



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/7/4/Rev.1
22 September 2014

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

Seventh meeting

Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 29 September - 3 October 2014

Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

MATTERS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM AND RESOURCES

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its sixth meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol (hereafter referred to as the “meeting of the Parties to the Protocol”) adopted decision BS-VI/5 on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources. Part I of the decision included a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties (COP) regarding further guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety. In paragraph 28 of its decision XI/5, the Conference of the Parties transmitted the recommendation of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the financial mechanism. Part II of decision BS-VI/5 outlined measures for mobilization of additional resources for the implementation of the Protocol.

2. The present note provides, in section II, a summary report on the status of implementation of the guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety, including an overview of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) funding portfolio for biosafety within the biodiversity focal area, and an update on the recent GEF support for biosafety projects. This is based on information provided in the report of the GEF Council to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, information received from Parties, as well as information contained in relevant documents including reports of the fourth review of the effectiveness of the GEF and the Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS-5). The full report submitted by the GEF Council to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties is made available as document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/14/Add.1.

3. Section III of the note provides an update on the sixth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund for the period 2014-2018 (GEF-6) and the programming directions for GEF-6. Section IV reviews the recent developments relevant to the mobilization of additional resources to support the implementation of the Protocol and outlines further possible strategies for mobilizing resources based on the outcomes of the Online Forum on the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which was held through the Biosafety Clearing-House from 26 May to 13 June 2014. The last section provides the suggested elements of a draft decision on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources.

* UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/7/1.

4. The meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to review information provided in the present note and take a decision, as appropriate, including a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties regarding further guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety.

II. STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PREVIOUS GUIDANCE TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM WITH RESPECT TO BIOSAFETY

A. *GEF's response to the guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties with respect to biosafety*

5. The guidance by the Conference of the Parties to the financial mechanism with respect to biosafety (decision XI/5, paragraph 28 and appendix II) was transmitted to the Global Environment Facility by the Executive Secretary on 29 October 2012.¹ Table 1 below provides a summary of GEF's response to that guidance. The table is extracted from the report submitted by the GEF Council to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity which is available in document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/14/Add.1). The full report provides details on the specific projects approved during the reporting period.

Table 1. GEF's response to COP guidance with respect to biosafety contained in decision XI/5

COP/MOP 6 Guidance	GEF Response
<p><i>Adopts</i> the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the period 2014-2018 as contained in the annex to the present decision and <i>requests</i> the GEF to implement it and report back to the COP at its twelfth meeting on the GEF-6 strategy and its thirteenth meeting on its implementation and how it responds to the individual Elements and their components, and the Additional Strategic Considerations of the Framework, in accordance with the MoU between the Conference of the Parties and the GEF Council.</p>	<p>Report on GEF support to the implementation of the Strategic Plan is provided in this report. Please see Figures 1-4 of this report in particular which maps country prioritization of their allocations to the Aichi Targets.</p> <p>In addition, please see GEF-6 biodiversity strategy and paragraphs 18-24 in particular, and Annex I and II within the GEF-6 biodiversity strategy.</p>
<p>Biosafety</p> <p>In decision XI/5, paragraph 28, the COP further transmitted the guidance received from the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which was contained in appendix II to the present decision.</p>	<p>This guidance was incorporated into the GEF-6 biodiversity strategy and will inform GEF's ongoing support to the Cartagena Protocol. Please see Annex 1 of this report (GEF-6 biodiversity strategy).</p>

Source: GEF Report to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (pages 14 and 18).

6. In paragraph 2 (f) of appendix II to decision XI/5, the GEF was invited to provide further support to all eligible Parties for capacity-building in the use of the Biosafety Clearing-House, based on experiences or lessons learned during the Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House and using resources under the biodiversity focal

¹ A copy of the communication is available at: <http://www.cbd.int/financial/doc/es-letter-to-gefceo-en.pdf>.

area. In response, the GEF approved a global project, Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH), which will support capacity-building in the 76 countries that did not participate in the BCH-2 and BCH-1 projects.

7. In paragraph 7 of appendix II to decision XI/5, the Executive Secretary was requested to further communicate with the GEF Secretariat before the meeting of the GEF Council in November 2012 to discuss the possibility of opening a special financial support window for implementation of the Protocol, and to report on the outcome to the Parties to the Protocol. Pursuant to the request, on 29 October 2012 the Executive Secretary sent a letter to the Chief Executive Officer of the GEF transmitting the guidance to the financial mechanism contained in decision XI/5, including the issue of opening a special financial support window for implementation of the Protocol. However, due to the close proximity between the meeting of the Conference of the Parties in October 2012 and the meeting of the GEF Council in November 2012, it was not possible for the GEF Council to discuss this matter at its November meeting. The Convention and GEF Secretariats further discussed the issue at the joint CBD-GEF retreat on the financial mechanism and 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets held 4-5 June 2013. However, at its subsequent meetings the GEF Council did not consider that specific request of opening a special financial support window for implementation of the Protocol.

