



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/4
27 August 2012

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

Sixth meeting

Hyderabad, India, 1-5 October 2012

Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

MATTERS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM AND RESOURCES

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its previous meetings, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (hereafter referred to as “the meeting of the Parties”) has taken a number of decisions on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources, including recommendations to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP) regarding guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety.

2. The present note provides, in Section II, a brief report on the status of implementation of the previous decisions, including implementation of the guidance provided to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with respect to biosafety and the experience of Parties in accessing funds from the GEF as communicated through their second national reports. Section III discusses the funding requirements and programme priorities for the sixth GEF replenishment period 2014-2018. Section IV presents a report on the status of countries that received GEF funding before becoming parties to the Protocol in accordance with paragraph 21 (b) of decision VII/20 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. Section V discusses possible means of mobilizing additional resources for the implementation of the Protocol. The last section outlines the suggested elements of a draft decision on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources.

* UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/1.

II. STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PREVIOUS DECISIONS ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM

A. *Report on the status of implementation of the previous guidance provided to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety*

3. Table 1 below presents a summary of GEF's response to the guidance with respect to biosafety provided in paragraph 20 of decision X/25 of the Conference of the Parties, which is contained in the report submitted by the GEF Council to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/8). The full report provides details on the specific projects approved during the reporting period.

Table 1. Status of GEF response to COP guidance included in paragraph 20 of decision X/25

COP/MOP 5 Guidance	GEF Response
Continue to implement all previous guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety.	GEF was ready to continue to implement previous guidance; however no projects were submitted in the first two years of GEF-5.
Consider, in the context of the replenishment process for GEF-6, supporting the implementation of the Protocol within the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) by defining specific quotas for biosafety for each country, on the basis of the second national reports on the implementation of the Protocol.	Using the second national reports that are now filed with the CBD Secretariat for almost all GEF-eligible countries, data that each country produced on their budgetary demands for biosafety can be extracted.
Make available, in a timely manner, financial resources to eligible Parties to facilitate the preparation of their second national reports under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.	Resources for national reporting were made available outside of the STAR in GEF-5 through Objective 5 of the strategy and the focal area set aside. Three medium-sized umbrella projects implemented by UNEP were approved by the CEO in May 2011 to support national reporting: (i) Latin America, Caribbean and Pacific Regions covering 39 eligible Parties; (ii) North Africa (NA), Asia (A), Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) covering 41 eligible Parties; and (iii) Africa, covering 42 Parties.
Expand its support for capacity-building for effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House to all eligible Parties to the Protocol and to submit a report for consideration of the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.	An update on the implementation of the UNEP-GEF BCH-II implementation project has been appended as Annex 13 of this report. Upon satisfactory completion and evaluation of BCH-II, extension of the project could be considered.
Ensure the inclusion of biosafety-related elements in the terms of reference for national capacity self-assessments (NCSAs) and other capacity assessment initiatives carried out with GEF funding.	The NCSA process is essentially over, however, for new GEF-eligible countries, GEF takes note of the need to include biosafety-related elements.
Ensure that identification requirements of paragraph 2 (a) of Article 18 and related decisions are taken into account in activities carried out with GEF funding. Ensure that the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms is taken into account in activities carried	Within the context of future submissions of National Biosafety Framework (NBF) implementation projects, GEF will systematically review projects to assess whether these elements are taken into account in the project design and if not request explanation and justification. However, no new NBF implementation projects

COP/MOP 5 Guidance	GEF Response
out with GEF funding.	were submitted during the first two years of GEF-5.
Make funds available to eligible Parties in a facilitated manner and to monitor, as appropriate, the expeditious accessibility of those funds.	No projects were submitted during the first two years of GEF-5.

Source: GEF Report to the Eleventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (page 19-20)

(i) GEF biosafety project support during the reporting period

4. According to the report submitted to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, during the reporting period, 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2012, the GEF provided a total of US\$ 2.805 million for biosafety, which leveraged US\$ 2.44 million in co-financing. This represents 7% of the notional allocation of US\$ 40 million for objective 3 of the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy, i.e., to build capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (see table 2 below).¹

5. All the GEF funding support for biosafety approved during the current reporting period was directed towards assisting eligible Parties to prepare their second national reports. The funding was provided through three medium-sized umbrella projects implemented by the United Nations Environment Programme. The three projects are listed in Annex 7 to the GEF report to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention (page 109) and briefly described on pages 128 and 129 of the report. The report notes that no other requests for GEF support in biosafety were presented during the reporting period.

