Biosafety Clearing-House and other necessary institutional capabilities to enable them to become Parties.

32. Pursuant to the above-mentioned guidance, and in response to the request by the GEF Council made at its May 2004 meeting, the Chief Executive Officer/Chairman of the GEF and the Executive Secretary of the Convention sent a joint letter to all focal points of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the GEF, clarifying the procedures to be followed to ensure that such funding would lead to ratification of the Protocol. The procedures, among other things, require non-Party countries that have received GEF funding in accordance with paragraph 21 (b) of decision VII/20 to report to the Executive Secretary of the Convention, on an annual basis, regarding actions being taken towards becoming Parties to the Protocol. In its decision BS-II/5, paragraph 4, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol re-affirmed that requirement and requested the Executive Secretary to compile the reports submitted and distribute the compiled reports to the Parties to the GEF Convention and to the Council for information.

33. As of December 2007, at least 19 countries that are Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity but not yet Parties to the Protocol had sent to the Executive Secretary and the Chief Executive Officer of the GEF letters of political commitment towards becoming Parties to the Protocol. Out of those countries 10 have since become Parties to the Protocol. ^{15/} The remaining 9 countries had not yet submitted their report on the actions being taken towards becoming Parties to the Protocol. ^{16/} Thirty-one countries that are eligible to receive funding from the GEF for activities specified in paragraph 21 (b)

^{15/} The countries that became Parties are: Cape Verde, Chad, Costa Rica, Gabon, Indonesia, Malta, Swaziland, Thailand, The FYR of Macedonia and Yemen.

^{16/} The countries that submitted letters of political commitment but have not yet submitted their reports on the steps taken towards becoming Parties to the Protocol are: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Haiti, Lebanon and Sao Tome and Principe.

of COP decision VII/20 had not yet submitted to the Executive Secretary letters of political commitment towards becoming Parties to the Protocol. The list of those countries is presented in annex II to the present note.

34. The meeting of the Parties may wish to remind those Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity that sent letters of political commitment towards becoming Parties to the Protocol but have not yet submitted their reports on the actions being taken towards becoming Parties to the Protocol to do so as soon as possible.

V. NEW AND ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR BIOSAFETY

35. A lack of financial resources continues to be one of the major limiting factors to the effective implementation of the Protocol by developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition. In their first national reports, many developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition indicated that they had received support from the GEF for developing their national biosafety frameworks but that they lack resources to implement those frameworks. Effective implementation of the Protocol will require adequate, predictable and timely access to financial resources.

36. An assessment of internationally-funded capacity-building in biosafety and biotechnology carried out by the United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS) between 2004 and 2007 indicated that funding for biosafety capacity development activities in developing countries, had in the last ten years, totalled more than US\$ 135 million.^{17/} The assessment noted that to date the largest proportion of international financial assistance for capacity-building in biosafety is provided through GEF-funded projects.

37. In view of the limited financial resources available through the GEF, and considering the vital importance of adequate financial resources for the implementation of the Protocol, there is an urgent need to identify and mobilize new financial resources in addition to those provided through the Global Environment Facility to assist developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to effectively implement the Protocol.

38. The Protocol, in paragraph 6 of Article 28, encourages developed country Parties to provide to the developing country Parties and the Parties with economies in transition additional financial and technological resources, over and above those provided through the financial mechanism, for the implementation of the Protocol through bilateral, regional and multilateral channels. In their first national reports, some developed country Parties reported on their support to developing country Parties or Parties with an economy in transition for capacity-building in biosafety. Examples of such support are highlighted in the note on capacity-building (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/4) prepared by the Executive Secretary for the present meeting. However, the level of support reported is rather limited compared to needs and priorities expressed by Parties for the effective implementation of the Protocol.

39. Currently, there is a lack of comprehensive information about the current status and trends in international assistance with respect to biosafety. The information provided in the national reports and through the Biosafety Clearing-House with regard to the funding support for biosafety activities are scanty. In paragraph 7 of decision BS-II/5, the Parties to the Protocol requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the GEF and through the Coordination Mechanism, to assess status of funding and promote coordination, coherence and synergies in financing for biosafety activities among donors and their agencies in order to facilitate the avoidance of duplication of work and identify gaps in funding

^{17/} A copy of the draft assessment report is available at:
http://www.ias.unu.edu/sub_page.aspx?catID=107&ddIID=192

activities. In 2006, the Secretariat produced a Catalogue of Funding Sources to facilitate easier access by developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to relevant information on funding opportunities for biodiversity and biosafety activities and other international assistance programs. ^{18/} It is also aimed to contribute to improved coordination and communication among donor Parties and Governments, bilateral, regional and multilateral funding institutions and development agencies. However, the catalogue contains limited information regarding funding sources for biosafety.