B. GEF support for biosafety projects during the reporting period

8. During the reporting period (1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014), the GEF funded five projects (3 country-based projects, 1 regional project and 1 global project) that contributed to the third objective of the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy, i.e., building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol for Biosafety. The GEF invested \$13.6 million (about 35% of the resources notionally allocated to biosafety during GEF-5) and leveraged \$26.2 million in co-financing. The five approved projects are listed in Annex 7 and described in Annex 9 of the GEF report to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. For ease of reference the list is also presented in the annex to the present document.

9. Although the total amount of resources allocated to projects supporting the implementation of the Protocol (objective 3 of the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy) increased during the current reporting period when compared with the first two years of GEF-5 (2010-2012), during which only \$2.805 million were used to support eligible Parties to prepare their second national reports, only a few projects were supported and in general the rate of utilization of resources for biosafety was quite low compared to the rates for the other thematic areas under the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy.

Table 2. Level of programming for the Biodiversity Strategy Objectives during 2012-2014²

Biodiversity focal area objective	Notional allocation (US\$)	Amount utilized	% utilized
BD-1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	700,000,000	210,067,104	30%
BD-2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors	250,000,000	185,372,436	74%
BD-3: Building Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena	40,000,000	13,663,648	35%

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.

Protocol for Biosafety			
BD-4: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing	40,000,000	45,119,483	113%
BD-5: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities (NBSAPs)	40,000,000	5,388,557	12%
TOTAL	1,070,000,000	459,611,228	43%

Source: GEF Report to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (page 4).

C. GEF support for biosafety projects during the entire GEF-5 period

10. In general, the level of utilization of resources for biosafety during the entire GEF-5 cycle (2010-2014) was quite low compared to the other thematic areas under the biodiversity focal area. In total, \$16,468,648 was approved for 8 biosafety projects during GEF-5, which represents 41 per cent of the amount (US\$ 40 million) that was notionally allocated for supporting the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (see Table 3 below).

Table 3. Level of programming for the Biodiversity Strategy Objectives during the entire GEF-5³

Biodiversity Focal Area Objective	Notional allocation (US\$)	Amount utilized	% utilized
BD-1: Sustainability of protected area systems	700,000,000	489,068,947	70%
BD-2: Mainstreaming biodiversity	250,000,000	409,102,504	164%
BD-3: Biosafety	40,000,000	16,468,648	41%
BD-4: Access and benefit-sharing	40,000,000	47,806,233	120%
BD-5: Enabling activities (NBSAPs)	40,000,000	30,263,908	76%
TOTAL	1,070,000,000	992,710,240	93%

Source: GEF Report to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (page 4).

11. Also, as indicated in Table 4 below, the total amount used to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (\$16,468,648) represents less than 2 per cent of the actual total amount of resources that were approved for projects under the biodiversity focal area during GEF-5.

³ 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.

Table 4. Biodiversity Programming by Strategy Objective During GEF-5 (2010-2014)

Biodiversity Strategy Objective	GEF Amount	% of the total programmed	Co-financing (US\$)
BD-1: Sustainability of protected area systems	489,068,947	49%	2,239,746,445
BD-2: Mainstreaming biodiversity	409,102,504	41%	1,862,014,386
BD-3: Biosafety	16,468,648	2%	28,680,180
BD-4: Access and benefit-sharing	47,806,233	5%	113,238,843
BD-5: Enabling activities (NBSAPs)	30,263,908	3%	51,998,355
TOTAL	992,710,240	100%	4,295,678,209

Source: GEF Report to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (page 3).

12. The level of utilization of GEF funds for biosafety during GEF-5 (\$16.5 million for 8 projects) was also much lower than the level in GEF-4 (more than \$52 million for at least 50 projects) and GEF-3 (more than \$36 million for 18 biosafety projects). As a result, the notional allocation for biosafety has been reduced, from \$75 million in GEF-4 to \$40 million in GEF-5 and now \$30 million in GEF-6 (see Table 5 below).

Table 5. Biodiversity Programming Levels for GEF-4, GEF-5 and GEF-6

Biodiversity Strategy Objective	GEF-4 (2006-2010)		GEF-5 (2010-2014)		GEF-6 (2014-2018)	
	GEF Amount (\$ million)	% of total amount	GEF Amount (\$ million)	% of total amount	GEF Amount (\$ million)	% of total amount
Protected area systems	425	47%	700	65%	250	19%
Mainstreaming biodiversity	270	30%	250	23%	416	32%
Biosafety	75	8%	40	4%	30	2%
Access and benefit-sharing			40	4%	50	4%
Enabling activities	36	4%	40	4%		
Emerging issues	90	10%				
Threatened species					80	6%
Invasive alien species					50	4%
Sustainable use of biodiversity					175	14%
Focal Area Set-Aside					245	18%
TOTAL	906	100%	1,070	100%	1,296	100%

Source: Programming Documents for GEF-4 (GEF/R.4/33), GEF-5 (GEF/R.5/31) and GEF-6 (GEF/R.6/20/Rev.04).

