

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr. GENERAL

CBD/CP/MOP/9/12 5 October 2018

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 Ninth meeting Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, 17-29 November 2018 Item 7 of the provisional agenda*

FINANCIAL MECHANISM AND RESOURCES (ARTICLE 28)

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In decision <u>CP-VIII/5</u>, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol made recommendations to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on further guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety.

2. At its thirteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties, in decision XIII/21, adopted the consolidated guidance to the financial mechanism, including the four-year framework of programme priorities (2018-2022) for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, and adopted the terms of reference for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism. It also took note of the report on the full assessment of the amount of funds needed for the seventh replenishment. The Conference of the Parties called for a successful implementation of the four-year framework of programme priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, and requested the Global Environment Facility to include in its reports to the Conference of the Parties information regarding the individual elements of the guidance and framework. The Global Environment Facility was also invited to indicate, in its regular report to the Conference of the Parties, how it had responded to the assessment of needs for the seventh replenishment period. Negotiations for the seventh replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund were concluded on 25 April 2018 in Stockholm.

3. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its second meeting considered the outcome of the replenishment and relevant documents prepared by the Executive Secretary as well as a preliminary report from the Global Environment Facility.

4. The meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol is expected to consider associated matters of relevance to the Protocol on the basis of relevant recommendations from the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

5. The present document presents information related to the financial mechanism in relation to the Cartagena Protocol. Section II offers a brief description of the GEF strategy for biosafety, as well as information on its sixth and seventh replenishments; section III presents conclusions; and section IV outlines elements for a draft decision.

^{*} CBD/CP/MOP/9/1.

II. FINANCIAL MECHANISM

A. GEF support for biosafety¹

6. The current biennium included the partial implementation of two GEF replenishment cycles; part of sixth replenishment, which spanned the period from July 2014 to June 2018, and the start of the seventh replenishment from July 2018 onwards. Therefore, activities undertaken during part of the sixth replenishment, and the planning directions for the seventh replenishment, are included in the present document.

7. The sixth-replenishment biodiversity focal area strategy and the seventh-replenishment programming directions contain a specific section on the Cartagena Protocol. According to this, the GEF strategy to build capacity to implement the Protocol during the sixth and seventh replenishments 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 and the Strategic Plan for Biosafety for the period 2011-2020.

8. The sixth replenishment provided an opportunity for countries that had not yet requested support for their national biosafety frameworks to seek support for these initial phases of basic capacity-building. the seventh replenishment will continue to work along the same lines. The implementation of national biosafety frameworks in these remaining countries will be undertaken when the characteristics of the eligible country, as assessed in the stocktaking analysis, recommend a national approach for the implementation of the Protocol in that country.

B. GEF support to biosafety during the sixth replenishment

9. By the end of the fifth replenishment, 64 countries had received support for implementation of their national biosafety frameworks (NBFs); however, another 71 eligible countries had yet to request support to implement their NBFs. The sixth replenishment provided the opportunity for these countries to seek support for these initial phases of basic capacity-building. A total of US\$ 30 million was allocated for this purpose through programme 5 of the GEF biodiversity strategy (the smallest allocation within the biodiversity focal area).

10. The sixth replenishment also offered the opportunity to provide support to eligible countries through regional or subregional projects which allowed for cost-effective sharing of limited resources to support implementation of the Protocol and for coordination between biosafety frameworks. GEF experience has shown that such approaches are effective where stocktaking assessments support the potential for coordinating biosafety frameworks, interchange of regional expertise, and capacity-building in common priority or thematic areas to develop the capacities of groups of countries lacking competences in relevant fields.

11. The sixth replenishment also offered the possibility of supporting thematic projects that address some of the specific provisions of the Cartagena Protocol. In addition, support was offered towards the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

12. As per the report of GEF to the fourteenth meeting of the Conferences of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity,² during the 2017-2018 biennium, GEF funded two country-based projects (in Cuba and Guatemala) in support of the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. For this, GEF invested \$3.2 million, leveraging \$4.6 million in co-financing.

13. A brief description of the two country-based projects supported during this biennium is presented below:

(a) "Creation of Additional Biosafety Capacities that Lead to a Full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Cuba": The project seeks to further complete the process of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol through the creation of additional capacities in the areas of monitoring, detection, liability and redress, and education;

¹ <u>http://www.thegef.org/publications/gef-6-biodiversity-strategy</u>.

² CBD/COP/14/7.

(b) "Strengthening and Expansion of Capacities in Biosafety that Lead to a full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Guatemala": The project seeks to advance the process of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol through an innovative approach that promotes a strong link between biosafety and biodiversity.

