



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/5  
11 October 2016

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

Eighth meeting

Cancun, Mexico, 4-17 December 2016

Item 8 of the provisional agenda\*

### FINANCIAL MECHANISM AND RESOURCES (ARTICLE 28)

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. In accordance with Article 28 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol provides recommendations to the Conference of the Parties through its decisions on matters to the financial mechanism and resources. The decisions are further considered by the Conference of the Parties for inclusion in its guidance to the financial mechanism.

2. The present note provides an update on the implementation of article 28 on financial mechanism and resources of the Cartagena Protocol. Section II on the financial mechanism contains information related to guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties, an update on the financial mechanism for the Cartagena Protocol as reported by the Global Environment Facility, a review of effectiveness of the financial mechanism, and an overview of funding needs as indicated by Parties. Section III on financial resources provides an update on the latest development in resource mobilization. Section IV provides suggested elements of a draft decision containing recommendations to the Conference of the Parties on updated needs of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol as related to the financial mechanism.

#### II. THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM

3. In decision BS-I/15, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol confirmed that the arrangements between the Conference of the Parties and the Council of the Global Environment Facility provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its third meeting would apply, *mutatis mutandis*, for purposes of the Cartagena Protocol. Paragraphs 2, 3, and 5 of Article 28 give special attention to the provision of guidance for inclusion in the guidance of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. This section is therefore organized according to guidance, reporting, effectiveness review and determination of funding needs.

---

\* UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/1.

### A. Guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties

4. In paragraph 5 of decision XII/30, the Conference of the Parties decided, with a view to further streamlining guidance to the Global Environment Facility (GEF), to review proposed new guidance to avoid or reduce repetitiveness, to consolidate previous guidance where appropriate and to prioritize guidance in the context of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In recommendation 1/7, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, at its first meeting, recommended that the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting adopt a decision that addresses, inter alia, draft consolidated guidance to the financial mechanism, including the four-year framework of programme priorities and advice received from the biodiversity-related conventions. The next subsection provides an analysis towards the four-year framework, while the following subsection provides consolidated guidance related to biosafety.

#### 1. *Four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities*

5. The Conference of the Parties has previously adopted four-year outcome-oriented frameworks of programme priorities related to the utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity for relevant replenishment periods of the GEF Trust Fund, namely, in decision IX/31 B (for GEF-5) and in decision XI/5 (for GEF-6). Those earlier outcome-oriented frameworks included programme priorities for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. In its recommendation 1/7, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation requested the Executive Secretary to prepare, in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility, a draft four-year framework of programme priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, taking into account, inter alia: (a) the biodiversity strategy for the sixth replenishment period; (b) potential synergies across the biodiversity-related conventions and the conventions for which the Global Environment Facility serves as a financial mechanism; (c) potential synergies between achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals; (d) the global assessment of progress and the need to prioritize activities to fill gaps; (e) the needs expressed by Parties through the Financial Reporting Framework; and (f) the responses to the questionnaire from the expert team on funding needs for the seventh replenishment period, as well as the report of the expert team (para. 1 (a)).

6. Document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.3 provides an analysis of the individual elements enumerated in recommendation 1/7, identifying implementation gaps and opportunities for synergies, as well as resulting possible priority areas and outcomes. On this basis, a draft four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the seventh replenishment period (2018-2022) of the Global Environment Facility is provided in UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12, annex I, section A. The remainder of this subsection provides information of relevance for the Cartagena Protocol, following the list of elements to be considered in the analysis, and suggests elements for inclusion into the four-year framework from the perspective of the Cartagena Protocol.