13. In short, despite being a separate binding international treaty under the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety has continued to receive less and less funding support from the GEF, which is its designated financial mechanism. The main reason for this decline is the stiff competition between biosafety and other thematic areas under the biodiversity focal area for the limited

national GEF allocation under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR).⁴ In programming the use of their national allocations, a number of Parties have given preference to projects addressing issues which tend to produce immediate and visible results, such as protected areas, rather than to biosafety projects, which are more regulatory in nature and produce less tangible results in the short term.

14. The downward trend in the national programming of GEF resources for biosafety, coupled with the general decline in bilateral and multilateral support for biosafety, might have a serious negative effect on the future of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. A number of developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition may not be able to comply with the provisions of the Protocol, including establishment of operational national biosafety regulatory systems and building the necessary capacities, due to lack of financial support.

15. At its tenth and eleventh meetings, the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety considered ways that could help Parties to improve their access to GEF funding for biosafety projects.⁵ Among other things, the Committee called for better coordination between biosafety, biodiversity and GEF focal points and organization of regional workshops with a view to: (a) raising awareness among relevant government officials of the importance of fulfilling biosafety-related obligations; (b) helping to identify local or regional capacities that may be available and utilized; and (c) designing projects that have a better chance of being approved. The Committee also suggested that regional biosafety projects could have a greater chance of success as they allow for the pooling of resources available among participating Parties while spreading of the administrative costs involved. In this regard, the Committee has advised the seventh meeting of the Parties to encourage Parties to cooperate at the regional level to obtain GEF funding.

16. The tenth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety, which was held in April 2014 in Budapest,⁶ made the following suggestions to improve the use of GEF resources for national implementation of the Protocol:

(a) National workshops should be organized for relevant government officials (including GEF operational focal points) with a view to ensuring that biosafety is given due consideration when apportioning the countries' national GEF allocations for biodiversity;

(b) Regional and bilateral workshops should be organized for the Cartagena Protocol and Convention national focal points and the GEF operational focal points and relevant stakeholders to share experiences and lessons learned in the mobilization of resources for supporting biosafety activities;

(c) The Secretariat should consider sending a letter to the GEF operational focal points describing the current situation of declining national allocation of GEF funding for the national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and also bringing to their attention paragraph 1 of decision BS-VI/5 urging Parties to give priority to biosafety under the GEF System for Transparent

⁴ The current negative trend is in direct contrast to the positive evaluation of the GEF support for Biosafety during GEF-3 that was considered by the GEF Council at its November 2005 meeting (GEF/ME/C.27/Inf.1/Rev.1), which noted, among other things, that the GEF had responded very expeditiously and systematically to the requests for support to the Protocol and that the GEF's support had contributed to building momentum for the ratification and implementation of the Protocol.

⁵ The reports of the tenth and eleventh meetings of the Compliance Committee are available at <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BSCC-10> and <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BSCC-11>.

⁶ The report of the tenth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety is contained in document UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/10/2 available at: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BSLGCB-10>.

Allocation of Resources (STAR), in view of the fact that the GEF is the financial mechanism for the Protocol.

17. The present meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to consider the above recommendations and other possible corrective measures and take a decision, as appropriate.

D. Findings of the Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS-5) and the fourth review of the effectiveness of the Global Environment Facility

18. In accordance with the annex to decision X/27, the Executive Secretary contracted the services of an independent evaluator, ICF International Inc., to conduct the fourth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism. In April 2013, ICF International Inc. circulated to all Parties a questionnaire seeking their input in assessing the effectiveness of the financial mechanism.⁷ In total, 48 Parties responded to the survey, including 43 developing country Parties and 5 developed country Parties. The assessment report was presented to the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention in document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/INF/10 and the findings will be considered by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting.⁸

19. The main conclusions and recommendations of the review that may be of direct relevance to the Cartagena Protocol include the following:

(a) Conclusion 1: The Conference of the Parties has made measurable improvements in consolidating older guidance to the GEF, but the number of new guidance items adopted at each Conference of the Parties is still consistently high and sometimes the guidance is repetitive.

Recommendation 1: The Conference of the Parties may wish to further streamline guidance to the GEF through a more regular and systematic process.

(b) Conclusion 2: Strategic prioritization of COP guidance remains an issue. The Convention does not rank its guidance in order of importance, nor identify funding quotients associated with guidance. As GEF resources are limited, this lack of prioritization may result in fragmentation of limited GEF resources and achievement of limited impact in many areas, as opposed to concentrated impact in a few areas.

Recommendation 2: The CBD and GEF Secretariats should explore ways that the COP can best utilize the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 to set priorities for the GEF, and perhaps agree upon certain Aichi Targets that are high priority for the GEF to address in the short term.