14. In addition, as described in the report of GEF to the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, a country-based project to support implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in Malaysia was also funded through the sixth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.³

15. From July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018, only US\$ 4.2 million from GEF grants were used towards programme 5, out of the \$30 million that were allocated for this programme at the beginning of the sixth replenishment. In addition to the 4.2 million provided by GEF, US\$ 7.6 million from co-financing for the implementation of such projects were leveraged. Thus, the total investment for this programme during the sixth replenishment was US\$ 11.8 million.

C. Seventh replenishment programming for biosafety

16. At the beginning of the seventh replenishment, many countries had yet to request support to implement their national biosafety frameworks. the seventh replenishment will provide the opportunity for these countries to seek support for these initial phases of basic capacity-building.

17. GEF will support the ratification of the Protocol by the countries that have not yet done so and will also support the implementation of NBFs in these remaining countries. Parties will be supported to implement the provisions of the Protocol, including capacity-building related to risk assessment and risk management in the context of country-driven projects, and enhancing public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms. GEF experience has shown that these kinds of approaches are effective.

18. As in the sixth replenishment, the seventh replenishment will also continue to support thematic projects that address some of the specific provisions of the Cartagena Protocol.

19. GEF will also provide support for the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

20. According to the report on the seventh replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund on resource allocation,⁴ the funds allocated in support of the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol during the seventh replenishment have been reduced from US\$ 30 million to US\$ 7 million. This is similar to the scenario under the sixth replenishment, in which the allocation for biosafety was the smallest one within the whole biodiversity focal area.

III. CONCLUSIONS

21. While GEF, through its sixth and seventh replenishment cycles, has continued to make funds available to Parties to be used towards the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, the allocation has been reduced, as noted above. However, many eligible countries had yet to request support to implement their national biosafety frameworks. In the sixth replenishment, only three countries used part of their GEF allocation towards this end. This means that there are still many Parties that could request support.

22. Furthermore, in the context of the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, in decision <u>CP-VIII/15</u>, paragraph 9, noted with concern that only approximately half of the Parties to the Protocol had fully put in place legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol, and urged Parties that had not yet fully done so to put in place their national biosafety frameworks, in particular biosafety legislation, as a matter of priority.

³ See "Report of the Council of the Global Environment Facility" (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.1).

⁴ <u>http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/GEF-</u> 7%20Resource%20Allocation%20and%20Targets%20-%20GEF_R.7_22.pdf.

23. It is unknown at this stage how many requests for biosafety projects Parties will be submitted to GEF during the seventh replenishment cycle, but, if these countries decide to use part of their GEF allocations towards biosafety, the global level of implementation of and compliance with the Protocol could substantially improve. In addition, the ratification and uptake of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress could also be positively impacted if Parties decide to use GEF funds on biosafety projects.

IV. SUGGESTED ELEMENTS OF A DRAFT DECISION

24. In the report of the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety on the work of its fourteenth and fifteenth meetings,⁵ the Committee recommended that, at its ninth meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol decide:

(a) To urge eligible Parties to prioritize biosafety projects during the programming of their national allocations under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) within the framework of the seventh replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, taking into account their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020, and the guidance of the Conference of the Parties to the financial mechanism;

(b) 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, invite the Global Environment Facility to make funding available:

- (i) To assist eligible Parties that have not yet done so to fully put into place measures to implement the Protocol;
- (ii) To support eligible Parties in completing their fourth national reports under the Protocol;
- (iii) To support Parties in implementing compliance action plans regarding the achievement of compliance with the Protocol;

(c) To urge eligible Parties to engage proactively with the Global Environment Facility, including through coordination with their operational focal points for the Global Environment Facility, in order to ensure that they are able to access available funds for biosafety.

25. In addition, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety may wish:

(a) To welcome the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and express its appreciation to the countries that contributed to the seventh replenishment;

(b) To encourage Parties to cooperate at the regional and subregional levels, and to request support from the Global Environment Facility for joint projects, in order to maximize synergies and opportunities for cost-effective sharing of resources, information, experiences and expertise;

(c) To request the Global Environment Facility to continue to provide Parties with support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and to consider the establishment of a set-aside fund dedicated to regional biosafety projects, and for the completion of national biosafety frameworks in countries that have not done so yet, the set-aside fund possibly serving as a mechanism for addressing the decrease in the number of biosafety projects submitted by Parties.

⁵ CBD/CP/MOP/9/2.