40. In order to develop strategies and mechanisms to effectively identify and mobilize additional financial resources to assist developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to implement the Protocol, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety may wish to:

(a) Invite also developed country Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, including funding institutions, to provide to Executive Secretary at least six months before fifth meeting of the Parties information on their current funding support for biosafety, their funding policies and procedures as well as suggestions on ways in which they could better support the implementation of the Protocol;

(b) Invite the GEF to provide to the Executive Secretary at least six months before the fifth meeting of the Parties, an analysis of the previous and existing co-financing arrangements for biosafety projects, including information on the sources, trends/patterns and requirements of those co-financing arrangements in order to provide insights on possible sources and arrangements for additional funding support for the Protocol;

(c) Request the Executive Secretary to undertake, in collaboration with the GEF and its implementing agencies, a survey of other existing or potential sources of financial resources for biosafety, in addition to those provided through the GEF, and how Parties might gain access to these resources;

(d) Request also the Executive Secretary to prepare a report, on the basis of the information referred above, reviewing the availability of financial resources in addition to those provided through the GEF and ways and means of mobilizing and channelling those resources in support of the implementation of the Protocol for consideration by the Parties at their fifth meeting;

(e) Request developing Parties and Parties with economies in transition to provide to the Executive Secretary at least six months before fifth meeting of the Parties assessments of their projected funding needs for the effective implementation of the Protocol for the period 2010-2014;

(f) Request the Executive Secretary to continue making available through the Biosafety Clearing-House information on other sources of financial resources in addition to those provided through the GEF, as well as information on funding policies, procedures and requirements.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

41. A lack of financial resources continues to be one of the major limiting factors to the effective implementation of the Protocol by developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition. The GEF, as the financial mechanism for the Protocol, has responded effectively to the guidance provided to it by the Conference of the Parties with respect to biosafety. The measures undertaken by the

^{18/} The catalogue is available at: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/guidelines/fin-sources.pdf>

GEF, including the adoption of the new Strategy for Financing Biosafety Activities within the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4 are expected to facilitate and streamline GEF funding towards building capacities for the effective implementation of the Protocol in order to achieve the broad objective of safeguarding biodiversity from potential adverse effects of living modified organisms. The introduction of the resource allocation framework has significantly changed the operations of the GEF and the way resources are allocated for different projects, including biosafety projects. The level of funding for biosafety will now depend on the extent to which countries wish to prioritize biosafety among the biodiversity issues. In this regard, countries within their internal priority-setting processes need to consider giving priority to biosafety projects within the biodiversity allocation if the Protocol is to be effectively implemented.

42. Currently, the GEF is the main source of international funding assistance for capacity-building in biosafety. However, there are limited financial resources available through the GEF as mentioned in the present note. In this regard, it is crucial to identify and mobilize other financial resources in addition to those provided through the Global Environment Facility, including from bilateral and multilateral donors, regional funding institutions, non-governmental organizations and the private sector, to assist developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to effectively implement the Protocol. Furthermore, developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition also need to commit more substantial resources for biosafety in their national budgets.

43. On the basis of the information provided in this note, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to:

(a) Welcome the successful fourth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and express its appreciation to the donor countries that contributed to the Trust Fund;

(b) Take note of the report of the Global Environment Facility and the information provided in this note on the implementation of the guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety and consider the need for further guidance;

(c) Commend the effort and flexibility made by the Global Environment Facility to provide support to eligible countries for biosafety capacity-building activities;

(d) Welcome the measures undertaken by the GEF to streamline the project cycle and to provide guidance on the implementation procedures for the Resource Allocation Framework;

(e) Recommend to the Conference of the Parties in adopting its multi-year guidance to the GEF coinciding with the fifth GEF replenishment, to consider the following guidance with respect to the support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety:

(i) Request the GEF Evaluation Office to assess the consequences of the RAF on the implementation of the Protocol, and propose measures that can minimize potential resource limitations to funding the Protocol's implementation;

(ii) Reiterate its request to the GEF to make available financial resources to eligible Parties to facilitate the preparation of their national reports.

(To be completed based on the decisions relating to the GEF adopted by the COP-MOP under the different items on the agenda for the fourth meeting)

44. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, in its decision on matters relating to financial mechanism and resource, may also wish to consider the other recommendations contained in this note, including the proposals to facilitate input into the strategic programming for GEF-5 (contained in paragraph 30) and the measures to foster the identification and mobilization of additional financial resources to assist developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to implement the Protocol (contained in paragraph 40).