(c) Conclusion 3: Overall, the GEF has been largely responsive to the COP guidance, within its means. COP guidance is reflected in the GEF-4 and GEF-5 Focal Area Strategies, project approvals and the GEF reports to the COP. However, GEF activities have not addressed all pieces of COP guidance during this review period. For instance, during this review period, no countries submitted projects that

⁷ The assessment considered, inter alia: the conformity of GEF activities with the COP guidance; the effectiveness of GEF in mobilizing new and additional financial resources (e.g., through co-financing); the efficiency of the GEF in providing and delivering financial resources and overseeing the activities financed; the efficiency and effectiveness of the GEF-funded activities; the effectiveness and relevance of guidance from the COP to the GEF; and the coherence and synergy with the guidance and activities of the other Rio conventions.

⁸ The report is available at: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/wgri/wgri-05/information/wgri-05-inf-10-en.pdf>.

explicitly addressed the guidance related to the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, the Global Taxonomy Initiative, and National Biosafety Framework implementation projects.

Recommendation 3: The GEF and the Conference of the Parties should together continue to explore ways to address this challenge.

(d) Conclusion 4: While the total allocation of GEF funds to the biodiversity focal area has been largely predictable, the allocation of funding to individual countries has been less predictable, with predictability increasing from GEF-4 to GEF-5 due to the replacement of the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) with STAR.

Recommendation 4: The GEF should continue to use an allocation framework to predictably and equitably allocate biodiversity funding to individual countries; however, adjustments to the framework should be considered based upon the mid-term evaluation of STAR.

(e) Conclusion 5: Compared to previous replenishment periods, the number of enabling activities supported significantly increased during GEF-5. The GEF has been effective in disbursing available funds; funds that were allocated to the biodiversity focal area under GEF-4 were almost entirely utilized, and it is expected that the majority of funds allocated under GEF-5 will be similarly utilized.

Recommendation 5: Greater discussion is needed at the Conference of the Parties regarding the role of the GEF in providing funds to achieve the Aichi Targets and in supporting activities under the Cartagena Protocol.

(f) Conclusion 6: The GEF has helped to mobilize new and additional financial resources at the project level to support implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, although opportunity exists to do more. While the ratio of anticipated co-financing to GEF biodiversity funding has gradually increased over time, the average co-financing ratio for the biodiversity focal area is significantly below the ratio for other GEF focal areas.

Recommendation 6: The GEF should continue to put emphasis on resource mobilization (e.g., project co-financing) while not compromising project goals. It should seek innovative ways in GEF-6 to further mobilize resources for biodiversity.

(g) Conclusion 7: To date under GEF-5, country requests and GEF approvals for biodiversity funding have not fully aligned with the notional allocations for each objective in the GEF-5 biodiversity strategy. Halfway through GEF-5, the amount of funding approved to support objective 2 (mainstreaming biodiversity) had already exceeded the notional allocation while no countries had submitted projects for approval to support objective 3 (building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety). Some stakeholders interviewed suggested that the use of an allocation framework under GEF-4 and GEF-5 (i.e., RAF and STAR) has contributed to under-requesting of biosafety funding because each country decides which priorities to address with its limited national allocation. Biosafety may be a lower national priority in some countries for various reasons: the biosafety focal point is in the agriculture ministry which is less involved in the prioritization of GEF resources; some countries do not import or export living modified organisms; or biosafety may be better addressed through transboundary projects, which can be challenging with the individual country allocations.

Recommendation 7: The COP may wish to encourage Parties to submit projects to the GEF related to the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation and the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) –

two areas in which no projects were submitted to the GEF, despite COP guidance that these are priority areas. In addition, requests for biosafety support were limited to national reporting. The GEF should continue to monitor the progress of project approvals in these areas and provide updates to the Conference of the Parties.

20. The Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS-5),⁹ which was conducted by the GEF Evaluation Office, noted, among other things, that the GEF is achieving its mandate and objectives and continues to be highly relevant and successful in its interventions. Technical Document No. 3 of OPS-5 noted that during GEF-5 there were deviations between the indicative resource allocations and the programmed resources in some of the biodiversity focal area objectives. For example, a much larger proportion of resources was approved for objective BD-2, “Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production land/seascapes and sectors”, than what was notionally allocated, while other biodiversity objectives such as biosafety and access and benefit-sharing received very limited funding.

21. The present meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to consider the above findings and recommendations of the fourth review of the effectiveness of the GEF and the Fifth Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS-5) and take a decision, as appropriate.

III. THE SIXTH REPLENISHMENT OF THE GEF TRUST FUND AND THE PROGRAMMING OF RESOURCES FOR THE BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA STRATEGY

A. The Sixth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund and the Programming Directions for 2014-2018

22. Following its restructuring in 1994, the GEF Trust Fund has been replenished five times: GEF-1 Replenishment (1994-1998) for \$2.0 billion, GEF-2 Replenishment (1998-2002) for US\$ 2.75 billion, GEF-3 Replenishment (2002-2006) for US\$ 3.0 billion, GEF-4 Replenishment (2006-2010) for US\$ 3.13 billion, and GEF-5 Replenishment (2010-2014) for US\$ 4.34 billion.

23. Negotiations for the sixth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund for the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2018 (GEF-6) were successfully concluded in April 2014 in Geneva and a total of \$4.433 billion was pledged, representing a nominal increase of 4 per cent over GEF-5.