Table 2. Rate of programming per notional allocation in the GEF-5 Biodiversity Strategy²

Biodiversity focal area objective	Amount notionally allocated (US\$)	Amount utilized (US\$)	% utilized
BD-1: Sustainability of protected area systems	700,000,000	255,010,201	36%
BD-2: Biodiversity mainstreaming & sustainable use	250,000,000	199,738,426	80%
BD-3: Biosafety	40,000,000	2,805,000	7%
BD-4: Access and benefit sharing	40,000,000	2,686,750	7%
BD-5: Enabling Activities: NBSAP revision	40,000,000	24,875,351	62%
TOTAL	1,070,000,000	485,115,728	45%

Source: GEF Report to the Eleventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (page 8)

6. Table 2 above shows that the rate of programming resources for objective 3 of the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy relating to biosafety is very low (7%) compared to the rates of the other objectives. This is most likely because of the stiff competition at the national level between biosafety and the other

¹ The notional allocations were based on past programming by countries depending on the level of priority placed on various objectives and activities as expressed in the country-driven proposals that were presented to the GEF for funding.

² Programming amounts per strategy objective do not include project management costs or the agency fee as it is not possible to attribute them on a biodiversity strategy objective or outcome basis as these costs cover the entire grant amount and are not attributed to discrete objectives and outcome deliverables.

priorities within the biodiversity focal area for the country allocation under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR). As noted in the independent evaluation of the capacity-building Action Plan (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/2), Parties seem to be giving low priority to biosafety activities which are more preventative, precautionary and strategic in nature, compared to other biodiversity activities, such as protected areas' management or species conservation, which tend to yield immediate and visible results.

7. While the objective and underlying principles of the STAR (including country-drivenness, flexibility, transparency and predictability in the availability of resources) are quite logical, in practice some of its operational policies and procedures have inadvertently had a negative impact on the national implementation of certain international obligations, especially those under subsidiary instruments, such as the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity. As demonstrated above, by lumping in the funds for biosafety with the funds for all other biodiversity issues, the current STAR system has created a situation whereby adequate GEF resources are not being allocated to support implementation of the Protocol yet the GEF is the financial mechanism for the Protocol. The limited provision of funds from the national STAR allocation for biosafety activities has not only put the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at a disadvantage but has also resulted in curtailing the effectiveness of the GEF as the financial mechanism for the Protocol.

8. In light of the above analysis, the meeting of the Parties may wish to reiterate its earlier recommendation to the Conference of the Parties, contained in paragraph 4 (b) of decision BS-V/5, urging the GEF to consider supporting the implementation of the Protocol within the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources by defining specific quotas for biosafety for each country. Alternatively, the GEF may be urged to support implementation of the Protocol using the Focal Area Set-aside (FAS) resources under the biodiversity focal area, outside the national STAR allocations.

9. In paragraph 4 (d) of decision BS-V/5, the meeting of the Parties urged the GEF to expand its support for capacity-building for effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) from 50 Parties to all eligible Parties to the Protocol and to submit a report for consideration of the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. The UNEP-GEF Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH (BCH-II), which was approved in 2010, had been limited to 50 Parties due to the inadequate funds remaining under GEF-4 to support all eligible Parties.

10. Pursuant to the above decision, the Executive Secretary has had a number of correspondences with the GEF Secretariat and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). However, the BCH-II project has so far not been extended to all the remaining eligible Parties as requested by the meeting of the Parties in paragraph 4 (d) of decision BS-V/5. In its report submitted to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the GEF indicated that extension of the project could only be considered upon satisfactory completion and evaluation of the BCH-II project. Unfortunately, this is likely to cause further delay in extending this crucial capacity-building activity to the remaining Parties.

11. The meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to once again recommend to the Conference of the Parties, in its further guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety, to urge the GEF to extend without further delay support under the BCH-II project to all the remaining Parties, using the Focal Area Set-aside resources under the biodiversity focal area, outside the national STAR allocations.

(ii) Overall status of GEF's support for biosafety projects

12. During the current reporting period, implementation of the 33 national projects and 5 regional and global projects, including the UNEP-GEF BCH-II Project on Continued Enhancement of Building

Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH-II), approved under the GEF-3 and GEF-4, continued. A list of ongoing projects and approved Project Identification Forms (PIFs) is annexed hereto. Most of the national projects are supporting implementation of the National Biosafety Frameworks.