Annex I
LIST OF GEF BIOSAFETY PROJECTS

Table 1: Biosafety Projects Approved Since COP-MOP 3 (March 2006)

Project Title	IA	GEF GRANT (\$ million)
AFRICA		
1. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Egypt	UNEP	0.908
2. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Mauritius	UNEP	0.428
3. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of United Republic of Tanzania	UNEP	0.777
4. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Tunisia	UNEP	0.849
5. West African Regional Biosafety Program (Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Togo)	WB	5.400
ASIA-PACIFIC		
6. Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Cambodia	UNEP	0.641
7. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Viet Nam	UNEP	0.998
CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE		
8. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of the Czech Republic	UNEP	0.452
9. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Estonia	UNEP	0.669
10. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Lithuania	UNEP	0.687
11. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of the Republic of Moldova	UNEP	0.542
12. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of the Slovak Republic	UNEP	0.466
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN		
13. Latin American Multi-country Capacity-building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica and Peru)	WB	4.000
TOTAL		16.817

Table 2: Project Identification Forms for MSPs Submitted for Approval

Project Title	IA	GEF GRANT
AFRICA		
1. Implementation of a National Biosafety Framework for Ghana	UNEP	0.636
2. Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Lesotho	UNEP	0.884
3. Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Madagascar	UNEP	0.613
4. Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Mozambique	UNEP	0.755
5. Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Nigeria	UNEP	0.965
6. Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Rwanda	UNEP	0.645
7. Implementation of National Biosafety Framework of Sudan	UNEP	0.989
ASIA		
8. Detection and Monitoring of LMOs in Cambodia	UNEP	0.656
9. Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Indonesia	UNEP	0.922
10. Support for Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Laos	UNEP	0.995
11. Supporting the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Tajikistan	UNEP	0.916

LATIN AMERICA		
12. Communication and Public Awareness Capacity-Building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Latin-America	WB	0.900
13. Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework in Costa Rica	UNEP	0.800
14. Completion and strengthening of the Cuban National Biosafety Framework for the effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	UNEP	1.000
15. Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Ecuador	UNEP	0.750
16. Contributing to the safe use of biotechnology in El Salvador	UNEP	0.600
17. Development of mechanisms to strengthen the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Guatemala	UNEP	0.700
18. Establishment of a National Centre for Biosafety in Panama	UNEP	1.070
19. Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Peru	UNEP	0.920
TOTAL		15.721

Table 3: FSPs Submitted for Approval at the April 2008 Council meeting

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>IA</u>	<u>GEF GRANT</u>
AFRICA		
20. Development of a National Monitoring and Control System/Framework for Living Modified Organisms and Invasive Alien Species in Cameroon	UNEP	2.400
LATIN AMERICA		
21. Support for Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean sub-region (Antigua & Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & Grenadines, Trinidad & Tobago)	UNEP	3.340
TOTAL		5.740

*Annex II***LIST OF PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY THAT HAVE SUBMITTED LETTERS OF POLITICAL COMMITMENT TO BECOME PARTIES TO THE PROTOCOL**

Country	Date of Signature of the Protocol	Date of receipt of the Political Commitment Letter	Due Date of the 1 st Report	Date of Receipt of the Report	Remarks
1. Bosnia and Herzegovina		14 June 2006	14 June 2007		
2. Burundi		24 Aug 2005	24 Aug 2006		
3. Comoros		22 Oct 2005	22 Oct 2006		
4. Côte d'Ivoire		20 July 2005	20 July 2006		
5. Equatorial Guinea		30 Oct 2006	30 Oct 2007		
6. Guinea	24 May 2000	24 June 2005	24 June 2006		
7. Haiti	24 May 2000	7 Oct 2005	7 Oct 2006		
8. Lebanon		10 Aug 2005	10 Aug 2006		
9. Sao Tome e Principe		23 Nov 2004	23 Nov 2005		

LIST OF PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY THAT HAVE NOT SUBMITTED LETTERS OF POLITICAL COMMITMENT TO BECOME PARTIES TO THE PROTOCOL

Country	Date of Signature of the Protocol	Date of receipt of the Political Commitment Letter	Due Date of the 1 st Report	Date of Receipt of the Report	Remarks
10. Afghanistan					
11. Angola					
12. Argentina	24 May 2000				
13. Bahrain					
14. Central African Republic	24 May 2000				
15. Chile	24 May 2000				
16. Cook Islands	21 May 2001				

Country	Date of Signature of the Protocol	Date of receipt of the Political Commitment Letter	Due Date of the 1 st Report	Date of Receipt of the Report	Remarks
17. Georgia					
18. Guinea-Bissau					
19. Guyana					
20. Honduras	24 May 2000				
21. Jamaica	4 Jun 2001				
22. Kazakhstan					
23. Malawi	24 May 2000				
24. Micronesia					
25. Morocco	25 May 2000				
26. Myanmar	11 May 2001				
27. Nepal	2 Mar 2001				
28. Pakistan	4 Jun 2001				
29. Russian Federation					
30. Saudi Arabia					
31. Sierra Leone					
32. Singapore					
33. Suriname					
34. Timor-Leste					
35. Turkmenistan					
36. Tuvalu					
37. United Arab Emirates					
38. Uruguay	1 Jun 2001				
39. Uzbekistan					
40. Vanuatu					