24. The programming of GEF-6 resources covers operations and activities in its six focal areas (biodiversity, climate change, chemicals and waste, international waters, land degradation, sustainable forest management) in accordance with each of the focal area strategies. It also covers the pilot non-grant instruments, the corporate programmes (including the Country Support Program, Cross-Cutting Capacity Development, and the Small Grants Program) as well as the corporate budget (for the GEF Secretariat, STAP and the Trustee) and the Independent Evaluation Office. Table 6 below summarizes the agreed programming targets for the different focal areas/themes.

⁹ The OPS-5 report can be accessed at: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/OPS5>.

Table 6. GEF-6 Programming Targets for the Different Focal Areas/Themes

Focal Area/Theme	GEF-5 Programming Targets (\$ million)¹⁰	GEF-6 Programming Targets (\$ million)
Biodiversity	1,210	1296
Climate change	1,360	1260
Chemicals and waste	425	554
International waters	440	456
Land degradation	405	431
Non-grant instruments pilot	80	115
Corporate programs	210	197
Corporate Budget: Secretariat, STAP and Trustee	120	106
Independent Evaluation Office		19
TOTAL GEF Replenishment	4,250	4,433

Source: GEF Council document GEF/C.46/07/Rev.01 - Summary of the Negotiations of the Sixth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (page 15).

25. The GEF-6 programming has introduced innovative strategies, which include “Integrated Approach Pilots”, innovative programming, non-grant instruments and expanded private sector engagement and collaboration with civil society organizations. Under the “integrated approach pilots”, the GEF will test the delivery of integrated approach programmes aimed at addressing discrete global environmental challenges by focusing on some of the underlying drivers of environmental degradation through special programmes that provide unique added-value and build strong stakeholder relationships.

B. GEF-6 Programming Directions for the Biodiversity Focal Area

26. The biodiversity focal area has been allocated \$1.296 billion (29% of the overall GEF-6 portfolio), making biodiversity the largest single focal area resource envelope in GEF-6. This amount has been programmed to support the implementation of the GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy.

27. In accordance with the COP guidance to the financial mechanism regarding the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for 2014-2018 (decision XI/5), the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy incorporates elements of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 including its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020, and programme priorities relating to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization proposed by the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol.

28. The overall goal of the biodiversity focal area strategy is to maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society. To achieve this goal, the strategy encompasses four objectives:

- (a) BD 1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems;
- (b) BD 2: Reduce Threats to Globally Significant Biodiversity;
- (c) BD 3: Sustainably Use Biodiversity;

¹⁰ GEF-5 programming and application of the STAR was based on the agreed programming scenario of US\$ 4.25 billion. The final replenishment amount, including additional pledges from donors, increased to US\$ 4.34 billion.

(d) BD 4: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors.

29. The GEF-6 biodiversity strategy is composed of ten programmes that directly contribute to the above four objectives and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including at least 14 of the 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The indicative resource allocations for the different programmes during GEF-6 are outlined in Table 7 below.

Table 7. GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Objectives and Indicative Allocations per Program

Focal Area Objective	Focal Area Programs	Notional Allocation (US\$ million)
BD 1: Improve sustainability of protected area systems	Program 1: Improving Financial Sustainability and Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure	125
	Program 2: Nature's Last Stand: Expanding the Reach of the Global Protected Area Estate	125
BD 2: Reduce threats to globally significant biodiversity	Program 3: Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species	80
	Program 4: Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species	50
	Program 5: Implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)	30
BD 3: Sustainably use biodiversity	Program 6: Ridge to Reef+: Maintaining Integrity and Function of Coral Reef Ecosystems	100
	Program 7: Securing Agriculture's Future: Sustainable Use of Plant and Animal Genetic Resources	75
	Program 8: Implement the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing	50
BD 4: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes and seascapes and sectors	Program 9: Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface	338
	Program 10: Integration of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services into Development & Finance Planning	78
Focal Area Set-Aside (Convention obligations, global/regional programs including the "Integrated Approach pilots", and SFM Program)		245
Total Biodiversity		1,296

Source: GEF Report to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, annex 1 (page 23).

30. In addition to the above ten programmes, the GEF will provide support through the focal area set-aside (FAS) funds to enable eligible countries to implement enabling activities, including revision of the NBSAPs (for countries that have not yet done so) and preparation of the national reports under the

Convention, the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol which will come due during the GEF-6 period. The Biodiversity FAS will also be used to support regional and global projects, including the “Integrated Approach pilots” which will contribute to various the Aichi Targets and other GEF focal areas

31. The integrated approach pilots relevant to the biodiversity focal area include:
 - (a) Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains;
 - (b) Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Africa.
32. Consistent with past practice and the GEF project review criteria, projects submitted for funding in GEF-6 will have to demonstrate that the thematic areas addressed within the project have been prioritized within the national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) and are appropriately aligned with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

C. Support for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety under GEF-6

33. Support for biosafety will be provided mainly through Program 5: Implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB), under the second strategic objective. A notional allocation of US\$ 30 million has been provided for the programme. Through this programme, the GEF will prioritize the implementation of activities identified in country stocktaking analyses and in the COP guidance to the GEF, in particular the key elements in the Strategic Plan for Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020 and the framework and action plan for capacity-building for effective implementation of the Protocol adopted at the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. The main priority will be supporting the implementation of national biosafety frameworks (NBFs) of Parties that did not seek support for this purpose during the previous GEF cycles.