13. According to the information in the GEF project database (accessible at <http://www.gefonline.org/>), as of June 2012, the GEF has funded a total of 53 national projects and 15 regional and global projects supporting the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to a tune of about 112.5 million in GEF grants and 98.7 million in co-financing.

14. Table 3 below provides a summary of the number of countries per region that have participated in the various projects funded by the GEF, as of 31 January 2012. The data were extracted from the GEF project database as of 30 January 2012.

Table 3. Number of Parties that have participated in GEF-funded projects (as of January 2012)

No. of countries in each region	GEF-STAR eligible Parties	CPB Parties	No. of countries participating in GEF-funded projects						
			Pilot project (1998-2000)	NBF-Dev (2001-2007)	NBF-Imp (Demo) (2002-2006)	NBF-imp (2002-ongoing)	BCH-I (2004-2008)	BCH-II (2010-2012)	Regional projects (2007-2012)
Africa: 53	52	49	10	39	4	14	47	23	5
Asia-Pacific: 56	46	42	2	36	3	13	30	11	-
CEE: 23	15	22	4	18	2	7	16	1	-
GRULAC: 33	33	29	2	28	3	6	27	15	17
WEOG: 30	1	21	-	2	-	1	2	-	-
Total: 195	147	163	18	123	12	41	122	50	22

Source: Cartagena Protocol website: <http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/gefprojects.shtml#note>

15. The data as of January 2012 show that 18 Parties (10% of the Parties to the Protocol) received GEF support under the Pilot Biosafety Enabling Activity (1998-2000); 123 countries received support for the development of national biosafety frameworks (2001-2007); 53 Parties (33% of the Parties to the Protocol) received support for implementation of their national biosafety frameworks; 122 Parties (75% of the Parties to the Protocol) received support under Phase I of the project to build Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH (2004-2008); and 50 Parties (31% of the Parties to the Protocol) received support under Phase II of the Project on Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH (BCH-II). In addition, a total of 22 Parties received support through regional biosafety projects, including one project in Africa (which supported 5 Parties) and 4 projects in Latin America and the Caribbean which have supported at least 17 Parties.

B. Report on the experience of Parties in accessing funds from the GEF

16. In paragraph 6 of decision BS-V/5, Parties were invited to provide, in their second national reports, under the section of the reporting format on capacity-building, information on their experience in accessing existing funds from the GEF.

17. In response to Question 139 of the reporting format for the second national reports, 112 Parties (79% of the respondents to this question) reported that they are *eligible to receive funding from the*

/...

Global Environment Facility (GEF):³ This includes 100% of the respondents from Africa, 86% in Asia and the Pacific, 58% in CEE, 100% in Latin America and the Caribbean (GRULAC), 6% in the Western Europe and Other Group (WEOG), and 100% of respondents in both the least developed countries (LDCs) and the Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

18. In response to Question 140, 98 Parties (89% of the respondents to this question) reported that they have *initiated a process to access GEF funds for building capacity in biosafety*: 83% of the respondents from Africa, 93% in Asia and the Pacific, 91% in CEE, 100% in GRULAC, 50% in WEOG, 87% from LDCs and 86% from SIDS.

19. In Question 141, the above 98 Parties which reported having initiated a process to access GEF funds were asked to characterize the process. No respondent characterized the process as *very easy*; 13 Parties (13% of the respondents to this question) characterized it as *easy*, 60 Parties (61% of the respondents to this question) as *average*; 20 Parties (20% of the respondents to this question) as *difficult* and 5 Parties (5% of the respondents to this question) as *very difficult*. The percentages of respondents from the different regions/economic groups that characterized the process as *difficult* or *very difficult* are as follows: 34% from Africa, 29% in Asia and the Pacific, 24% in GRULAC, 36% in LDCs and 10% of Parties from SIDS. No Party in CEE and WEOG characterized the process as *difficult* or *very difficult*.

20. In Question 142 countries were asked whether they *have ever received funding from the GEF for building capacity in biosafety*. Twenty-one responses referred to receiving funding for a *pilot biosafety enabling activity*; 88 for the *development of national biosafety frameworks*; 43 for the *implementation of national biosafety frameworks*; 81 for *Phase I of the project Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH*; and 43 for *Phase II* of the same project.

21. The above analysis shows that the majority of Parties in general find the current process of accessing existing funds from the GEF relatively easier than before, on the average. This could, in part, be attributed to the more streamlined project cycle for medium-sized and full-sized projects introduced during GEF-5 to speed up the project approval process whereby the GEF Chief Executive Officer (CEO) has delegated authority to approve medium-sized projects without prior circulation to the Council for comments.⁴ However, over 25% of the Parties reported that they still have difficulties in accessing the GEF funds.