7. *Biodiversity strategy for the sixth replenishment period:* The GEF-6 biodiversity focal area strategy contains a specific programme for implementing the Cartagena Protocol (programme 5). According to this programme, the GEF-6 strategy to build capacity to implement the Protocol prioritizes the implementation of activities that are identified in country stocktaking analyses and in the guidance from the Conference of the Parties to the Global Environment Facility, in particular the key elements in the framework and action plan for capacity-building for effective implementation of the Protocol<sup>1</sup> and the Strategic Plan for Biosafety 2011-2020.<sup>2</sup> GEF-6 provides an opportunity for countries that had not yet requested support from their national biosafety frameworks to seek support for these initial phases of basic capacity-building.

8. According to the programme, the implementation of national biosafety frameworks in these remaining countries will be undertaken when the characteristics of the eligible country, as assessed in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision BS-VI/3, annex I.

<sup>2</sup> Decision BS-V/16, annex I.

stocktaking analysis, recommend a national approach for the implementation of the Protocol in that country. GEF will provide support to eligible countries through regional or subregional projects when there are opportunities for cost-effective sharing of limited resources and for coordination between biosafety frameworks. The GEF will support thematic projects addressing some of the specific provisions of the Cartagena Protocol. These projects should be developed at the regional or subregional level and built on a common set of targets and opportunities to implement the Cartagena Protocol beyond the development and implementation of national biosafety frameworks. The GEF will also support the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

9. *Global assessment of progress on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol:* The Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting conducted an assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and a mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol, and, in recommendation 1/3, noted the slow progress in: (a) the development of modalities for cooperation and guidance in identifying living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health; (b) capacity-building for risk assessment and risk management; (c) socioeconomic considerations; and (d) capacity-building to take appropriate measures in cases of unintentional release of living modified organisms (para. 3).

10. The Subsidiary Body also noted with concern that, to date, only approximately half of the Parties have fully put in place legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol,<sup>3</sup> and notes that a lack of awareness and political support for biosafety issues contributes to limited access to and uptake of funding for biosafety.<sup>4</sup>

11. The Subsidiary Body, in the same recommendation, identified several areas for further work by Parties, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its eighth meeting. The Subsidiary Body urged Parties to strengthen national consultative mechanisms among relevant government institutions regarding the programming of national Global Environment Facility allocations with a view to ensuring appropriate funding for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.<sup>5</sup>

12. As regards guidance to the financial mechanism, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation recommended to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to recommend to the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, to invite the Global Environment Facility to continue to assist eligible Parties that have not yet done so to put in place a national biosafety framework and to make funding available to this end (para. 12).

13. The Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol, at its twelfth and thirteenth meetings, also considered matters related to the financial mechanism. The Compliance Committee recommended that the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, invite the Global Environment Facility (a) to make specific funding available to eligible Parties to put in place their national biosafety frameworks; and (b) to extend funding for projects and capacity-building activities necessary for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See paragraph 6 of the Subsidiary Body's recommendation to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., para. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., para. 14.

<sup>6</sup> See UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/2, annex, para. 8.

14. *National submissions on GEF-7 funding needs:* In anticipation of the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, the Conference of the Parties decided to undertake, at its thirteenth meeting, the second determination of funding requirements for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment period (2018-2022). Parties were invited to complete a questionnaire prepared by the expert team tasked with undertaking the assessment, as per the terms of reference adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting. According to the final report of the expert team, 3 per cent of all projects submitted (40 in total) aim at contributing to the implementing the Cartagena Protocol.<sup>7</sup> The submitted project concepts cover the following areas: development and implementation of national biosafety frameworks; Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; regulatory capacities regarding environmental releases of living modified plants and living modified organisms developed through synthetic biology, assessments of socioeconomic considerations and human health; communication, education and public awareness; scientific research and enhancement of information network, safe handling, transfer and use of living modified organisms; and monitoring system and national reporting.