34. The 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 to support implementation of the Protocol. GEF experience has shown that these kinds of 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.

35. The GEF will also support thematic projects addressing specific provisions of the Cartagena Protocol. These projects should be developed at the regional or subregional level and build on a common set of targets and opportunities to implement the Protocol beyond the development and implementation of national biosafety frameworks. Furthermore, it will support the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Protocol.

36. As noted above, the GEF will provide support for preparation of the third national reports under the Protocol through the biodiversity focal area set-aside (FAS) funds. Parties may also wish to consider requesting support for regional and subregional thematic projects through the FAS funds. In its report to the present meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, the Compliance Committee has also recommended that the GEF be further invited to make funds available through the biodiversity focal area set-aside for small-scale projects to assist eligible Parties that inform the Compliance Committee of their difficulties in complying with the Protocol, pursuant to item 8 of paragraph 2 (n) of appendix II to decision XI/5 of the Conference of the Parties. In addition, Parties that are in non-compliance with certain provisions of the Protocol may wish to consider requesting GEF support from their country’s allocation under the STAR to meet their obligations under the Protocol.

37. The meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may also wish to encourage Parties to explore the possibility of incorporating biosafety activities into the proposed “integrated approach” programmes that will be piloted during GEF-6, as well as projects to be developed under the other biodiversity focal area programmes. For example, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety definitely has linkages with the “integrated approach” programme on “Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Africa”. Biosafety activities could also be incorporated into Program 7 on Securing Agriculture’s Future: Sustainable Use of Plant and Animal Genetic Resources and Program 9 on Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface.

IV. MOBILIZATION OF ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL

38. Since the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted its previous decision on resource mobilization (decision BS-VI/5, part II) in October 2012, there have been a number of developments relevant to the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Protocol that the present meeting of the Parties may wish to consider and take further decisions on, as appropriate. These include outcomes of the tenth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety, which was held in April 2014 in Budapest (document UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/10/2), the Online Forum on the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which was held through the Biosafety Clearing-House from 26 May to 13 June 2014, and developments under the Convention on Biological Diversity, as outlined below.

39. The tenth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety made a few observations and proposed recommendations regarding mobilization of additional resources to support national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. Among other things, it recommended that:

(a) Regular briefing sessions should be organized for key policy and decision makers to increase their awareness of the importance of biosafety and secure their support and commitment to providing national budgetary allocations for biosafety activities and the inclusion of biosafety among the priority issues for consideration in bilateral and multilateral development cooperation;

(b) Regional and bilateral workshops should be organized for the Cartagena Protocol and Convention national focal points and the GEF operational focal points and relevant stakeholders to share experiences and lessons learned in the mobilization of resources for supporting biosafety activities; and

(c) The Secretariat should send a questionnaire to Parties to find out their main sources of funding for biosafety activities and their capacity-building needs with regard to mobilization of new and additional resources.

40. In the Online Forum on the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, participants made a number of suggestions under topic 4, regarding ways of mobilizing resources for implementation of the Protocol. Among other things, the participants noted that:

(a) In order to secure national budget allocations for implementation of the Protocol, you need to develop an overarching biosafety policy and enact a national law on biosafety. Passing a biosafety law paves the way for inclusion of biosafety-related activities in the national budgets for the implementing Ministries/agencies. Short of a law, it is extremely difficult to get funds allocated for biosafety in the national budget;

(b) It is also important to mainstream biosafety into the national development plans, such as Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategies. When biosafety is fully integrated into the national planning process, it can be possible to receive a national budget allocation;

(c) If biosafety activities are integrated into NBSAPs and other national development plans they gain more recognition and prioritization. They can also benefit from funds other than national budgets, for example the national GEF allocations;

(d) Raising awareness of the importance of biosafety and the Biosafety Protocol, including how they impact on the national interests, especially among policy and decision makers, is crucial. It helps to build political support for biosafety and could ultimately result in favourable budgetary allocations. Effort should be devoted to providing accurate and timely information to all stakeholders;

(e) Identifying “biosafety champions” to promote awareness and greater understanding of biotechnology and its regulation among the public and parliamentarians is also an important strategy;

(f) It is important to link biosafety to the issues of national concerns and priority for each country so as to attract the attention of policymakers. We need to show that biosafety is invaluable in developing new products from modern biotechnology for socio-economic development, while safeguarding human and animal health and the environment;

(g) There is also a need to work with civil society, academia, the youths, ordinary people, and funding agencies to convince them that implementing the Protocol must be seen as a national priority and is inextricably linked to national development and security.