22. During the regional workshops conducted by the Secretariat, some Parties noted the challenges involved in developing regional and global biosafety projects under the STAR. It was reported that the process of getting Parties to collectively agree to contribute part of the national allocations towards subregional, regional and global projects is very complicated and time-consuming. In part this could be one of the reasons for the significant drop in the number of global and regional biosafety projects during GEF-5, although the current GEF Strategy for Financing Biosafety provides that the GEF would support regional and subregional projects where stock-taking assessments support the potential for coordinating biosafety frameworks, interchange of regional expertise, and capacity-building of common priority areas. Likewise, few thematic projects were developed under GEF-4 and GEF-5, perhaps for the same reasons, although the Strategy for Financing Biosafety recognizes that a multi-country thematic approach can be an effective way to pool resources, maximize the economies of scale and foster international coordination to develop the capacities of groups of countries lacking competences in specific fields.

³ According to the information available on the GEF website (at http://www.thegef.org/gef/STAR/country_allocations), as of the date this report was prepared, 125 Parties (77% of the Parties to the Protocol) had received initial indicative allocations for biodiversity under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) of the GEF fifth replenishment period. Specific funds for biosafety may be part of the biodiversity allocation, but are not identified in the STAR envelopes for GEF-5.

⁴ The revised project cycle is described in document GEF/C.38/5 entitled, "Streamlining the project cycle and refining the programmatic approach", accessible at <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3225>.

23. In this regard, the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to recommend to 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, to urge the GEF to further streamline, simplify and expedite, to the extent possible, the process of accessing funds from the GEF trust fund.

III. PROGRAMME PRIORITIES AND FUNDING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SIXTH GEF REPLENISHMENT PERIOD 2014-2018

24. In accordance with section 5 of the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the Council of the Restructured Global Environment Facility (GEF Council),⁵ the Conference of the Parties is to make an assessment of the amount of funds necessary to assist developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition in fulfilling their obligations during the next GEF replenishment cycle. In this regard, the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties adopted, in decision X/26, terms of reference for that assessment and requested the Executive Secretary to ensure completion of the process in time for consideration by the fourth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI 4). Furthermore, in paragraph 7 of decision X/24, the Conference of the Parties agreed to adopt, at its eleventh meeting, a four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities related to utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity for consideration during the sixth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund for the period July 2014 to June 2018.

25. In response, the Executive Secretary commissioned a team of five experts to prepare a report on the full assessment of funding requirements for the sixth replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund (2014-2018) and also sent out, in October 2011, a questionnaire to assist Parties in assessing their financial needs.

26. The preliminary assessment report prepared by the team of experts for consideration by WGRI 4 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/10) included a specific section on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (pages 116-121), which identifies the programme priorities based on the focal areas of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and provides an assessment of the amount of funds that would be needed for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.⁶

27. In accordance with the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (decision BS-V/16), the report notes that the main focal areas with respect to biosafety are:

- 1) Facilitating the establishment and further development of effective biosafety systems for the implementation of the Protocol, i.e., to put in place further tools and guidance necessary to make the Protocol fully operational;
- 2) Capacity-building - to further develop and strengthen the capacity of Parties to implement the Protocol;
- 3) Compliance and review - to achieve compliance with the Protocol and foster its effectiveness;
- 4) Information sharing - to enhance the availability and exchange of relevant information; and

⁵ The MoU was adopted in decision III/8 and is available at <http://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/?id=7104>.

⁶ The preliminary report is available at <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/wgri/wgri-04/information/wgri-04-inf-10-en.pdf> and is being finalized following comments from WGRI 4. A summary of the report is to be available to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/15 and the full report as an information document.

- 5) Outreach and cooperation - to expand the reach of the Protocol and promote cooperation in its implementation.

28. In accordance with focal area 2 of Strategic Plan for the Protocol, GEF support would be required for capacity-building activities in the following priority areas:

- 1) National biosafety frameworks;
- 2) Risk assessment and risk management;
- 3) Handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms;
- 4) Liability and redress;
- 5) Public awareness, education, and participation;
- 6) Information sharing, including full participation in the BCH; and
- 7) Biosafety education and training

29. In addition, GEF support would be required to support additional activities recommended by the Compliance Committee to assist eligible Parties to comply with their obligations under the Protocol, including, as appropriate, provision of technical assistance, technology transfer, training and other capacity-building measures.