15. *Elements for inclusion in the four-year outcome oriented framework:* Based on the afore-mentioned information, there is an ongoing need for continued support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may therefore wish to consider recommending to the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting the following elements for inclusion in the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities:

(a) Outcome 1: Increased number of ratifications of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress;

(b) Outcome 2: National implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress enhanced;

(c) Outcome 3: Parties deliver their reporting obligations under the Protocol, through submission of national reports and of relevant information through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

## 2. *Consolidated previous guidance*

16. Further to the decision by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting “to consolidate previous guidance where appropriate” (decision XII/30, para. 5), annex II, section B of document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12 contains a consolidation of previous guidance to the financial mechanism, for consideration and adoption by the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting. The consolidation of previous guidance builds on the first consolidation exercise, adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting and contained in decision X/24 (para. 1 and annex), while also taking into account the additional decisions related to the financial mechanism taken by the Conference of the Parties up to its twelfth meeting; namely, decisions X/25 (additional guidance to the financial mechanism), X/26 (the financial mechanism: assessment of the amount of funds needed for the implementation of the Convention for the sixth replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund), X/27 (preparation for the fourth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism), XI/5 (financial mechanism), and XII/30 (financial mechanism).

17. These previous decisions from the Conference of the Parties also include guidance to the financial mechanism related the Cartagena Protocol.<sup>8</sup> The elements under the programme priority related to the

---

<sup>7</sup> The full final report of the Expert Team is available in document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.2.

<sup>8</sup> See decisions X/24, annex, paragraph 4.14; X/25, paragraph 20; XI/5, paragraph 28 and appendix II; XII/30, paragraphs 13 and 15, and appendix I.

Cartagena Protocol in the consolidation of guidance, as contained in annex II, section B of document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12, are as follows:

- (a) Ratification and implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress;
- (b) Development and implementation of national biosafety frameworks, in particular biosafety legislation;
- (c) Building, consolidating and enhancing sustainable human-resource capacity in risk assessment and risk management;
- (d) Identification of living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health;
- (e) Capacity-building on socioeconomic considerations;
- (f) Capacity building to take appropriate measures in cases of unintentional release of living modified organisms;
- (g) Enhancing capacity for public awareness, education and participation regarding the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, including for indigenous and local communities;
- (h) Public participation and information sharing, and use of the Biosafety Clearing-House;
- (i) National reports under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

#### **B. Update on the financial mechanism for the Cartagena Protocol**

18. In its GEF-6 biodiversity focal area strategy, the GEF indicated a programming target (or notional allocation) of US\$ 30 million for programme 5 on implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The GEF-6 programming directions, under programme 5, projected that by the end of GEF-5, as many as 64 countries will have received support for implementation of their national biosafety frameworks; however, another 71 eligible countries had by this time yet to request support to implement their national biosafety frameworks. According to the report submitted by the Council of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/14/Add.1), during the reporting period, the GEF funded one country-based project (Malaysia) in support of the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, with a GEF investment of \$1.0 million and leveraging \$2.0 million in co-financing. In addition, GEF provided funding through three regional umbrella projects for the third national reports, “Support to Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety” (Latin America and the Caribbean, Central and Eastern Europe Africa, and Asia-Pacific) for a total GEF grant amount for the three projects of \$3.96 million which leveraged an additional \$3.1 million in co-financing.

19. The annex to the present note provides an overview of all GEF support that has been approved by GEF since its first report on its funding for biosafety for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its fourth meeting. According to past GEF reports, the number of projects on biosafety and associated funding approved by GEF has fluctuated considerably over different reporting periods: the reports to the seventh (2004), ninth (2008) and tenth (2010) meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention contained information on more biosafety projects than those to the eighth, eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth meetings. Global projects have been a common modality for financing biosafety enabling activities, such as development of national biosafety frameworks, Biosafety Clearing-House and national reports. Three regional projects were financed to support Parties in fulfilling their obligations in the second and third national reporting cycles, respectively. All the country-based projects were enabling activities under expedited procedures. The average project size is less than US\$ 0.8 million, except for two projects (India and Cameroon) for approximately US\$ 2.5 million and one project (Mexico) for approximately US\$ 1.5 million.