41. At its eleventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties had intense negotiations regarding the issue of resource mobilization, including targets for implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization. A compromise was reached on interim targets, including doubling biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to developing countries by 2015 and at least maintaining this level until 2020 to contribute to the achievement of the Convention’s three objectives (decision XI/4, paragraph 7). In paragraph 22 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties decided to review, at its twelfth meeting, progress towards the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 20, with the aim of adopting a final target for resource mobilization. In addition, the Parties welcomed and decided to use the preliminary reporting framework and guidance in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/14/Add.1.

42. In paragraph 10 of decision XI/4, the Conference of the Parties mandated the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI), at its fifth meeting, to review the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization and further review the preliminary reporting framework and baseline information for each of the targets. To assist the Working Group, the Executive Secretary prepared document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/4, which includes a review of the implementation of Goals 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the strategy for resource mobilization,¹¹ based on the input provided by Parties and other relevant stakeholders as well as other relevant sources of information.

43. At its twelfth meeting the Conference of the Parties will review progress in the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization with a view to, inter alia, adopting the final targets for resource mobilization. It is also expected to adopt the revised financial reporting framework.

44. In its recommendation 5/10, contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/4, WGRI has advised the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting to consider the proposals for concrete and effective

¹¹ Goal 2 of the strategy for resource mobilization seeks to strengthen national capacity for resource utilization and mobilization of domestic financial resources; Goal 5 aims to mainstream biological diversity and ecosystem services in development cooperation plans and priorities; Goal 6 seeks to build capacity for resource mobilization and utilization and promote South-South cooperation as a complement to necessary North-South cooperation; Goal 7 aims at enhancing implementation of access and benefit-sharing initiatives and mechanisms in support of resources mobilization; Goal 8 aims to enhance the global engagement for resource mobilization in support of the achievement of the Convention’s three objectives.

actions for implementing Aichi Biodiversity Target 20 to be developed by the Executive Secretary, which will include, inter alia, the following:

- (a) Possible actions for achieving targets, as well as associated indicators, including actions associated with the eight goals of the strategy for resource mobilization;
- (b) Delivery and support mechanisms providing technical support and capacity-building, including on good practices and lessons learned in applying financial tools and instruments and in enhancing their effectiveness;
- (c) Capacity-building and technical support instruments that have been made available to Parties by various organizations in order to inform policy development from a toolkit of options that Parties can use to address their resource mobilization needs;
- (d) Options for voluntary guidelines on possible risks and benefits of country-specific innovative financial mechanisms and safeguards; and
- (e) Activities that encourage and support collective action and non-market-based approaches for mobilizing resources for achieving the objectives of the Convention, including such approaches as community-based natural resource management, shared governance or joint management of protected areas, or through indigenous and community conserved territories and areas.

45. Furthermore, the draft decision contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/4 calls for the provision of further technical support and guidance and capacity-building by the Executive Secretary and relevant international organizations on financial reporting, identification of funding needs, gaps and priorities and the development of national resource mobilization strategies.

46. The meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to consider the above developments under the Convention, the recommendations of the tenth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety and the views expressed in the Online Forum on the Implementation of the Protocol and take a decision as appropriate. Among other things, the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish recommend that the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting takes into consideration resource mobilization for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in its consideration of agenda item 14 on resource mobilization and in the draft decision and proposals on resource mobilization referred to above.

V. SUGGESTED ELEMENTS FOR A DRAFT DECISION

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

I. GEF Support for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

1. *Notes with concern* the low number of projects and the total amount of funding requested by Parties from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to support implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety during the fifth replenishment (GEF-5) period;

2. *Welcomes* the sixth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and *expresses its appreciation* to the countries that contributed to the sixth replenishment;

3. *Also welcomes* the GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy contained in document GEF/C.46/07/Rev.01, which includes Program 5 on Implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and *takes note* of the indicative programming targets for the various Biodiversity Focal Area objectives and programmes;

4. *Urges* eligible Parties to prioritize biosafety projects during the programming of their GEF-6 national allocations under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR), 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;

5. *Encourages* Parties to explore the possibility of incorporating biosafety activities into multi-focal-area projects, including the proposed “integrated approach pilots”, as well as projects to be developed under the other biodiversity focal area programmes;

6. *Also encourages* 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;

7. *Invites* Parties and other Governments to organize national workshops for relevant government officials (including GEF operational focal points) to increase their awareness of the importance of biosafety and the national obligations under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety with a view to ensuring due consideration of biosafety in the programming of the national GEF allocations for biodiversity;

8. *Urges* Parties to strengthen their efforts to improve their access to funding for biosafety projects from the Global Environment Facility, inter alia, through better coordination between Cartagena Protocol national focal points, CBD national focal points, and GEF operational focal points, and cooperation in organizing regional workshops with a view to raising awareness of the Cartagena Protocol as a tool for sustainable development and the importance of fulfilling obligations under the Protocol; identifying available local or regional capacities that may be utilized; and designing projects that have a better chance of being approved;