30. The report estimates that during the period 2014-2018, a total of US\$ 170 million would be required for supporting implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This includes US\$ 158.2 million for biosafety capacity-building activities, US\$ 5.8 million for compliance and review and US\$ 8 million for facilitating the establishment and further development of effective biosafety systems. The report proposes the following three possible scenarios regarding the incremental cost that would be covered by the GEF Trust Fund:

- *Scenario 1:* Assuming that an equal amount could be leveraged from other sources of funding, the amount that would be required for the GEF-6 investments would be **US\$ 85 million** (i.e., at 50% GEF financing) during 2014-2018;
- *Scenario 2:* At 60% GEF financing rate, the amount that would be required for the GEF-6 investments would be **US\$ 102 million**; and
- *Scenario 3:* At 80% GEF financing rate, the amount that would be required for the GEF-6 investments would be **US\$ 136 million**.

31. The report recommends scenario 2, noting that increasing GEF's funding support to 60% or more would allow more activities to be implemented and would speed up the process of achieving the strategic objectives of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol by putting in place all the necessary measures, carrying out training and capacity-building, ensuring compliance and improving access to and use of the Biosafety Clearing-House.

32. The meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to recommend to the Conference of the Parties to include in its four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities related to the utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity the above priorities and the estimates of financial needs with respect to biosafety for the sixth replenishment period of the GEF Trust Fund, taking into account the proposed results-based Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.1).

Other recommendations from inter-sessional meetings regarding GEF funding support

33. The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Assessment and Review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety⁷ which met from 14 to 16 May 2012 in Vienna, Austria, recommended to the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to request the Conference of the Parties, in its guidance to the financial mechanism, to urge the GEF to:

- (i) Provide support to all eligible Parties that have not yet done so to initiate implementation of their legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol;
- (ii) Define specific quotas for biosafety for each country during the GEF-6 programming period;
- (iii) Set aside more resources for thematic and regional capacity-building projects;
- (iv) Allow for more flexibility in the utilization of funds provided for capacity-building to address emerging needs within the overall framework of the approved projects; and
- (v) Provide support to eligible Parties for preparation of their national reports on a regular basis.

34. The Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its ninth meeting, held 30 May to 1 June 2012 in Montreal, noted that the financial support that was made available by the GEF to eligible Parties contributed to achieving the high rate of submission of the second national reports (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/2). In this regard, the Committee recommended to the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to request the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the GEF with respect to support for the implementation of the Protocol, to urge the GEF to make available, in a timely manner, financial resources to eligible Parties to facilitate the preparation of their third national reports, and to make specific provision to this effect as part of the sixth replenishment.

35. The meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to recommend to the Conference of the Parties to include the above programme priorities in its further guidance to the GEF.

IV. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF COUNTRIES THAT RECEIVED GEF FUNDING BEFORE BECOMING PARTIES TO THE PROTOCOL

36. In its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety (paragraphs 21-26 of decision VII/20), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity varied 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 (paragraph 21 (b) of decision VII/20).

37. Since the last meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, of the five countries that had submitted letters of political commitment then (i.e., Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Lebanon and Sao Tome and Principe) none had yet become Parties to the Protocol and none had submitted reports on the steps taken towards becoming Parties.

38. On the other hand, 15 of the 18 the countries that had submitted neither letters of commitment nor reports on the steps being taken towards becoming Parties to the Protocol (i.e., Afghanistan,

⁷ The report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group is made available in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/21.

Argentina, Chile, Cook Islands, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Micronesia, Nepal, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan and Vanuatu) have still not done so. However, three countries in this category (Bahrain, Morocco and Uruguay) have since become Parties to the Protocol.

39. In view of the fact that more than eight years have passed since the decision was taken as an interim measure to allow Parties to the Convention that are not yet Parties to the Protocol to receive GEF funding for certain capacity-building activities to enable them to become Parties to the Protocol, and in the absence of reports from the concerned non-Parties on the steps being taken towards becoming Parties to the Protocol, the meeting of the Parties may wish to recommend to the Conference of the Parties in its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to Biosafety to set aside paragraph 21 (b) of its decision VII/20.

V. POSSIBLE MEANS OF MOBILIZING ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL

40. In paragraph 7 of decision BS-V/5, the meeting of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to further explore means of mobilizing additional financial resources for implementation of the Protocol and report to the present meeting.