### **C. Review of effectiveness of the financial mechanism**

20. In recommendation 1/7, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, at its first meeting, suggested adopting draft terms of reference for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism under the Convention. Given that the review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism of the Cartagena Protocol is integrated with the review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism, the draft terms of reference for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism need to include the Cartagena Protocol. In this context, the following three points may be considered when undertaking the review:

(a) The questionnaire on the effectiveness of the financial mechanism could also be circulated to the Cartagena Protocol national focal points;

(b) The consultation on the effectiveness of the financial mechanism could also include the Cartagena Protocol national focal points;

(c) The report on the effectiveness of the financial mechanism could contain a dedicated chapter on the effectiveness of the financial mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.

### **D. Determination of funding requirements**

21. As noted in paragraph 14 above, in anticipation of the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties is undertaking an assessment of funding needed for the GEF-7 period of time 2018-2022. Information received from recipient countries related to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol is summarized in subsection A above, in the context of the development of the four-year framework of programme priorities for GEF-7.

## **III. FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

22. Paragraphs 1, 4 and 6 of Article 28 of the Cartagena Protocol contain the provisions on financial resources. Paragraph 6 states that the developed country Parties may also provide, and the developing country Parties and the Parties with economies in transition avail themselves of, financial and other resources for the implementation of the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol through bilateral, regional and multilateral channels. The Executive Secretary has monitored the bilateral assistance on biosafety which was extracted from the statistical database on official development assistance marked for the Rio conventions, compiled by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee.<sup>9</sup> While no clear trend on bilateral assistance towards the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol could be drawn from this information over the years, on average, about 7 projects per year were committed with total funding of over US\$ 4 million, at an average project size of over US\$ 0.6 million.

23. According to the biosafety-related information from the above-mentioned OECD database, the most active donors of funds for implementation of biosafety-related projects are Austria, Canada, Denmark, European Union institutions, Finland, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland and the United States of America. The funded projects focus on agricultural policy and administration, agricultural research, industrial crops/export crops, agricultural extension, agricultural education/training, health policy and administrative management, multisector aid, information and communications technology, infectious disease control, environmental policy and administration, environmental research, environmental education and training.

24. In decision BS-VII/5, paragraph 18, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol requested the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, to take into account biosafety concerns when providing technical support and guidance and capacity-building,

---

<sup>9</sup> The database is accessible under [stats.oecd.org](http://stats.oecd.org).

including through regional and subregional workshops, in order to assist Parties to identify their funding needs and gaps in biosafety and to integrate biosafety in the development of their national resource mobilization strategies for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention. During the intersessional period, the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility, co-organized 11 joint CBD-GEF workshops on CBD implementation and financial reporting, back-to-back with the GEF Expanded Constituency Workshops. The joint workshops included presentations on developments in implementing the Convention and its Protocols, as well as programming opportunities provided by the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy and other programming windows during GEF-6, including opportunities to advance implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on biosafety.

25. In addition, the Executive Secretary organized a total of nine subregional capacity-building workshops on financial reporting and resources mobilization. Organized in cooperation with the UNDP BIOFIN initiative, the workshops covered, inter alia, the steps to be taken towards the development of a national resource mobilization strategy for the revised NBSAPs, including the identification of funding needs and gaps, as well as associated reporting, consistent with the BIOFIN methodology and the targets for resource mobilization adopted by decision XII/3. While the workshops did not provide specific focus on the Cartagena Protocol nor on any other substantial implementation issue, they underlined the important role of revised NBSAPs as a basis for identifying national funding needs and priorities, and for the effective mobilization of financial resources from all sources, including, as appropriate, for the implementation of the Protocols under the Convention.

26. The Executive Secretary conducted a pilot project “Capacity-building to promote integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Convention on Biological Diversity at the national level”, which is being funded with the generous support from the Government of Japan, through its Japan Biodiversity Fund. Nine Parties to the Cartagena Protocol participate in the project. The project was developed against the background of a series of decisions from the Conference of the Parties and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol which called for integration and mainstreaming of biosafety, in particular decisions BS-V/16 and BS-VII/5 as well as decision XII/29. In the latter decision, the Conference of the Parties encouraged Parties to integrate biosafety and access and benefit-sharing into national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national development plans and other relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes and to strengthen national coordination mechanisms to facilitate a coordinated approach to the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols.