9. *Further urges* Parties and *invites* other Governments to integrate and prioritize biosafety within their national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national development plans and programmes, as appropriate;

10. *Encourages* the implementing agencies of the Global Environment Facility, in particular the United Nations Environment Programme, to make sufficient provisions to support eligible Parties in developing and implementing biosafety projects;

11. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to communicate with the GEF operational focal points concerning the need to consider programming part of the national GEF allocation to support national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which is a binding international agreement under the Convention on Biological Diversity, taking into account paragraph 1 of decision BS-VI/5 and the fact that the Global Environment Facility is the financial mechanism for the Protocol;

12. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme and other relevant organizations, to organize regional and subregional

workshops for the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention national focal points, the GEF operational focal points and relevant stakeholders to strengthen their capacities and foster sharing of experiences and lessons learned regarding GEF funding for biosafety projects;

II. Further guidance to the financial mechanism

13. *Recommends* that 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, invite the Global Environment Facility to:

(a) Make funds available through a focal area set-aside for small-scale projects to eligible Parties that inform the Compliance Committee of their difficulties in complying with the Protocol, and in particular for the following activities:

- (i) Preparation of the third national reports under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, in accordance with paragraph 2 (g) of decision BS-VI/5;
- (ii) Preparation, by Parties that have not yet done so, of their first national reports under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, in accordance with decision BS-V/14;
- (iii) Updating or finalization and implementation of national biosafety frameworks, in accordance with paragraph 2 (h) of decision BS-VI/5;
- (iv) Supporting the use of experts, selected in consultation with the concerned Parties, from the Biosafety Roster of Experts in pursuit of (i), (ii) and (iii) above, as necessary;

(b) Continue to monitor the status of funding requests for projects supporting the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and provide updates to the Conference of the Parties;

(c) Explore the possibility of opening a special financial window for supporting the implementation of the Protocol and report to the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting;

(d) Continue to collaborate with the Executive Secretary to further identify ways of assisting Parties in prioritizing biosafety to access GEF funding;

Mobilization of additional resources

14. *Invites* the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting to take into consideration resource mobilization for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in its consideration of agenda item 14 on resource mobilization;

15. *Urges* Parties that have not yet done so to expedite the enactment of their national biosafety laws to pave the way for securing dedicated funding allocations for biosafety in their national budgets;

16. *Also urges* Parties and invites other Governments to implement, as appropriate, the following strategic 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) Mainstream biosafety into the national development plans, such as Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategies, to make possible to secure national budget support;
- (b) Establish strong outreach programmes targeting key policymakers, the general public and other stakeholders, to promote their awareness of biosafety issues and raise the profile of biosafety among other national priorities;
- (c) Strengthen the capacity of the personnel dealing with biosafety to effectively engage and encourage policymakers, decision makers and officials from other sectors about the importance of biosafety and to secure their support;
- (d) Identify “biosafety champions” to promote awareness and greater understanding of biotechnology and its regulation among the public and parliamentarians;
- (e) Link biosafety to the issues of national concerns and priority for each country so as to attract the attention of policymakers;

17. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to further provide technical support and guidance and capacity-building, 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 on Biological Diversity.

Annex

LIST OF BIOSAFETY PROJECTS APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD (2012-2014)

No.	GEF ID	Country	Project Name	IA ¹²	Project Type	GEF Grant	Co-financing	Status
National projects								
1.	5639	Mauritania	Stocktaking and Update of National Biosafety Framework of Mauritania	UNEP	MSP	878,000	930,000	PIF approved
2.	5768	Sri Lanka	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework in Accordance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)	FAO	FP	2,365,964	2,366,000	Council approved
3.	5290	Venezuela	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework in Venezuela in Accordance to the Cartagena Protocol	UNEP	MSP	1,860,000	6,672,000	PIF/PPG approved
Regional and global projects								
4.	5688	Global	UNEP-GEF Project for Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety	UNEP	FP	4,699,684	9,725,680	Council approved
5.	5283	Regional	Multi-Country Project to Strengthen Institutional Capacity on LMO Testing in Support of National Decision-making	UNEP	FP	3,860,000	6,546,500	PIF/PPG approved
TOTAL						13,663,648	26,240,180	

Source: GEF Report to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Annex 7.

PROJECTS PENDING APPROVAL

	GEF ID	Country	Project Name	IA	Project Type	GEF Grant	Co-financing	Status
6.	5804	Malaysia	Institutional Capacity to Enhance Biosafety Practices in Malaysia	UNEP	MSP	995,000	2,986,500	Resubmitted for approval
7.	5809	Tanzania	Strengthening Institutional Capacity on Handling Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) in Tanzania	UNEP	MSP	1,000,000	1,370,500	PIF resubmitted
8.	5585	Yemen	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Yemen	UNEP	MSP	512,000	784,000	PIF resubmitted
TOTAL						2,507,000	5,141,000	

¹² IA = Implementing Agency; MSP = Medium-Sized Project; FP = Full-Sized Project; PIF = Project Identification Form; PPG = Project Preparation Grant.