41. The effective implementation of the Protocol requires an adequate, predictable, timely and sustainable flow of financial resources. However as noted in the report on the independent evaluation of the capacity-building Action Plan (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/2), there has been a drastic decline in the level of bilateral and multilateral funding available for biosafety capacity-building activities over the last few years. The situation has been further compounded by the apparent decline in the amount of GEF resources being allocated to biosafety projects following the introduction of the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) and the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR). The decline in bilateral and multilateral funding for biosafety is likely to adversely affect the implementation of the Protocol.

42. In view of the above situation, there is an urgent need for new strategies to enhance efforts to mobilize additional financial and other resources for the implementation of the Protocol. To date, most developing countries Parties and Parties with economies in transition rely on preparing and submitting grant proposals to bilateral and multilateral donors, including the GEF, to support specific biosafety capacity-building projects. However, Parties and other Governments need to expand the donor base and endeavour to mobilize resources from as many and as diverse donors as possible. There is also a need to explore opportunities to obtain financial resources from national, regional and international donor agencies and the private sector and other organizations, as appropriate.

43. While project grant applications will continue to be an important mechanism of resource mobilization, Parties and other Governments need to diversify their sources, both domestic and external, of financial resources. This will require innovative approaches and increased collaboration and partnerships between various stakeholders.

44. Primarily, Parties and other Governments are encouraged to explore possibilities of increasing allocations for biosafety activities in their national budgets and mobilizing additional resources domestically, for example, through charging a reasonable fee for processing applications for import or release of living modified organisms (LMOs) and/or levying fines on violations of the biosafety laws and regulations and re-channelling the funds directly towards supporting biosafety activities. Furthermore, Parties and other Governments could charge fees for the technical services (for instance LMO testing services) or expert advice provided by their employees (for instance as resource persons or facilitators of training activities) to other stakeholders.

45. Parties and other Governments may wish to establish strategic partnerships among themselves and with various donor agencies, organizations, regional bodies or centres of excellence. Such partnerships could help them to pool resources and/or widen opportunities and possibilities of mobilizing resources at the national, regional and international levels. Furthermore, Parties and other Governments are encouraged to identify and maximize opportunities for technical cooperation with regional and international organizations, institutions and development assistance agencies. A related resource mobilization strategy is to build networks or participate in existing networks to facilitate sharing of resources and information.

46. As resource mobilization is a continuous process, Parties and other Governments are encouraged to develop national strategies and build internal capacity to mobilize resources for the implementation of their biosafety activities in a systematic, coordinated and sustainable manner. In this regard, they may wish to consider assigning dedicated staff for resource mobilization and training them in relevant skills such as project proposal writing, fundraising strategies, partnership-building and networking, communications and outreach, including working with the media to publicize the ongoing activities, achievements and future plans as a strategy for promoting awareness and support of decision makers and donors.

47. Furthermore, mainstreaming biosafety into national development plans and relevant sectoral policies, strategies and programmes, including the development assistance programmes and the national biodiversity strategies and action plans, could be another important strategy for mobilizing additional resources to support the implementation of biosafety activities at the national level. National focal points for the Protocol should be encouraged to interact with the national focal points of the Convention and other relevant treaties, the GEF operational focal points and other government officials in relevant government ministries and departments, including the ministries of finance and economic planning, among others.

48. Finally, in the current era of limited availability of funding, efforts should be made to ensure efficient use of the available resources and adopt cost-effective approaches to capacity-building and other activities, including targeted training-of-trainers and use of online tools.

49. The meeting of the Parties may wish to urge Parties and invite other Governments to implement the above measures within the overall framework of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization in support of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which was adopted in 2008 (decision IX/11), and to exchange, through the BCH, information on their experiences, good practices and lessons learned on the mobilization of resources at the national and regional levels. It may also wish to request the Executive Secretary to include resource mobilization for the Protocol in its activities to facilitate the national implementation of the CBD Strategy for Resource Mobilization.