27. As part of the project activities, each participating country has developed a national desk study that provides an analysis of the extent to which policy and legal instruments as well as institutional frameworks at the national level promote integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention. The studies also draw lessons from national experiences and identify needs to further improve integrated implementation. On the basis of the desk studies, an e-learning module and a toolkit on integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention is being developed.

#### **IV. SUGGESTED ELEMENTS FOR A DRAFT DECISION**

28. In the light of the information presented above and taking into account the work of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its eighth meeting may wish to consider a decision on the implementation of Article 28 on financial mechanism and resources in line with the following:

*The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,*

*Recalling Article 28 of the Cartagena Protocol,*

*Having considered* the information on biosafety in the report of the Council of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention at its thirteenth meeting,<sup>10</sup>

*Having also considered* the information on biosafety contained in the report of the Expert Group on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility,<sup>11</sup>

*Bearing in mind* the previous decisions on guidance to the financial mechanism regarding programme priorities to support the ratification and implementation of the Cartagena Protocol,

1. *Takes note* of the consolidated previous guidance to the financial mechanism related to the Cartagena Protocol;<sup>12</sup>

2. *Recommends* to the Conference of the Parties that it include the following elements in the four-year (2018-2022) outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund:

(a) Outcome 1: Increased number of ratifications of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress;

(b) Outcome 2: National implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress enhanced;

(c) Outcome 3: Parties deliver their reporting obligations under the Protocol, through submission of national reports and of relevant information through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

3. *Also recommends* to the Conference of the Parties that it:

(a) Give full consideration to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in the terms of reference to be adopted for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism under the Convention;

(b) Invite Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to respond proactively to the survey for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism under the Convention.

28. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its eighth meeting may also wish to consider the recommendation from the Compliance Committee on this matter, that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol decide, at its eighth meeting, to:

*Recommend* that the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism, with respect to support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, invite the Global Environment Facility:

(a) To make specific funding available to eligible Parties to put in place their national biosafety frameworks;

(b) To extend funding for projects and capacity-building activities necessary for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

---

<sup>10</sup> UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.1.

<sup>11</sup> UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.2.

<sup>12</sup> See UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12, annex II, section B.

*Annex***OVERVIEW OF SUPPORT FOR BIOSAFETY AS PER THE REPORTS OF THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY****Activities from 1998-2014**

	<b>GEF grants (USD million)</b>	<b>Total finance (USD million)</b>
Support for Biosafety Projects (1998-2014)	131.25	259.01

**Activities in GEF 6 to date 2016**

**GEF Preliminary Report: UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/8/Add.1, 24 March 2016:** Only one project (Malaysia: Institutional Capacity to Enhance Biosafety Practices in Malaysia) totalling \$995,000 has been submitted for support in biosafety in GEF-6 as of March 14, 2016. GEF provided expedited support in May-June 2015 to three regional projects for all GEF-eligible parties totalling \$3.964 million of GEF resources for the preparation of the third national reports using funds from the biodiversity focal area set aside.

**GEF Report: UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.1, 2016:** Programme 5 of the GEF-6 biodiversity strategy “Implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,” provides guidance for countries to seek support on biosafety using resources from their country allocation.

<b>Project title</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>GEF grants (USD million)</b>	<b>Total finance (USD million)</b>
Malaysia: Institutional Capacity to Enhance Biosafety Practices in Malaysia	UNEP	0.995	3.98
Regional (Africa): Support to Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	UNEP	1.36855	2.59
Regional (Asia and the Pacific): Support to Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	UNEP	1.099	2.094
Regional (GRULAC and CEE): Support to Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	UNEP	1.15295	2.178