VI. SUGGESTED ELEMENTS OF A DRAFT DECISION

50. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Protocol may wish to take a decision on the financial mechanism and financial resources along the following lines:

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

Guidance to the financial mechanism

1. Recommends to the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its further 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:

(a) Support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety within the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) by defining specific quotas for biosafety for each country during the GEF-6 programming period;

(b) Also support regional and multi-country thematic capacity-building projects for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety using the Focal Area Set-aside (FAS) resources under the biodiversity focal area, outside the national STAR allocations;

(c) Allow for more flexibility in the utilization of funds provided for capacity-building to address emerging needs within the overall framework of the approved projects;

(d) Further streamline, simplify and expedite, to the extent possible, the process of accessing funds from the GEF trust fund;

(e) Consider developing a new Strategy for Financing Biosafety, taking into account the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020 and other developments that have taken place since 2006;

(f) Set aside the guidance contained in paragraph 21 (b) of decision VII/20 which allowed 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;

(g) Extend without further delay support under the BCH-II project to all the remaining eligible Parties, using resources under the biodiversity focal area, outside the national STAR allocations;

(h) Make available, in a timely manner, financial resources to eligible Parties to facilitate the preparation of their third national reports under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

(i) Provide support to eligible Parties that have not yet done so to initiate implementation of their legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol;

(j) Take into account the new “Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety” in providing financial support to developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

(k) Consider, within the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for biodiversity for the sixth replenishment period (2014-2018), the following programme priorities with respect to biosafety:

- 1) National biosafety frameworks;
- 2) Risk assessment and risk management;

- 3) Handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms (LMOs);
- 4) Liability and redress;
- 5) Public awareness, education, and participation;
- 6) Information sharing, including full participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House;
- 7) Biosafety education and training; and
- 8) Activities recommended by the Compliance Committee to assist eligible Parties to comply with their obligations under the Protocol;

(l) In programming resources under the biodiversity focal area, consider making a notional allocation of at least US\$ 102 million to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety during the sixth replenishment period (2014-2018);

Mobilization of additional resources

2. Urges Parties and invites other Governments to implement, as appropriate, the following measures within the overall framework of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization in support of the Convention on Biological Diversity, with a view to mobilizing additional financial resources for implementation of the Protocol:

(a) Identify and seek funding support from diverse sources including regional and international donor agencies, foundations and, as appropriate, through private-sector involvement;

(b) Consider re-channelling any fees that may be charged for processing LMO import or release applications and for technical services provided, and fines that may be charged for violation of biosafety laws and regulations, directly towards supporting national biosafety activities;

(c) Establish strategic partnerships with other Parties and with various organizations, regional bodies or centres of excellence, with a view to pooling resources and/or widening opportunities and possibilities of mobilizing resources from various sources;

(d) Identify and maximize opportunities for technical cooperation with regional and international organizations, institutions and development assistance agencies;

(e) Mainstream biosafety into national development plans and relevant sectoral policies, strategies and programmes, including development assistance programmes and national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

(f) Consider designating dedicated staff for resource mobilization and building internal capacity to mobilize resources for the implementation of national biosafety activities in a systematic, coordinated and sustainable manner;

(g) Ensure efficient use of the available resources and adopt cost-effective approaches to capacity-building;

3. Invites Parties and other Governments to exchange, through the Biosafety Clearing-House, information on their experiences, good practices and lessons learned on the mobilization of resources at the national and regional levels;

4. Requests the Executive Secretary to include resource mobilization for the Protocol in the activities to facilitate the implementation of the CBD Strategy for Resource Mobilization, including the regional and subregional workshops to assist Parties to elaborate country-specific resource mobilization strategies for the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

Annex

LIST OF ONGOING GEF-FUNDED BIOSAFETY PROJECTS

(Based on information from the GEF project database as of 30 June 2012)

No.	GEF ID	Country	Project Name	IA	Project Type	GEF Grant	Co-financing	Status
National projects								
1.	2648	Tunisia	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	848,900	919,260	Under Implementation
2.	2822	Mauritius	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	427,800	207,900	Under Implementation
3.	2824	Egypt	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	908,100	1,389,000	Under Implementation
4.	3012	Tanzania	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	777,300	614,300	Under Implementation
5.	3040	Liberia	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Liberia	UNEP	MSP	577,679	530,000	Under Implementation
6.	3045	Ghana	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Ghana	UNEP	MSP	636,364	800,000	Under Implementation
7.	3211	Tajikistan	BS Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of the Republic of Tajikistan	UNEP	MSP	840,000	540,000	Under Implementation
8.	3332	El Salvador	BS Contributing to the Safe use of Biotechnology	UNEP	MSP	900,000	1,025,000	Under Implementation
9.	3333	Indonesia	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	830,196	709,200	IA Approved
10.	3335	Madagascar	BS Support for Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Madagascar	UNEP	MSP	613,850	290,000	Under Implementation
11.	3405	Ecuador	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	665,818	660,824	Under Implementation

No.	GEF ID	Country	Project Name	IA	Project Type	GEF Grant	Co-financing	Status
12.	3633	Peru	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	811,804	900,000	Under Implementation
13.	3642	Lao PDR	BS Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of LAO PDR	UNEP	MSP	995,000	505,000	Under Implementation
14.	3644	Namibia	BS Institutional Capacity Building Towards the Implementation of the Biosafety Act 2006 and related Obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	UNEP	MSP	510,000	396,000	Under Implementation
15.	3646	Lesotho	BS Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Lesotho	UNEP	MSP	884,806	166,888	Under Implementation
16.	3629	Costa Rica	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	718,873	750,102	Under Implementation
17.	3630	Guatemala	BS Development of Biosafety Mechanisms to Strengthen the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in Guatemala	UNEP	MSP	616,364	490,020	Under Implementation
18.	3631	Panama	BS Consolidation of National Capacities for the Full Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Panama.	UNEP	MSP	954,927	1,000,000	Under Implementation
19.	3636	Cambodia	BS Building Capacity for the Detection and Monitoring of LMOs in Cambodia Biosafety Program	UNEP	MSP	656,528	1,000,000	Under Implementation
20.	3643	Cuba	BS Completion and Strengthening of the Cuban National Biosafety Framework for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	UNEP	MSP	900,091	895,800	Under Implementation
21.	3655	Nigeria	BS Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Nigeria	UNEP	MSP	965,000	1,046,000	Under Implementation
22.	3667	Rwanda	BS Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Rwanda	UNEP	MSP	645,455	969,085	IA Approved
23.	3730	Iran	Building National Capacity to Implement the National Biosafety Framework of Islamic Republic of Iran and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	UNEP	MSP	749,000	851,000	IA Approved
24.	3751	India	BS Capacity Building on Biosafety for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol - Phase II under the Biosafety Program	UNEP	FP	2,727,273	6,000,000	Under Implementation

No.	GEF ID	Country	Project Name	IA	Project Type	GEF Grant	Co-financing	Status
25.	3850	Bhutan	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Bhutan	UNEP	MSP	869,000	854,000	Under Implementation
26.	3895	Albania	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	558,000	306,600	Under Implementation
27.	4010	Mongolia	Capacity Building for Biosafety Implementation	UNEP	MSP	381,800	335,000	Under Implementation
28.	4022	Bangladesh	BS Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	884,090	533,300	Under Implementation
29.	4067	Turkey	BS Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	542,650	750,000	CEO Approved
30.	4077	Swaziland	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Swaziland	UNEP	MSP	770,000	352,500	Under Implementation
31.	4086	Jordan	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Jordan	UNEP	MSP	884,000	905,000	Under Implementation
32.	4087	Syria	Support for the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Syria	UNEP	MSP	875,000	953,000	IA Approved
33.	4103	Macedonia	Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	407,000	236,000	Under Implementation
Regional and global projects								
34.	2689	Regional	Latin America: Multi-country Capacity-building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	IBRD	FP	5,000,000	10,745,200	Under Implementation
35.	2911	Regional	West African Regional Biosafety Program	IBRD	FP	5,400,000	15,540,000	Under Implementation
36.	2967	Regional	BS Regional Project for Implementing National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean Sub-region - under the GEF Biosafety Program	UNEP	FP	5,972,493	6,918,624	Under Implementation

37.	3562	Regional	Latin-America: Communication and Public Awareness Capacity-Building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	IBRD	MSP	900,000	1,020,000	Under Implementation
38.	3856	Global	BS:UNEP-GEF Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH II	UNEP	FP	2,500,000	2,515,000	Under Implementation
39.	4523	Regional	Support to Preparation of the Second National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety-Africa	UNEP	MSP	993,950	840,000	Under Implementation
40.	4524	Global	Support to Preparation of the Second National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety-North Africa (NA), Asia (A), Central and Eastern Europe (CEE)	UNEP	MSP	970,775	820,000	Under Implementation
41.	4525	Global	Support to Preparation of the Second National Biosafety Reports to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety--Latin America, Caribbean and Pacific Regions	UNEP	MSP	924,425	780,000	Under Implementation

Projects under development

	GEF ID	Country	Project Name	IA	Project Type	GEF Grant	Co-financing	Status
42.	4065	Turkmenistan	BS Capacity Building for the Development of the National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	284,600	167,625	PIF Approved
43.	4078	Ethiopia	BS Implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through Effective Implementation of National Biosafety Framework	UNEP	MSP	616,000	700,000	PIF Approved
44.	3649	Mozambique	Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Mozambique	UNEP	MSP	755,000	188,750	PIF Approved
